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1 Welcome

2 Apologies

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

3 Declaration of Interest

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

4 Leave of Absence

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

5 Acknowledgements

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

6 Petitions

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

7 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 Maungakiekie-Tāmaki 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.

7.1 Auckland Cricket

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Providing Tony Naidu, Community Development Manager of Auckland Cricket the opportunity to present to the board on the current landscape of cricket/kilikiti within the local board area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. As per standing orders the Chairperson has approved the deputation request from Auckland Cricket.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) thank Tony Naidu for their attendance.
8  **Public Forum**

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

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

9  **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 fund, part-fund or decline applications received for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Grants Round One 2019/2020 including multiboard applications.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report presents applications received for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Grants Round One 2019/2020 (Attachment B) including multiboard applications (Attachment C).
4. The local board has set a total community grants budget of $120,000 for the 2019/2020 financial year.
5. Thirty-four applications were received for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Grants, Round One 2019/2020, requesting a total of $219,138.24 and seventeen multiboard applications were also received requesting a total of $57,245.70.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendations
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Grants Round One 2019/2020 listed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LG2011-128</td>
<td>City of Sails Pipe Band Incorporated</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of 40 bagpipe covers.</td>
<td>$4,220.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2011-143</td>
<td>The Dust Palace Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards “To weave a people” workshop series including the “BlindSpot Circus” mentors, scholarship tutor fees, and health and safety monitoring costs.</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2011-145</td>
<td>Action Education Incorporated</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the facilitator fees, administration and resources to deliver 20 spoken word poetry workshops at</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Trust/Incorporated</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LG2011-147</td>
<td>The Good The Bad Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the cost of a feasibility study to produce an annual outdoor sculpture event at Panmure Basin and Onehunga Bay Reserve.</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the “312 Hub” in Onehunga from 1 September 2019 to 30 September 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LG2011-104</td>
<td>Everybody Eats Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of carpentry labour, and materials, electrical services, and equipment for the fit-out of the new ‘Pay As You Feel’ restaurant at 306 Onehunga Mall.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Everybody Eats Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of carpentry labour, and materials, electrical services, and equipment for the fit-out of the new ‘Pay As You Feel’ restaurant at 306 Onehunga Mall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Everybody Eats Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of carpentry labour, and materials, electrical services, and equipment for the fit-out of the new ‘Pay As You Feel’ restaurant at 306 Onehunga Mall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>LG2011-107</td>
<td>The Friends Of Onehunga Community House</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of a half-day workshop on &quot;Raising Your Profile in the Community&quot; in May 2020 including workshop and travel costs.</td>
<td>$2,415.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>House Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of a half-day workshop on &quot;Raising Your Profile in the Community&quot; in May 2020 including workshop and travel costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LG2011-109</td>
<td>Maungarei Community Christian Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of fun activities, balloons, lollies, prizes and a traffic management plan for the “2019 Light Party” on 31 October 2019.</td>
<td>$5,704.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Community Christian Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of fun activities, balloons, lollies, prizes and a traffic management plan for the “2019 Light Party” on 31 October 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>LG2011-112</td>
<td>Onehunga Toy Library</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the expansion of the toy library inventory through the purchase of new toys.</td>
<td>$1,207.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>LG2011-113</td>
<td>Onehunga Chinese Association Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of venue hire, outdoor activities, design, and maintenance of the website, social media and the Chinese New Year Festival for the period of 1 October 2019 to 30 September 2020.</td>
<td>$12,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Onehunga Chinese Association Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of venue hire, outdoor activities, design, and maintenance of the website, social media and the Chinese New Year Festival for the period of 1 October 2019 to 30 September 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Onehunga Chinese Association Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of venue hire, outdoor activities, design, and maintenance of the website, social media and the Chinese New Year Festival for the period of 1 October 2019 to 30 September 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Item | LG2011-114 | Ellerslie Playcentre  
New Zealand Playcentre Federation Incorporated | Community | Towards the manufacture and installation of weatherproof deck screens at Ellerslie Playcentre. | $5,720.00 | Eligible |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2011-115</td>
<td>Communicare-Civilian Maimed Association (Auckland) Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the weekly venue hire cost of the Royal Oak Friendship Centre for one year from 2 September 2019 to 31 August 2020.</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2011-116</td>
<td>Mountains To Sea Conservation Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of running the &quot;Tāmaki Kaitiaki Programme&quot; for 60 students of Tamaki College, including the equipment levy to replace equipment.</td>
<td>$3,367.50</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2011-117</td>
<td>Glen Innes Chinese Groups Incorporated.</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the venue hire cost, purchase of an electronic musical instrument (keyboard arranger), purchase and delivery charges for costumes from China, travel(mileage), stationery and administration costs for the China National Day, Christmas event and the Chinese New Year celebration festival.</td>
<td>$9,552.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2011-118</td>
<td>Panmure FM</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of a laptop for the “Panmure FM” radio studio to enhance audio quality.</td>
<td>$888.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2011-119</td>
<td>Community Impact Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of a trailer to help with the collection of green waste.</td>
<td>$5,785.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Grant Code</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LG2011-124</td>
<td>Shanti Niwas Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Towards the International Day of Older Person (IDOP) celebrations on 21 September 2019, including the cost of venue hire, stage, decorations, publicity, event coordination, catering, contributions for volunteers and judges, sound system hire, prizes, videography, photography, artist fees, transport, entertainment, and waste management.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2011-126</td>
<td>The Potters House Christian Fellowship Onehunga</td>
<td>Towards the venue hire and advertising cost for the &quot;#OPH - Fresh Start&quot; programme.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2011-127</td>
<td>Auckland Regional Migrant Services Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Towards the cost of transport for participants, overheads and staff wages including playgroup leader’s and manager’s salary for the period of 2 September 2019 to 30 June 2020.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2011-129</td>
<td>Youthline Auckland Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Towards the overall costs to train, manage and supervise the volunteer counsellors, triage support and telecommunications for the period of 1 September 2019 to 31 March 2020.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2011-132</td>
<td>Life Education Trust Counties Manukau</td>
<td>Towards the overall costs to deliver a health and well-being programme to schools in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>LG2011-134</td>
<td>Kahui Tu Kaha Ltd</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of running &quot;‘Niu’ (Coconut) Tree of Life&quot; a Pasifika focus programme including the cost of venue hire, specialist tutor fees, purchase of tools, equipment, materials, and transport to events for the period of 17 September 2019 to 30 October 2020.</td>
<td>$7,304.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>LG2011-135</td>
<td>Dance Therapy NZ</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards programme facilitation, coordination, materials, marketing and administration costs for &quot;Arts 4 Us&quot; drop-in workshops in Riverside and Oranga from 11 February 2020 to 24 June 2020.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>LG2011-137</td>
<td>CCS Disability Action Auckland Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards all costs of the &quot;International Day of Disabled people&quot;, a family fun day to be held on 3 December 2019 including the cost of New Zealand Signage Language interpreters, audiovisual equipment hire, food, and entertainment.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>LG2011-139</td>
<td>The Carol White Family Centre Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the &quot;Refugee and Migrant Children and Families Welfare Support&quot; programme, including the cost of transport, food, training and supervision, resources for early childcare centre and a bilingual assistant.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2011-141</td>
<td>Kids Safe with Dogs Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards instructor wages, administration and printing costs to deliver the &quot;Kids Safe with Dogs&quot; programme to schools in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki area.</td>
<td>$8,775.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2011-142</td>
<td>Mount Wellington Playcentre New Zealand Playcentre Federation Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of heuristic and sensory play resources for infants and toddlers.</td>
<td>$2,511.27</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2011-130</td>
<td>Tread Lightly Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Towards the costs of bringing the Tread Lightly Caravan to Tamaki Primary.</td>
<td>$2,555.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2011-101</td>
<td>Sports Implementation Foundation</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards all boxing gear including hand wraps, gloves and protective gear to provide a boxing and fitness mentoring programme over six months.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2011-110</td>
<td>Glen Taylor School Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of a fleet of different sized children's bikes, helmets, and container to store the bikes.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2011-121</td>
<td>The Synergy Projects Trust</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards the equipment and facilitation costs of running the Maungakiekie Community Sports' Mini Olympics at Fergusson Park, Oranga from 8 December 2019 to 21 February 2020.</td>
<td>$9,500.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2011-123</td>
<td>Te Papapa Onehunga Rugby Football and Sports Club</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards the purchase and installation of new carpet in the main hall area of the Te Papapa Onehunga</td>
<td>$7,291.30</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incorporated Rugby Football and Sports Club.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LG2011-125</td>
<td>Auckland Basketball Services Limited</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards office rent for November 2019 and hall hire for a junior development programme from October 2019 to December 2019.</td>
<td>$4,075.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2011-133</td>
<td>YMCA North Incorporated</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of 50 new life jackets and kickboards for the aquatics programmes at YMCA Onehunga War Memorial Pools.</td>
<td>$3,966.73</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2011-138</td>
<td>New Hope Community Impact Trust</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of a new treadmill for the “Transformers” gym and fitness centre at the Impact Centre in Onehunga.</td>
<td>$5,300.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$219,138.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Multiboard Round One 2019/2020, listed in Table Two below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-115</td>
<td>Manukau Orchestral Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the wages to engage professional mentors and a soloist to rehearse and deliver a concert.</td>
<td>$723.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-152</td>
<td>Mika Haka Foundation Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the cost of running the &quot;YES Creative Hub&quot; from 10 October 2019 to 10 October 2020, specifically the costs of rent (studio and office), public liability, utilities, safety officer's salary, and administration.</td>
<td>$9,794.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-153</td>
<td>The Operating Theatre Trust</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards 2,000 free show tickets and free transport for children from low decile schools in the local board area to attend the theatre production &quot;Greedy Cat&quot; by Joy Cowley.</td>
<td>$3,103.55</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-126</td>
<td>Age Concern Auckland Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the provision of an accredited visitor service and field social support services across west and central Auckland.</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-135</td>
<td>Auckland Kids Achievement Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the salary of the three “Stars” Programme Coordinators.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-136</td>
<td>Deaf Action New Zealand</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards venue hire, New Zealand Sign Language interpreter fee, and purchase of technical equipment to deliver forums from October 2019 to September 2020.</td>
<td>$1,427.17</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-141</td>
<td>Royal New Zealand Foundation Of The Blind Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of digital talking books for the Blind Foundation library.</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-147</td>
<td>YMCA North Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the costs of delivering the “Family Camp” at YMCA Camp Adair including staff costs, accommodation, outdoor instruction, gear and catering in November 2019 and February 2020.</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-157</td>
<td>PHAB Association (Auckland) Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of the &quot;Youth With Disabilities Disco&quot; event on 28 September 2019 at the Mt Albert War Memorial Hall, specifically venue</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-162</td>
<td>Children’s Autism Foundation</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of delivering “In It Together” workshops specifically the cost of workshop facilitators, travel and mileage, project co-ordination and administrative surcharges.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-173</td>
<td>Body Positive - New Zealand Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the peer navigator’s salary for Body Positive</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-170</td>
<td>Environmental Education for Resource Sustainability Trust</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of native plants from Te Whangai Trust and Gulf Trees and courier fees for delivering classroom bins, administration and office expenses for recycling for schools and preschools in the local board area.</td>
<td>$4,540.48</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-110</td>
<td>The Korean Society of Auckland Incorporated</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards the annual event costs for the Korean Day event on 14 March 2020.</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>Ineligible due to requested amount being above maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-145</td>
<td>5Tunz Communications Ltd</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards the delivery of “Holi - Festival of Colours 2020” on 14 March 2020, including the cost of the generator, stage lighting and decorations, sound, port-a-loos, waste management, security, advertising, and marquees.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-151</td>
<td>New Zealand Nepal Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards 'Nepal Festival 2020' including audio visual hire, insurance, waste management, marketing, travel and operational costs.</td>
<td>$8,007.50</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-159</td>
<td>United North Piha Lifeguard Service Incorporated</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards the costs of structural engineering, detailed design, project management and consent fees for the North Piha Lifeguard Facility replacement project.</td>
<td>$1,750.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-167</td>
<td>Auckland Indian Sports Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards the annual hockey turf hire fees from 1 September 2019 to 31 August 2020.</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** |  |  |  | **$57,245.70** |  |

### Horopaki Context

6. The local board allocates grants to groups and organisations delivering projects, activities and services that benefit Aucklanders and contribute to the vision of being a world class city.

7. The Auckland Council Community Grants Policy supports each local board to adopt a grants programme.

8. The local board grants programme sets out:
   - local board priorities
   - lower priorities for funding
   - exclusions
   - grant types, the number of grant rounds and when these will open and close
   - any additional accountability requirements.


10. The community grant programmes have been extensively advertised through the council grants webpage, local board webpages, local board e-newsletters, Facebook pages, council publications, radio, and community networks.

11. The local board has set a total community grants budget of $120,000 for the 2019/2020 financial year.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

12. The aim of the local board grant programme is to deliver projects and activities which align with the outcomes identified in the local board plan. All applications have been assessed utilising the Community Grants Policy and the local board grant programme criteria. The eligibility of each application is identified in the report recommendations.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

13. The main focus of an application is identified as arts, community, events, sport and recreation, environment or heritage. Based on the main focus of an application, a subject matter expert from the relevant department, will provide input and advice.

14. The grants programme has no identified impacts on council-controlled organisations and therefore their views are not required.

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

Local impacts and local board views

15. Local boards are responsible for the decision-making and allocation of local board community grants. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board is required to fund, part-fund or decline these grant applications against the local board priorities identified in the local board grant programme.

16. The board is requested to note that section 48 of the Community Grants Policy states; ‘we will also provide feedback to unsuccessful grant applicants about why they have been declined, so they will know what they can do to increase their chances of success next time’.

17. A summary of each application received through Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Grants, Round One 2019/2020 and multi-board applications is provided in Attachment B and Attachment C.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

18. The local board grants programme aims to respond to Auckland Council’s commitment to improving Māori wellbeing by providing grants to individuals and groups who deliver positive outcomes for Māori. Auckland Council’s Māori Responsiveness Unit has provided input and support towards the development of the community grant processes.

19. Sixteen applicants applying to local grant round one, has indicated that their project targets Māori or Māori outcomes.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

20. The allocation of grants to community groups is within the adopted Long-term Plan 2018-2028 and local board agreements.

21. The local board has set a total community grants budget of $120,000 for the 2019/2020 financial year.

22. Thirty-four applications were received for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Grants, Round One 2019/2020, requesting a total of $219,138.24 and seventeen multiboard applications were also received requesting a total of $57,245.70.
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
27 August 2019

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

23. The allocation of grants occurs within the guidelines and criteria of the Community Grants Policy and the local board grants programme. The assessment process has identified a low risk associated with funding the applications in this round.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

24. Following the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board allocating funding for round one of the local grants and multiboard grants, Commercial and Finance staff will notify the applicants of the local board’s decision.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Grants Programme 2019/2020</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Grants Round One 2019/2020 applications (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Multiboard Grants Round One 2019/2020 applications (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

| Author                        | Marion Davies - Grants and Incentives Manager  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

Local Grants Programme 2019/2020

Our Local Grants Programme aims to provide contestable and discretionary community grants to local communities.

Outcomes sought from the local grants programme

Our grants programme will be targeted towards supporting the following outcomes, as outlined in our local board plan:

- Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is an active and engaged community
- Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is a community that cares about its environment
- Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is the place to be
- Maungakiekie-Tāmaki has quality infrastructure to match growth

Our priorities for grants

The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board welcomes grant applications that deliver the following priorities outlined in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Plan:

- **Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is an active and engaged community**
  - Putting people first - People are cared for and enabled to participate, celebrate and contribute to the community
  - Active participation - Our young people are engaged in the community and have access to a wide range of opportunities
  - Creating opportunities for our young people - Our community is a safer place
  - A safer community - Our community is a safer place
  - Support and grow community gardening initiatives

- **Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is a community that cares about its environment**
  - Environmental leadership - Demonstrate environmental leadership and support community sustainability initiatives
  - Clean water and beautiful waterways - Clean, beautiful waters and waterside areas
  - The development of social enterprise initiatives with tangible benefit for the wider local community
  - Heading towards zero waste

- **Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is the place to be**
  - A thriving local economy - Our businesses, town centres and industry flourish and provide high quality jobs
  - Quality urban environment - New developments are high-quality and reflect the flavour and character of our area
  - Destination areas (Onehunga, Parnure, Glen Innes, Sylvia Park and Mount Wellington) - Our suburbs and town centres are sought-after destinations to live, work and play.

- **Maungakiekie-Tāmaki has quality infrastructure to match growth**
  - Safe and improved community facilities – Have safe and improved community facilities
  - Good quality open spaces - Good quality open spaces
  - Better connections and transport infrastructure - Better transport connections and improved transport infrastructure
  - Keeping up with growth and development - Other infrastructure needs
Higher Priority
- Projects that are inclusive and support under-represented members of the community
- Projects that support smoke-free events

Lower Priorities
- catering
- the purchase of electronic equipment
- ongoing administration costs – for example wages, salaries or rent
- fundraising activities for a group or organisation
- projects or events that are outside the local board
- initiatives that are eligible and can be funded by central government
- projects that do not demonstrate any benefit to the wider community

Exclusions
The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board will not fund:
- gifts/prizes
- groups that have failed to meet accountability obligations from previous council grants except in exceptional circumstances

Investment approach
The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board will generally grant between $500 and $10,000, per grant application.

Quick Response grants are for grant applications up to $4,000.

Application dates
Local Grant rounds for 2019/2020 will be as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Projects to start after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round One</td>
<td>3 June 2019</td>
<td>12 July 2019</td>
<td>27 August 2019</td>
<td>1 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two</td>
<td>17 February</td>
<td>27 March 2020</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quick Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quick Response round</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Projects to start after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round One</td>
<td>30 March 2020</td>
<td>24 April 2020</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>1 July 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiboard rounds 2019/2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiboard grant round</th>
<th>Opening date</th>
<th>Closing date</th>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Projects to start after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round One</td>
<td>3 June 2019</td>
<td>19 July 2019</td>
<td>27 August 2019</td>
<td>1 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two</td>
<td>20 January 2020</td>
<td>13 March 2020</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accountability measures**

Accountability is an important step where successful applicants demonstrate what benefits came from their initiative. It is also about properly acknowledging where the funding for the activity came from. Accountability measures should be appropriate to the nature of the application and, in particular, the size of the grant. Therefore the specific accountability measures will be put in place by the local board at the time the grants are decided and will include financial reporting.
New Community lease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust, Ruapotaka Reserve, Glen Innes Community Centre, 96-108 Line Road, Glen Innes

File No.: CP2019/14744

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To grant a new community lease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust (Plunket) at Ruapotaka Reserve, for rooms within the Glen Innes Community Centre, 96-108 Line Road, Glen Innes.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Royal New Zealand Plunket Society Incorporated holds an expired community lease in the building adjacent to the Glen Innes Community Centre with Auckland City Council that commenced 1 April 2001 with a final expiry 31 March 2016.
3. In 2018 all leases for existing Plunket sites were assigned to a new Plunket entity the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust.
4. The group have already moved to the community centre and applied for a new lease in 2018. The delay in processing the application was owing to organisation changes and formation of new entities within Plunket. The group require a new community lease to authorise their occupation in the community centre.
5. The proposed lease was workshoped with the local board in August and November 2018. Staff recommended that the local board not call for expressions of interest as the group’s activities were regarded to be the best use of the premises, offering various services beneficial to a significant number of families and children within the community.
6. The proposed Plunket lease is in part of the community centre building on Ruapotaka Reserve at 96-108 Line Road, Glen Innes.
7. A requirement of the Conservation Act 1987 and Reserves Act 1977 calls for council to consult iwi before granting a new lease. This was undertaken in September 2018 and iwi were supportive of granting a new lease to this group.
8. This report recommends Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board grant a new community lease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust for a term of five (5) years with two (2) five (5) year rights of renewal.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) Agree to not call for expressions of interest for the proposed lease.

b) Approve a new community lease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust, within the council owned Glen Innes Community Centre on part of Ruapotaka Reserve described as being Part Lot 192 DP 43833, comprising 7282 square meters and contained in NA13A/1440 (Part cancelled) (Attachment A), on the following terms and conditions:
   i) term – five (5) years commencing 1 April 2016 with two (2) five (5) year rights
Item 11

of renewal;

ii) rent – One dollar ($1) plus GST per annum if demanded;

iii) payment of an operational charge of $250 plus GST per annum

iv) inclusion of a specific amendment to the lease that as the property is held by the Department of Conservation that it may be required for Treaty of Waitangi redress purposes in the future.

v) all other terms and conditions in accordance with the Reserves Act 1977 and the Auckland Council Community Occupancy Guidelines July 2012.

c) Delegate authority to the Chair and Deputy Chair to approve the Community Outcomes Plan to be attached to the lease as a schedule.

Horopaki Context

9. Plunket previously shared the building adjacent to the Glen Innes Community Centre with the Auckland Citizen Advice Bureaux (CAB). This building is being demolished as part of the redevelopment of Ruapotaka Reserve and both groups have either moved or are moving to space in the Glen Innes Community Centre.

10. A new lease is required to authorise Plunket’s occupation at the Glen Innes Community Centre.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

The Land

11. The Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust occupies space in the Glen Innes Community Centre, situated at 96-108 Line Road, Glen Innes, on Ruapotaka Reserve, which is legally described as Part Lot 192 DP 43833, comprising 7282 square meters more or less and contained in NA13A/1440 (Part cancelled). The land is held by the Crown through the Department of Conservation as a classified local purpose (site for community buildings) reserve, subject to the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977, and vested in the Auckland Council, in trust, for that purpose.

The Building

12. Plunket is already occupying part of the Glen Innes Community Centre. The proposed leased area is 60 square meters more or less in the north wing of the Glen Innes Community Centre and includes exclusive use of two (2) offices which are used to see clients; a waiting and play area with kitchen for families, a bathroom and two (2) small storage rooms. The Plunket also operates a Midwife service from the premises.

Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust

13. Plunket is a national not-for-profit organisation, that is community owned and governed. Plunket provides a caring, professional well child and whanau service committed to providing access to services for all children and families regardless of ethnicity, location or ability to pay.

14. Programmes have been designed to support whanau with young children and offer a range of activities including support and developmental assessments of children at varying stages between birth and five years.

15. Plunket visits can take place at pre-schools, marae and other community facilities. Each visit gives parents the opportunity to discuss parenting and whanau issues and children’s health and development.
16. Whanau have access to Plunket services at the Glen Innes clinic two days per week. The other days it is used by staff as an office base to complete administrative work, and for when they conduct home visits to whanau in the community.

17. Plunket has submitted a comprehensive application and are able to demonstrate its viability to deliver services. The group have also met the terms of the lease agreement.

18. A site visit has been undertaken and the Plunket clinic is well managed and maintained. Plunket has undertaken renovations including interior painting, installing a mini-kitchenette and waiting/play area, double glazing windows, and installing a bathroom facility for clients.

19. A community outcomes plan is being negotiated with Plunket that identifies the benefits it will provide to the community. This will be attached as a schedule to the lease document, when complete, and approved by the Chair and Deputy Chair.

20. Plunket is financially viable and audited accounts show proper accounting records have been kept.

21. Community groups occupying rooms within larger council owned buildings are required to pay an operational charge. The charge is a contribution towards the direct costs council incurs for the occupation of the building by the group. In this case the charge of $250 plus GST per annum is payable.

22. This report recommends the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board grant a new community lease to Plunket for a term of five (5) years with a two (2) five (5) year rights of renewal.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

23. The granting of this lease authorises the relocation of Plunket from an adjacent building. This allows for the demolition of the building as part of the redevelopment of the reserve once the CAB is also relocated to the community centre.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

24. The proposed new community lease was workshopped with the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board in August and November 2018.

25. An expression of interest process is usually undertaken when a new lease is available to ensure the highest and best use is accommodated. Staff recommend that the local board forego this process, as it has been deemed that the activities of the group are the best use of the premises, offering services which are beneficial to a significant number within the community.

26. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board is the allocated authority to approve the granting of a new community lease.

27. The recommendations within this report support the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Plan 2017 outcome of ‘Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is an active and engaged community.’

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

28. Auckland Council is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and its broader legal obligations to Māori. The council recognises these responsibilities are distinct from the Crown’s Treaty obligations and fall within a local government Tāmaki Makaurau context. These commitments are articulated in the council’s key strategic planning documents, the Auckland Plan, the 10-year budget 2018-2028, the Unitary Plan and Local Board Plans.
29. The proposal has been presented to a mana whenua forum and to individual iwi groups with an interest in the Glen Innes area. There were no comments or objections received regarding the proposal.

30. Plunket actively supports whanau Māori to achieve and maintain their maximum health and wellbeing. Plunket does this by providing a quality health service, and by working closely with others in the health sector.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

31. There are no financial implications for council in granting this lease.

32. Plunket has borne the cost of upgrading the leased space to provide a safe and calming space for community users.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

33. As the land is held by the Department of Conservation the property may be required in the future for Treaty of Waitangi redress. A clause will be inserted in the lease to reflect this requirement.

34. If a new community lease is not granted it will inhibit Plunket’s ability to plan and develop programmes specifically designed for the local community and continue to deliver its services to the community with surety. Staff recommend that the local board approve this lease.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

35. Subject to the grant of a new community lease, staff will work with Plunket to finalise the community lease arrangement.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Plan</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Valerie Vui - Community Lease Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment A: Site Plan and Leased Area

Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust

Ruapotaka Reserve, Glen Innes Community Centre, 96-108 Line Road, Glen Innes.

The leased area includes the footprint of the far north wing (hatched in red) of the Glen Innes Community Centre building which is a council-owned building outlined in blue and marked A, comprising approximately 1676 square meters and contained in NA65A/447. Legally described as Lot 1 DP 114327, and is currently held by the Crown through the Department of Conservation as a classified local purpose (site for community buildings) reserve, subject to the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977, and vested in the Auckland Council, in trust, for that purpose.
New community lease to Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated
Konini Domain Recreation Reserve, 18A Waiohua Road, Greenlane

File No.: CP2019/14772

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve a new community lease to Ellerslie Tennis Club for the land and building, situated at Konini Domain Recreation Reserve, 18A Waiohua Road, Greenlane.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated seeks a new community lease for the land and building at Konini Domain Recreation Reserve, 18A Waiohua Road, Greenlane.
3. The tennis club holds a community lease for the footprint of the building and the two upper tennis courts.
4. The lease commenced on 1 January 2003 for a term of five years with two five-year rights of renewal with a final expiry on 31 December 2017. The lease is holding over on a month by month basis on the same terms and conditions.
5. The club has submitted a comprehensive application in support of the new lease request. Staff have assessed the application and are satisfied that the requirements under Auckland Council's Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 have been met.
6. This report recommends that the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board approve a new community lease to the Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated. The recommendations within this report aligns with the Local Board Plan 2017 outcome: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is an active and engaged community.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) approve a new community lease to Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated, for the council-owned building and land comprising approximately 1634.8m², shown in Attachment A and situated at Konini Domain Recreation Reserve, 18A Waiohua Road, Greenlane, described as Section 21 SO 24235, held by Department of Conservation as a classified recreational reserve and vested in the Auckland Council, in trust, for recreational purposes subject to the following terms:

i. term – five (5) years commencing on 1 January 2018, with two (2) five (5) year right of renewals

ii. rent – $1.00 plus GST per annum

iii. payment of an operational charge of $250 plus GST per annum

iv. all other terms and conditions to be in accordance with Auckland Council’s Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 and the Reserves Act 1977.
b) approve the Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated’s Community Outcomes Plan to be attached to the lease as a schedule (Attachment B).

**Horopaki Context**

7. This report considers the new community lease to Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated for the council-owned building and tennis courts situated at Konini Domain Recreational Reserve.

8. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board is the allocated authority relating to local, recreation, sport and community facilities, including community leasing matters.

**Land, Buildings and Lease**

9. The Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated holds a community lease for the council owned building and two (2) of the three tennis courts, situated at Konini Domain Recreational Reserve, 18A Waiohua Road, Greenlane, legally described as Section 21 SO 24235.

10. Konini Domain consists of approximately 6442m² and is held by the Department of Conservation as a classified recreational reserve and vested in the Auckland Council, in trust, for recreational purposes.

11. The building is primarily used to host club meetings, functions and hosting teams from other clubs. It comprises two levels, the top level consisting of a large open floor, a kitchen and tuck shop. The bottom level has toilets and changing rooms and storage facilities. The building requires some cosmetic maintenance work but is generally fit for purpose.

12. The proposed lease to Ellerslie Tennis Club is for the council-owned building, and two (2) tennis courts consisting of approximately 1634.8m² as shown by Attachment A, delineated in red and marked A.

13. The tennis club is contemplated in the Konini Domain Reserve Management Plan 1977. The domain is a recreation reserve and the tennis club activity is described and approved in the plan. There is no departure from the approved land use.

**Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated**

14. The Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated was established 92 years ago and originally located on Robert Street, Ellerslie, then at Ellerslie Domain on the Main Highway before relocating to Konini Domain in 2003 after their clubroom was destroyed by arson.

15. The club has been at the present site for 16 years. It is a non-profit organisation and run by several part time volunteers who are passionate about the sport of tennis.

16. The club’s primary objective is to encourage the growth of tennis, by eliminating financial barriers to playing the sport.

17. They offer Junior and Senior tennis, the former has free coaching and both include social and competitive tennis through interclub and championship competitions.

18. The club has 92 registered members, from different ethnic backgrounds.

19. Some of the club’s activities include:
   i. Tennis theory and practice
   ii. Social activities
iii. Community open days  
iv. Coaching  
v. Social, competitive, inter-club, regional championship competitions  
iv. Other tennis focused activities.

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

**The new community lease to Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated**

20. Auckland Council’s Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 sets out the requirements for community occupancy agreements.


22. Local boards have discretion to vary the term of the lease if they wish. The guidelines suggest that where a term is varied, it aligns to one of the recommended terms contained in the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012.

23. The Ellerslie Tennis Club is a registered Incorporated Society, incorporated as of 5 July 2001.

24. The club has all necessary insurance cover, including public liability insurance in place.

25. After assessing the lease application and meeting with the executive committee of the club, staff advise that club qualifies for a new community lease by virtue of the following:

   - The activities of the tennis club support the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Plan 2017 outcome: *Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is an active and engaged community.*
   - The land classification, together with the reserve management plan, envision Konini Domain Recreational Reserve being used for recreation purposes and the tennis activity.
   - Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated is not in breach of the current occupancy agreement.
   - The group’s financial accounts have sufficient reserves to cover its operating costs with no declared contingent liabilities.
   - The group sustains its activities predominantly through membership fees, income from events and donations.
   - The building meets the needs of the tennis club, who share the building with other community groups including an afterschool group.

26. Community groups occupying council owned buildings are required to pay an operational charge. The charge is a contribution towards the direct costs council incurs for the occupation of the building by the group. In this case the charge of $250 plus GST per annum is payable.

27. It is recommended that a new lease be granted to the tennis club for an initial term of five (years) 5 years with two (2) five (5) year right of renewals, in line with the guidelines.

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

28. Staff obtained feedback from Parks and Places, Parks, Sports and Recreation, Operational Management and Maintenance and no concerns were raised regarding the proposed lease.

29. Community Leasing has worked collaboratively with Parks, Sports and Recreation to
develop a targeted community outcomes plan to guide the tennis club to achieve specified local board outcomes and deliver community benefit.

30. The proposed new lease has no identified impacts on other parts of the council group. The views of council controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of this report's advice.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

31. This is an approved item on the Community Facilities Work Programme for 2018/2019. The lease was workshopped with the local board on 21 August 2018 who indicated an informal support of the group and proposed new lease.

32. An advertisement regarding the proposed new lease to the group was published in local newspapers. The public had four weeks within which to provide submissions or objections. All submissions received from the public were in support of the proposed new lease. Staff therefore do not foresee any adverse local impact by group's continued occupation.

33. The recommendations within this report fall within the local board's delegated authority relating to local, recreation, sport and community facilities, including community leasing matters.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

34. Auckland Council is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi which are articulated in the council’s key strategic planning documents the Auckland Plan, the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, the Unitary Plan and local board plans.

35. An aim of community leasing is to increase targeted support for Māori community development. This proposal seeks to improve access to facilities for all Aucklanders, including Māori living in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki area.

36. Iwi engagement took place on 18 September 2018 at the Mana Whenua Forum, and through email correspondence between 28 September – 27 October 2018 when the relevant iwi groups identified as having an interest in the land were contacted.

37. No objection to the proposal to grant a new community lease to the tennis club was received.

38. There are no changes to the use or operational activities being conducted on the land.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

39. The cost of the public notification of the intention to lease, and any cost associated with the preparation of the lease document, will be borne by council.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

40. If the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board resolve not to grant the new lease to Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated, the club’s ability to undertake its core activities will be materially affected, which in turn will have a negative impact on the desired local board outcomes. Additionally, the community will lose access to the activities undertaken by the club.

41. As there is no significant departure from the current land use or change in activities there are no identified risks in granting the lease.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

42. Subject to the local board granting a new community lease, staff will work with Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated to formalise the lease agreement.
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Attachment A: Site Plan and Leased Area

Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated

Konini Domain Recreation Reserve, 18A Waiohua Road, Greenlane.

The leased area includes the footprint of the council-owned building and land (upper two tennis courts) hatched in red and marked A, comprising approximately 1634.8m². Legally described as Section 21 SO 24235 - No title, held by Department of Conservation as a classified recreational reserve and vested in the Auckland Council, in trust, for recreational purposes.
Community Outcomes Plan  
Ellerslie Tennis Club Inc (ETC), Konini Reserve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Auckland Plan 2050</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council or Local Board Priority</td>
<td>Improve health and wellbeing for all Aucklanders by reducing harm and disparities in opportunities</td>
<td>ETC ensures that membership fees are set to ensure that there are no barriers to access. ETC caters for tennis players of all ages and abilities. Provide weekend, evening and mid-week tennis to maximise times that the courts are used and to increase access.</td>
<td>Club fees remain lower than neighbouring tennis clubs. ETC continues to promote the club via its website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus area 2  
Provide accessible services and social and cultural infrastructure that are responsive in meeting people’s evolving needs

Focus area 7  
Recognise the value of arts, culture, sport and recreation to quality of life

Aucklanders live in secure, healthy, and affordable homes, and have access to a range of inclusive public places.
| Direction 4 | ETC maintains the public tennis court which public have access to. The club supports participation for all abilities and ages:  
  - Senior tennis is played all year round  
  - Junior tennis runs from Sept to April, however juniors are encouraged to also come to senior tennis sessions.  
  - ETC has an agreement with Auckland Veterans Tennis to use the courts.  
  - ETC promotes the club through local schools. | ETC has regular working bees (minimum 2 per year) to clean and maintain the facility. Agreement with Auckland Veterans Tennis continues. | Reported in ETC Annual Presidents Report  
Agreement with Auckland Veterans Tennis. |

**Auckland is prosperous, with many opportunities, and delivers a better standard of living for everyone.**

**Focus area 5**  
Increase educational achievement, lifelong learning and training, with a focus on those most in need

<p>|  | ETC supports a local provider of free mathematics tuition by allowing the club rooms to be utilised at no cost. | ETC continues to support free mathematic tuition. |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mangakiekie – Tamaki Local Board Plan 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Board Priority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangakiekie – Tamaki is an active and engaged community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People are cared for an enabled to participate, celebrate and contribute to the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Our Young are engaged in the community and have access to a wide range of opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Our community is a safer place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakeikei Tamaki is the place to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Our suburbs and town centres are sought after destinations to live, work and play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakeikei Tamaki has quality infrastructure to match growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local activities and levels of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Parks, sport and recreation – provision of open space for passive and active recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local community services; Improved community outcomes by providing spaces for the community to learn and recreate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board provided funding in FY2018/2019 to undertake the ‘Knowing phase’ of the Urban Ngahere (Forest) program.
3. The ‘Knowing phase’ has involved detailed analysis of the urban tree cover; using a variety of data sources from the council, Statistics NZ, and other local government sources. The analysis has looked at the urban tree cover extents from the 2013 aerial analysis work, alongside population statistics, and current growth projections outlined in the Auckland Plan.
4. The report has established that urban tree coverage in the local board area is approximately 11.2 per cent of the overall land area in 2013. The total tree cover is very low when compared to the averages across the region and well below the minimum target that has been set by Auckland Council in the regional Urban Ngahere Strategy. The strategy sets a regional target to have no local board with a canopy coverage less than 15 per cent.
5. To increase canopy cover to 15 per cent a long term concerted effort will be required to plant new specimen trees every year.
6. In FY2019/2020 the local board has provided LDI funding to undertake the ‘Growing phase’ of the Ngahere program. This will begin the work to bring the canopy cover nearer to the target of 15 per cent.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) approves the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Urban Forest (Ngahere) Analysis Report (Attachment A).

b) delegate authority through the Chief Executive to the General Manager, Parks Sport and Recreation to make minor changes and amendments to the text and design of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report that are required before publication.

Horopaki
Context
7. In 2017, Auckland Council staff developed a regional tree strategy to address concerns around tree cover changes resulting from: development pressures, disease threats, climate change, and changes to tree protection rules. The development of the strategy included workshops and consultation with elected members, mana whenua, and internal stakeholders. The work resulted in the regional Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy, which was adopted by the Environment and Community Committee in February 2018.
8. Currently the region has an average tree canopy cover of 18 per cent. The strategy sets targets that encourages all local boards to have a minimum tree canopy cover of at least 15 per cent, and on a regional scale the target is set at 30 per cent by 2050, in line with the Auckland Plan.

9. The regional Urban Ngahere Strategy recommends implementation and analysis at the local level. Local boards were offered the opportunity to invest LDI in area specific Urban Ngahere programmes of work.


Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

11. The analysis report highlights the low overall tree canopy coverage at 11.2 per cent for the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki local board area. The report provides a number of other statistics:
   - 9.5 per cent of local roads have tree canopy cover, which is low
   - 9.2 per cent of private land have tree canopy cover
   - 21.6 per cent of public parks have tree canopy cover.

12. Section 8 of the report which sets out key focus areas for increasing the tree canopy coverage across the local board area. These are intended to help provide long-term lasting benefits for local communities.

13. A concerted multi-year program of tree planting on public land in parks, open space areas and within the road corridor is necessary to help increase the overall tree numbers in the local board area which will in the long-term help to increase the areas overall tree canopy coverage.

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

14. Parks, Sports and Recreation (PSR) has collaborated with Community Facilities to inform where the current maintenance and renewal program for trees can help to improve the overall health, diversity and extent of the tree canopy cover.

15. PSR and Community Facilities will collaboratively manage the LDI opex and project manage the delivery of the new tree plantings in the 2020 planting season.

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

16. The local board has provided direction and support for the project at workshops in July and August 2018 to complete the ‘Knowing’ phase.

17. The board has also provided LDI for the next stage of the Ngahere program in FY2019/2020.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

18. The urban ngahere is important to mana whenua and the use of native trees will take place as the first choice in alignment with the council’s Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy. New tree plantings will benefit local Māori and the wider community by providing increased opportunities for access to nature and providing shade in the local park network.

19. Mana whenua will be engaged to support tree planting preparation and provide a cultural narrative in the choice of species for the local areas.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

20. The local board has provided further LDI funding in FY2019/2020 to undertake scoping of sites for new tree plantings. Further detail on this program will be presented to the local board at the beginning of 2020.

21. It is recommended the local board adopts an annual program of new tree planting in parks and along streets to increase the level of tree canopy coverage on public land across the entire local board area.

22. Further work is required to establish other options for financial assistance from the private sector within the local board area. Planting on private land is needed and large land holders such as Housing New Zealand and the Ministry of Education can help by funding the plantings of new trees.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

23. Failure to provide further funding for the ngahere program will result in no longer term planting plan development and no specific new tree planting program taking place in neighbourhood parks and along the road berms on suburban streets. Current renewal planting will be the only mechanism for improving the current tree asset.

24. The analysis report highlights a need for additional efforts to significantly increase tree canopy cover to help provide increased shade and the additional social and health benefits that come with more tree cover. In addition, the planting of new trees is increasingly being recognised as a local solution to help with climate related changes that are taking place.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

25. A canopy cover change chapter will be added as an update addendum once the data is ready later this year. The updated chapter will be presented to the local board in early 2020.

26. Staff recommend that the board delegate authority to the General Manager of PSR for minor changes to the report. This will streamline the approval process for the final draft (with addendum).

27. Community Services and Community Facilities will work collaboratively to develop an outline of the ‘Growing’ program to set out new tree planting plans for next five years. The longer term growing plan for the planting program will be adopted via a report in quarter four of FY2019/2020.
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Local Development Initiative – Urban Ngahere Programme

Year 1 Knowing Phase

Urban Ngahere Analysis report for the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki
Overview

The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki local board have provided Opex funding in the Financial year 18-19 to Councils Urban Forest Advisor to undertake a detailed analysis of the Ngahere (Forest) in their local area.

This report outlines the distribution, ownership, and protection status of urban tree cover within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board (Auckland Council) area. The intent of the report is to provide an evidence-based approach to ensure decision-makers are well-informed on the scale, health and diversity of the urban trees in their local board area. This information will enable the development of a sound and structured approach to urban forest management for future decision makers. Principally, the report will be utilised by Council’s Urban Forest Advisor for the Parks, Sports & Recreation Team, who is leading the Ngahere programme for the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board, to provide background information and some direction and context for an urban forest strategy.

Auckland’s urban forest is remarkable and special, and likely to be the largest and most varied collection of amenity trees on public and private land in the country. However, rapid population growth and recent legislative change to the Resource Management Act is leading to significant changes in the urban landscape, which is reflected in the scale, maturity, and size of the urban forest.

One of the most critical issues relating to urban forest in Auckland, and the most important unknown, is the rate of change in the urban forest canopy extent, including the numbers and sizes of trees being removed per annum. Prior to the analysis presented in this report, the Council had no reliable information on the extent, ownership, and protection status of Auckland’s urban forest assets.

The data presented in this report includes a snap-shot of urban forest cover from 2013, sourced through a measure of canopy distribution and height within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area. The data presented in this report is based on an analysis of 2013 LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) data captured jointly by NZ Aerial Mapping and Aerial Surveys Limited for Auckland Council. Auckland Council has undertaken a second aerial LiDAR survey of a similar nature, completed in 2017, which is currently being analysed to determine possible changes in urban forest cover and associated attributes.

The final results of the most recent survey will be presented to the Environment Committee in September 2019. As a result, it is expected that a more detailed change detection analysis can then be provided to the local board to show where the areas of tree canopy have changed both positively and negatively. This detail will help to inform the next stage of the Ngahere program which involves planting more trees to help grow the canopy in the local board area.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

‘Urban Ngahere’, or ‘urban forest’, comprises all the trees within a city – including parks, coastal cliffs, stream corridors, private gardens, and street trees – both native and naturalised (i.e. exotic). For the purposes of this report, urban forest is defined as all of the trees and other vegetation three metres or taller in stature, and the soil and water systems that support these trees. A healthy urban forest provides a multitude of benefits for ecosystems, the economy, and community health and well-being.

Based on the 2013 dataset, urban forest covers approximately 11.2% of the local board area, including 9.5% of roads, 21.6% of public parks, and 9.2% of private land. Total coverage is low when compared to other urban local boards within the Auckland metropolitan area. Approximately 41% of the urban forest cover has some form of statutory protection. There are approximately 780 records of Notable Trees on the Unitary Plan Scheduled within the local board area.

The Auckland Urban Forest Strategy aims to encourage tree plantings across the region to achieve an average cover of 30%, with no individual local board having less than 15% cover. A goal that achieves an even coverage of urban tree cover across the whole board area is recommended to give the community increased opportunity to interact with the Ngahere in their local area. As one of the aims of the local board is to help support local community, annual tree planting and restoration projects, along with looking at incentives to retain existing trees, could be concentrated in areas where known gaps exist.

There are some obvious gaps in tree cover throughout the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area, mainly in industrial and commercial zones, which overall have only 5.5% urban forest cover compared to the 14.8% cover found in residential areas. This presents multiple opportunities to plant more specimen park and street trees. Public land is identified as a good place to focus additional urban forest planting as this offers the best opportunities for long-term sustainable management due to the lower chance of conflict with future housing intensification, less infrastructure conflicts (which is often an important negative associated with street tree plantings), more considered selection of appropriate species and location for plantings, better arboricultural management, and a coherent policy for ongoing planting of replacement trees.

The benefits of taking a strategic Local Board-wide approach to increasing urban forest cover include more considered selection of appropriate species and location for plantings, better arboricultural management, and a coherent policy for ongoing planting of replacement trees. Public parks are also better able to accommodate the types of large trees which provide a disproportionate amount of many of urban forest benefits. The wider accessibility of trees on public parkland also means that the benefits they provide (e.g. better shade and increased emotional well-being for park users) apply to a larger number of people, which is a major positive in terms of overall cost-benefit outcomes. With the targeted study on tree cover within parks and around playgrounds, it is possible to obtain a clear view on where to plant more trees that will in time benefit the local community and users of open spaces.
The data presented in this report gives a starting point to compare changes to urban forest over time, which can be tracked and analysed to direct trees planting efforts within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki area. A study of the changes and trends that are occurring will be possible when the latest data is released. Additional analysis of further LIDAR data will be used to forecast the possible future changes in urban forest cover and height as a result of increased population growth and intensification. Other future areas for funding, research, and action on improving urban tree cover should look to focus on concentrating efforts in parts of the local board with greater population densities and higher numbers of children. Moving forward this will ensure these groups have better access to urban trees and nature, and will adopt the approach to deliver a ngahere for a flourishing future.
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1.0  PREFACE

Auckland is New Zealand’s largest city, and plantings of exotic and native trees have taken place as the region has developed since the mid-19th century. Early Māori settlers would have planted trees such as karaka, pūriri and totara to indicate a special place or to mark a celebration. Early European settlers would have planted trees that were familiar and provided a sense of place. London Plane, English oak, and European lime trees were some of the earliest recorded plantings in Auckland.

Fruit tree species such as olive, citrus, and a range of stone fruits were often commonly planted during settlement by Europeans. The north-western part of Auckland around the Kaipara Harbour still contains some of the earliest plantings of domestic plum and apple trees. Cornwall Park in Epsom was extensively planted with specimen trees in the 1800s by John Logan Campbell, before he gifted the park to Cornwall Park Trust in 1901.

Within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki area, the forest cover has changed dramatically since human settlement. Today, significant areas of urban forest cover within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki area are largely confined to larger reserves, such as Maungakiekie-One Tree Hill and Mutukaroa-Hamiltons Hill. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board has provided funding to Auckland Council’s Urban Forest Advisor in the Parks, Sports and Recreation Department, to develop an analysis of the tree cover in its area of responsibility. This report is the result of a programme of work across Auckland Council to develop detailed analysis of urban forest cover on public and private land, identifying opportunities to nurture, grow and protect urban trees in the local board area. The analysis work is based on Council’s Urban Forest Strategy 2018, which has 18 key objectives to help Council and Local Boards to deliver a healthy ngahere for a flourishing future.
2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Overview

This report summarises the distribution, size-class structure, ownership, and protection status of trees and urban forest within the Maungakiekie–Tāmaki Local Board area. The report has been prepared to provide a detailed stock take of the tree cover on public and private land along with identifying some key areas where opportunities exist to further enhance, nurture and grow the ngahere for local benefits.

The data presented in this report is based on an analysis of 2013 Light Detection and Ranging ("LiDAR") data captured for Auckland Council by NZ Aerial Mapping and Aerial Surveys Limited. The LiDAR dataset was supplied in raw above ground point classified form for vegetation at least three metres tall. Points in the data set classified as ‘vegetation’ were used to form the foundation of an ‘Urban forest’ layer for further analysis and interpretation with ArcGIS10.2 spatial software, in conjunction with other spatial datasets.

2.2 What is Urban Ngahere (Forest)?

‘Urban forest’ comprises all the trees within a city – including parks, coastal cliffs, stream corridors, private gardens and streets – both native and naturalised exotic species. This comprehensive definition is sourced from the North American view of urban forest (Miller et al. 2015, Wilcox 2012), rather than the European one, which instead defines urban forest as natural enclaves of forest within the city limits (Cliffin 2005, Carreiro and Zipperer 2008).
For the purposes of this report, ‘Urban ngahere/forest’ is defined as all the trees and other vegetation three metres or taller in stature within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board, and the soil and water systems that support these trees. This urban forest definition encompasses trees and shrubs in streets, parks, private gardens, stream embankments, coastal cliffs, rail corridors, and motorway margins and embankments. It also includes both planted and naturally established plants, of both exotic and native provenance.

The ngahere in the local board area may not represent a forest as an image of the kauri forests of Northland might. However, the scale of the tree and shrub cover across the area is sufficiently extensive on both public and private land to make a meaningful contribution to the liveability and sense of place for its residents.

*Native and exotic trees on a suburban street in Glen Innes. Removal of overhead services has enabled large trees to grow to provide benefits for residents.*

*Notable Pōhutukawa on Neilson Street, Onehunga*
2.3 Why do we want Urban Ngahere?

The benefits of the ngahere are well documented, with Figure 1 adapted from the Council’s Urban Ngahere Strategy showing the range of benefits provided by urban trees.

![Figure 1: Examples of the multitude of benefits of urban forest (from Auckland Council 2019)](image)

In addition, many of the native ecosystems within Auckland’s urban boundary are unique in their own right, being representative examples of naturally rare or unique ecosystems that have largely been cleared to make way for urban growth. Urban forest also provides habitat for other biodiversity, including native birds, reptiles, and insects.

2.4 What is the Rationale Behind Studying Urban Ngahere?

Section 35(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“RMA”) required councils to monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of any policy statements and plans prepared under the RMA. However, prior to the analysis presented in this report, Auckland Council had no reliable information on the extent, ownership, and protection status of Auckland’s urban forest assets.

Baseline information about Auckland’s urban forest is particularly important in light of the recent changes to the RMA which have removed the ability of Auckland Council to use general tree protection rules to protect urban forest over a certain size. Sections 76(4A) and 76(4B) of the RMA were inserted under the RMA (Simplifying and Streamlining) Amendment Act 2009 (RMAA09). This was amended under the RMA Act 2013 (RMAA13) to align with the original policy intent of prohibiting blanket tree protection rules in urban areas.
It was anticipated by the legislators that removal of general tree protection would occur in conjunction with a systematic program to identify and protect important trees through their incorporation onto the notable tree schedule, however in Auckland this has not been fully realised. Specifically, the current list in Schedule 10 of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) 2016 ("Unitary Plan") is not entirely accurate and contains multiple errors of various types including grammatical, location, and legal definitions. This Notable Tree list is therefore currently under review, with a Plan Change underway to fix some of the current errors. However, legislative requirements mean any changes to the current list will need to follow a public process of consultation and hearings to update and make any changes. This is a costly exercise for Council, both on time and resources.

While the Unitary Plan offers various degrees of protection to urban forest and groups of trees meeting specific characteristics (e.g. pre-identified significance, vegetation by coasts or streams), other important urban forest assets have no statutory protection and can therefore be removed. Council has no mechanism at present to record the removal of trees on an individual basis, in contrast to the previous blanket tree protection which required resource consents.

In the last five years, resulting from these changes to the RMA, concerns have been expressed to the Council by local board members, urban forest researchers, councillors, and local community groups relating to the removal and loss of large trees in local suburbs. Dr Margaret Stanley from the University of Auckland has presented detail on urban forest cover change and highlighted the need for Auckland Council to look at better options for encouraging tree preservation (Stanley 2018). A number of articles have also been published in the media regarding tree loss in Auckland.

The Environmental Defence Society of New Zealand ("EDS") stated in 2015, "While other cities have targets of achieving 40% tree cover or more, Auckland is moving backwards with a minimalist approach reliant on a cumbersome and costly scheduling process" (EDS 2015)1.

The recent changes to urban forest cover and the attention this has received highlights the need to consider future management issues that arise with major projects such as infrastructure upgrades, park redevelopments, and removal of aging stands of trees. The only viable method available to Council to track urban forest change is by LiDAR analysis, as outlined in this report. The results of this report are to provide a starting point for the local board to determine where the urban forest is located, where it could be increased, and what mechanisms could be utilised for this increase.

---

1 In contrast, many of the cities comparable to Auckland, which score consistently high on the various international indices of livability, have adopted urban forest strategies and targets. For example: Melbourne has a 40% target for tree cover in the public realm by 2040 (Anon 2012), an almost doubling of urban forest cover in 2012; Vancouver has a goal of planting 150,000 trees by 2020 (over 10 years); and increasing the city canopy cover; Sydney plans to increase its average total canopy cover from 16% (2013) to 23% by 2030, and then to 27% by 2050, through targeted programs for trees located in streets, parks and private property (Anon 2013).
3.0 RESEARCH THEMES

This report is framed around the key principles of Council’s Urban Ngahere Strategy. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board has provided feedback on, and funding for, a work programme following a workshop in September 2018.

The key deliverables of the knowing phase are to determine:

1. The distribution and height-class composition of urban forest within the suburban zones of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board.

2. The ownership distribution of the urban forest within the suburban zones of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board, including the species composition and percentage age of trees within local parks and the road corridor.

3. The protection status of the urban forest within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board, and the strength of that protection as provided for in the Unitary Plan.

4. Whether the urban forest cover of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board varies between suburb areas within the board, and how this is related to socio-economic factors.

5. Whether the urban forest within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board is appropriately located to provide health benefits to residents, including the tree canopy cover in local parks and whether this provides sufficient shade for children’s play spaces.

6. The overall status of the urban ngahere within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board, including developing trends, and where there are pressures and opportunities.

Example of industrial area with good tree cover – Notable Trees Hugo Johnston Drive
7. How the urban forest of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board is expected to change in the future, including future priority areas for investigation and research.

For the Maungakiekie- Tāmaki Local Board, specific challenges include the need to provide more plantings within road corridors of industrial areas, and to work with private land owners to find areas to plant trees for the collective benefit of people who work in these areas. It is anticipated that future land use changes will see greater residential developments in areas currently dominated by industrial and commercial activity, with these developments providing future opportunities to increase accessible urban forest.

Industrial area with no vegetation cover – Nelson Street, Onehunga
4.0 MAUNGAkiekie-TĀMAKI LOCAL BOARD INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board covers approximately 3,629 hectares (ha) in central Auckland to the southeast of the Central Business District (CBD). It is well connected to the CBD and other parts of Auckland by both road (State Highway 1 Motorway) and rail (Southern and Eastern Lines). The Board includes residential suburbs such as One Tree Hill, Mt Wellington, Panmure, Glen Innes and Point England, along with the industrial areas of Penrose and Southdown, and larger commercial areas of Onehunga and Sylvia Park. The population of the Local Board is approximately 75,000 residents, and approximately 71.3% of the land cover is urban development.

The Southern Motorway (SH1) runs roughly through the centre of the local board, splitting the Maungakiekie section on the western side from the Tāmaki section on the eastern side. The local board adjoins Orākei Local Board to the north, Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Boards to the west, and Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board to the south. The Local Board’s eastern boundary is set within the Tāmaki River and Estuary, and much of the coastal border is local parks and sports grounds. The northern and western parts of the local board area are predominately residential, while the southern areas of the local board cover are predominately commercial and industrial areas bordering the Mangere Inlet (eastern Manukau Harbour). The South-Western Motorway (SH20) runs through the south-western corner of the local board area.

Large scale sports facilities are present within the board area, including Mt Smart Stadium and Waikaraka Park, along with larger sports fields at Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve and Pt England Reserve. Amongst the built-up areas are more than 100 Local Parks, with some of the largest being Cornwall Park and the volcanic cones Maungakiekie-One Tree Hill, Maungarei-Mt Wellington and Ōtāhuhu-Mt Richmond. One of Auckland’s only urban Regional Parks, Mutukaroa-Hamlins Hill, is also located within Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board. Public Park land covers approximately 15% of the board’s total land area.
In pre-human times, the predominant vegetation cover in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki area would have comprised the largest proportion of volcanic boulderfield forest of all the local boards. Other common vegetation types would have included broadleaved and coastal forest, smaller, scattered patches of mixed kauri-podocarp-kauri forest, and occasional wetlands around Glenn Innes and Point England (Lindsay et al., 2009). This indigenous forest cover has been lost through modification by clearing from early Polynesian occupation and by subsequent urban and industrial development.

At present, very little indigenous forest remains (c. 1.8%), and most open, predominately grassed areas are found in parks. Continuous tracts of urban forest in the local board area are limited to riparian vegetation in Pt England Reserve, specimen trees in Cornwall Park, restoration planting in Mutukaroa-Hamiltons Hill, and pāhutukawa forest at Mt Smart. Stands of vegetation also occur on the southern slopes of Maungarei-Mt Wellington, with the pine trees to be replaced over the next two years with 10,000 native trees (Auckland Council 2018).

Ann’s Creek at the base of Hamlin’s Hill is also a key biodiversity site that has been identified as Significant Ecological Area in the Unitary Plan (Ann’s Creek Lava Flow Wetland and Shrubland). This site has been described as one of the best remaining coastal fringe complexes in the Auckland City isthmus. It contains one of the very last remaining pieces of basalt lava flow vegetation that would have once occupied large parts of the isthmus. The species it supports, whilst not generally threatened, are now not commonly found growing naturally (e.g. akeake). The site also supports important plant species including two native geranium species (*Geranium retrorsum* and *G. solanderi*) which are regionally rare, and it is the type locality for the small shrub *Coprosma crassifolia*. This is of scientific and historical interest because it is the first place that the plant was described from in the 19th Century.
Aside from these areas, more than half of the remaining urban forest is found on private properties. With large portions of the Local Board area now zoned for intensification under the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) 2016, including Mixed Housing Urban and Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings, much of the urban forest is under threat from development, which could potentially lead to irreversible changes in urban forest cover (Brown et al., 2015).
5.0 METHODS

5.1 Methodology Overview

The techniques considered for mapping Auckland’s urban forest at a high resolution included LiDAR, along with manual digitisation (marking up) of aerial imagery and field-work with aerial imagery followed by manual digitisation of field maps, or some combination of these methods. However, both the latter approaches involved considerable man hours and were therefore too expensive to allow a universal sample of urban forest within the Auckland urban area to be obtained.

Computer automatic classification of satellite imagery could have provided a universal sample, but the resolution of this approach was insufficient in providing mapping and change data at the scale that was required for this more detailed analysis work, being down to individual trees and shrubs. For these reasons, LiDAR was considered the best method for obtaining a universal sample of the urban forest for the purposes of this study.

The term LiDAR stands for Light Detection and Ranging. It is an airborne optical remote sensing technology that measures scattered light to find a range and other information on a distant target. The range to the target is measured using the time delay between transmission of a pulse and detection of a reflected signal. This technology allows for the direct measurement of three-dimensional features and structures and the underlying terrain. The ability to measure height of features on the ground or above the ground is the principle advantage over conventional optical remote sensing technologies such as aerial imagery.

LiDAR data that is suitable for urban forest analysis has been made available for the year 2013, and the processing of 2016 data is underway. Final 2016 results for the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board were not available at the time when this report was being prepared, and the Local Board will be updated later this year when the results become available.

The 2013 urban forest data presented in this report was created from airborne LiDAR sensor data collected between 17/07/2013 and 23/11/2013. The classified Raw Point Cloud data, that the urban forest layer was created from, is at least 1.5 points per square metre over open ground. Vertical accuracy is ±/−0.1m @ 68% confidence. Data-points classified as ‘vegetation’ were extracted to form the foundation of an urban forest layer for further analysis and interrogation within the ArcGIS 10.2 geospatial software through combination with other spatial datasets (Table 1).

The initial urban forest layer underwent some quality control checks to eliminate obvious errors found in the supplied classified point cloud data. During this process we removed misclassified areas of man-made materials and other non-vegetation surfaces. Such errors are symptomatic of classification functions which classify surface objects of varying composition based on the strength of the LiDAR pulse return. Objects with similar reflectivity to vegetation, such as transparent materials (glass) and power lines, were common sources of these errors.
Table 1: List of data sources and descriptions used in analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Organisation source</th>
<th>Retrieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area. A political division of the Auckland Council that includes the suburbs of Glen Innes, Tāmaki, Panmure, Mt Wellington, Penrose, One Tree Hill, and Onehunga.</td>
<td>Statistics NZ</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Owned Land (parcel level)</td>
<td>This includes roads (both formed and unformed), public parks administered by the Auckland Council and land administered by central government agencies (e.g. Department of Conservation and Ministry of Education).</td>
<td>RIMU, Auckland Council</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Parcels (all primary parcels except above)</td>
<td>Current land parcel polygons with associated descriptive data (Land information New Zealand, 2010). This dataset does not include parcels that have been vested in council for roading.</td>
<td>LINZ</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Land</td>
<td>See Table 3. Covers land within open space zones or protected in the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (e.g. as part of a Significant Ecological Area or Outstanding Natural Feature)</td>
<td>RIMU</td>
<td>August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census Data</td>
<td>Recent census data including information on population, households, and income for different Census Area Units</td>
<td>Statistics NZ</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Urban Forest Structure

LiDAR data includes a height component and we used this information to set a cut-off point for urban ‘forest’ vegetation at 3m. That is, LiDAR data-points classified as vegetation that were 3m+ in height were used to derive the urban forest layer. The output of this was extracted and then visually developed using GIS software into an urban forest layer.

To be clear on the vegetation classification process, the 3m cut-off point means that low-lying vegetation such as mown grassland, low stature hedges, and gardens are not included in the urban forest layer. It also means that new restoration and street tree plantings that have taken place since 2013 will not be visible in this analysis, as the majority of these would still be less than 3m in height.

5.3 Urban Forest Tenure

To determine the tenure of urban forest, the data points were compared to the zoning of different land parcels within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board. The zoning as corresponding to land tenure classification is summarised in Table 2.
Table 2: Classification of land parcels in relation to land tenure assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Category</th>
<th>Detail on classification in relation to zoning and land ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Trees</td>
<td>Trees within the road network, located in road reserves (ie along footpaths and berms) and within the motorway corridor².</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Land</td>
<td>Private residential land and privately owned businesses and commercial space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Parks</td>
<td>Publicly owned land accessible to the public for recreational and conservation purposes, including all public parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Land</td>
<td>All publicly owned land that is not classified as a public park, including tertiary campuses, schools, road reserves without formed roads on them, and Council owned commercial spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Urban Forest Protection Status

The level of urban forest protection was determined through an analysis of the underlying zones and protection layers in the Unitary Plan. Five different protection levels were assigned (shown in Table 3) based on the rules applying to vegetation clearance in the Unitary Plan, or other practical constraints to vegetation clearance for different zones and land uses as based on past experience. These protection levels are somewhat arbitrary and do not correspond to any legal weighting, however provide a means to determine the likelihood of each tree or urban forest area being cleared in the future.

For the Notable Trees, the list consulted for this study is the operative list in Schedule 10 of the Auckland Unitary Plan. This list is dated February 2017, so does not include the latest plan updates. It is noted this list set is recognised to include some anomalies, such as trees that have been removed since being scheduled, errors in individual vs group listings, and entries that have not been ground-truthed. However, on the whole, the list provides a useful tool for examining the distribution of Notable Trees throughout the Local Board area. GIS maps consulted showing the spatial distribution of the trees have been based on the same schedule.

² Note that the motorway corridor is actually owned and managed by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA). The Council has no control over the motorway corridor greenspace and trees planted here are not covered by the street tree rules in the Auckland Unitary Plan.
### Table 3: Level of protection assigned to urban forest based on Unitary Plan zone and overlay rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection zone</th>
<th>Detail on rules and restrictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – no protection</td>
<td>There is no statutory protection for urban forest and/or rules preventing tree or vegetation clearance in this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – some protection</td>
<td>Within an open space active recreation zone or a road corridor. For both these areas restricted discretionary resource consents are required to clear trees &gt; 4m in height. However, development pressures are often high in these locations and trees are often regarded as incompatible with the main land uses. The proposed Auckland Unitary Plan rules for street trees are more permissive in terms of what utilities can do around and to trees – including pruning as permitted activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – low protection</td>
<td>Within a coastal natural character area, or an area zoned as ‘Open Space Informal Recreation’ (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove trees/vegetation 4m+ in height). The proposed Auckland Unitary Plan rules for park trees are more permissive in terms of what utilities can do around and to trees – including pruning as permitted activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 – moderate protection | Including the following:  
  - Outstanding Natural Feature (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove 25m² of contiguous indigenous vegetation)⁴,  
  - Outstanding Natural Landscape (restricted discretionary consent needed for alteration or removal of 50m³ of any contiguous indigenous vegetation)⁴,  
  - Coastal yard (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove native trees/vegetation 3m+ in height)⁴  
  - Open Space Conservation (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove trees/vegetation 4m+ in height)  
  - Historic heritage (discretionary consent needed to remove trees/vegetation 3m+ in height)  
  - Riparian yard (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove any trees or shrubs)  
  - Lake protection zone (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove any trees or shrubs) |
| 4 – high protection | Significant Ecological Areas (“SEA”) (discretionary consent needed to remove any trees or vegetation), Notable trees (discretionary consent needed to remove any notable tree or shrub) |

⁴ = vegetation protection in these areas is restricted to indigenous species and does not cover exotic plants. In some cases (e.g. coastal zone) the removal of exotic vegetation is specifically mentioned as a permitted activity. Exotic trees can provide many of the same benefits as native species so this is a negative in terms of protection of urban forest values.

---

³ The protection classification work from the PAUP generated 5 broad levels of protection. The protection classes 3 & 4 were combined as the differences between these were seen to be very minimal. This results in a 4-tier classification for the protection classes as outlined in the table above.
Coastal vegetation along the Tāmaki Path
5.5 Urban Forest in Relation to Socio-Economic Factors

To further analyse the urban forest data and potential influencing factors, the data (including total canopy, tenure, size class distribution, and protection status) was categorised into Census Area Units (CAU) for the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board. The CAU covered by the Local Board area are shown in Figure 2, with 22 units being present in total. Where CAU within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki area cross over the Local Board boundary (e.g. One Tree Hill Central CAU shown below), they are covered in this report, unless the area of overlap is very small (e.g. Stonefields).

Figure 2: Census Area Units (2013) of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board (highlighted in green)

The socio-economic census data included in this report has been sourced from the 2013 New Zealand census records. This includes data on resident population, age distribution, income, and number of cars.

In addition, a desktop analysis of high-resolution aerial imagery was undertaken to understand tree canopy cover and the number of trees in community parks, and whether shade was provided to playgrounds in each park. This work was completed to show where opportunities exist for improvements to the numbers of trees in local parks that can provide future health benefits for individuals, groups, and the wider community.
The factors recorded in the desktop analysis, and methods used, are:

- Park selection and type of park maintenance (ie maintained or unmaintained)
  
  All parks in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board were assessed. Parks were identified using the Auckland Council GeoMaps Geospatial Information System ("GIS"), which records whether the park is maintained or unmaintained under the Council facility maintenance contract. For reference, unmaintained parks are often stormwater ponds or narrow esplanade strips in areas that are not easily accessible, or unpopular, with little to no infrastructure.

- Size of park
  
  - The Auckland Council GIS system provided the area of each park in square metres.

- Number of trees present and percentage of canopy cover
  
  - Digital photo interpretation through visual estimate of high-resolution aerial imagery was used to estimate the number of trees and the percentage of canopy cover. If there were less than twenty trees an accurate figure could be obtained, while higher tree numbers were estimated\(^4\). For the tree to be counted, the majority of the tree needed to be within the park boundary. Visual estimations of the percentage of canopy cover extent versus land areas were also made, with an example shown in Figure 3.

- Playground or sports field presence
  
  - The Auckland Council GIS system, including infrastructure layers, was used to record presence.

---

\(^4\) For consistency and validity, the same person carried out all estimations of tree numbers and the percentage of canopy cover.
- Amount of shade provided to playground, if present
  - Visual estimation of the amount of shade on playgrounds provided by trees was recorded within three different categories: ‘trees provide some shade to the playground’; ‘trees provide a little shade to the playground’; and ‘trees provide no shade to the playground’.

5.6 Change in Urban Forest Cover 2013 – 2016

The data set resulting from the most recent LiDAR survey (2016/2017) produced 88 billion data points for the region and was then assessed for quality and accuracy by Auckland Council staff prior to release. The data has now been released from the quality control process, enabling Council staff to undertake processing of the data to produce a vegetation or canopy extent layer that can then be used to develop the metrics for tree sizes, heights, and a range of other factors including canopy coverage.

A comparison of this data set to the 2013 data set, once finalised, will be provided in a subsequent report update on progress of the ngahere work for the local board. The Urban Forest Strategy will report back to Council’s Environment Committee in August 2019 with a full update on this, and on other areas where Council is implementing and operationalising the strategy’s objectives.
6.0 RESULTS

6.1 Overview

Figure 3 shows urban forest cover within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board, as represented by 2013 LiDAR data. Overall, urban forest covers 11.2% of the Local Board area, including 9.5% of roads, 21.6% of public parks, and 9.2% of private land.

Public parks in total account for approximately 14.8% of the Local Board area. 105 parks are present within the Local Board, with all of these except three being regularly maintained by Council contractors. All the parks within the local board area contain urban forest, however in three parks (Fong Reserve, West Tamaki Reserve, and Hobson Reserve), this urban forest is limited to three trees only.

Total urban forest cover within the Local Board is relatively low when compared to other urban local boards within the Auckland metropolitan area, having approximately only a third of the urban forest of the highest local board (Kaipatiki), as shown in Table 4. Urban forest cover within road reserves is average compared to other local boards, with the forest coverage in public open space and private land bringing down the overall total.

Table 4: Percentage cover of urban forest in Auckland’s urban local board areas: data includes percentages for different land tenures and the overall cover within each board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Local Boarda</th>
<th>Public open space</th>
<th>Private land</th>
<th>Roads</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaipatiki</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketapapa</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert - Eden</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orakei</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport - Takapuna</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson - Massey</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie - Tamaki</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otara - Papatoetoe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere - Otahuhu</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a A number of local boards have been excluded from this table as they contain significant pockets of rural land (i.e. Hibiscus and Bays, Upper Harbour, Howick and Papakura local boards) or are largely rural in character (i.e. Waitakere, Franklin, Rodney, Great Barrier and Waiheke local boards).
An initial analysis of the urban forest layer highlighted a clear distinction within the local board into two zones (Figure 4); the industrial/commercial zones in the south of the board area, and the remaining residential-dominant zones. The primary difference between these zones is the coverage of urban forest, with the residential areas having a total coverage of approximately 14.8%, while the industrial/commercial zones only have a total coverage of approximately 5.5%. In the remainder of this report, therefore, the urban forest cover and characteristics of these two distinct zones are assessed and reported on separately where appropriate.

**Figure 4: Urban forest cover with tree height classification within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board boundary**
6.2 Urban Forest Structure

The height class distribution of the urban forest canopy within the industrial and commercial areas of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board is displayed in Figure 5. As shown, approximately one third of the forest is in the lowest height category (3-5m tall), with a further approximate half (or 46%) in the next lowest category. Less than one quarter of the trees present within these parts of the local board are taller than 10m.

The height class distribution is similar for the residential areas of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board, as shown in Figure 6. The main variation for the residential areas is that there are slightly less trees in the lowest height class, replaced by a greater proportion of taller trees over 15m tall. The residential areas have almost twice as many tall trees, with 12.4% being over 15m tall compared to 7.6% in the industrial and commercial areas.

A similar general trend is observed when breaking the urban forest structure down to the suburb level (Figure 7), with most of the suburbs having between 70-80% of the urban forest in the lowest height classes (i.e. less than 10m tall). The exceptions to this are One Tree Hill and Onehunga. One Tree Hill has less than half of the urban forest being less than 10m tall, and has the greatest proportion of trees taller than 20m (approximately 15%), mostly likely due to mature specimen trees within Cornwall Park being included in this suburb. Onehunga on the other hand has a very low proportion of tall trees, with less than 20% of the trees being taller than 10m.

![Figure 5: Height class distribution of urban forest canopy within Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board (Industrial/commercial areas)](image)
Figure 6: Height class distribution of urban forest canopy within Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board (residential areas)

Figure 7: Height class distribution of urban forest canopy per suburb
6.3 Urban Forest Tenure

The tenure distribution of urban forest canopy within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board is displayed in Figures 8-11, separated out into the industrial/commercial zones (Figure 10) and the residential zones (Figure 11). Overall a similar trend is observed, with approximately half the forest being located on private land, a quarter within public parks, and the remaining quarter within other publicly owned land (e.g. schools) and road reserves. The industrial/commercial areas have a slightly greater proportion of forest within road reserves and private land, compared to the greater proportion of urban forest within public parks in the residential areas. Throughout all zones of the local board, public parks have twice as much land covered with urban forest than the remaining land tenures, as shown in Figure 12.

Figure 13 displays the distribution of height classes by land tenure, in relation to the total urban forest area in each tenure category. This figure shows public parks have the most even distribution of height classes out of all the land tenures, while private land and other public land have the greatest proportion of shorter (3-5m) trees. Approximately 80% of urban forest in other public land, private land, and road reserves are less than 10m tall. Public parks are the only land tenure with more than 10% of the urban forest being taller than 15m.

There is some variation in tenure of urban forest throughout the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area, as shown in Figures 14 and 15. Mount Wellington and Onehunga have overall the highest total urban forest, but as with all suburbs, the majority of this forest is on private land. Onehunga has a small amount of urban forest on public parkland in comparison, while the urban forest cover in parks within Mount Wellington remains high. One Tree Hill also has a relatively high cover of urban forest within public parks. Point England and Wai O Taiki Bay have the most even distribution of forest cover between different tenures.

To recognise that each suburb has different areas of land in each tenure, for example Mount Wellington has 110ha of public parks, while Wai O Taki Bay only has 11ha, the forest tenure proportions in Figure 15 are relative to land area. This figure shows a more even spread of urban forest across the different land tenures, with 7-15% of road reserves being covered in urban forest, 4-15% of private land, 10-33% of public parks, and 4-13% of other public land. Penrose most notably has the lowest proportion of urban forest cover on private land, and One Tree Hill the highest proportion of street trees. One Tree Hill and Wai O Taiki Bay have the highest urban forest cover overall relative to land area, with approximately 20% and 16% of the suburbs covered respectively.
Figure 8: Urban forest cover within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board boundary showing the tenure/ownership of urban forest

Figure 9: Comparison of urban forest in each land tenure of the industrial/commercial and residential areas of Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
Figure 10: Tenure of urban forest canopy within Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board (industrial/commercial areas)

Figure 11: Tenure of urban forest canopy within Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board (residential areas)
Figure 12: Percentage cover of urban forest within different land tenures of Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board.

Figure 13: Height class distribution of urban forest within different land tenures of Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board.
Figure 14: Tenure of urban forest within main suburbs of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

Figure 15: Tenure of urban forest within main suburbs of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board relative to land area
6.4 Urban Forest Protection Status

In terms of protection status under the assigned scale, only slight differences occur between the commercial/industrial zones (Figure 16) and residential zones (Figure 17) of the local board. Figure 16 shows that over half (approximately 64%) of the urban forest within the commercial/industrial zones has no form of protection, compared to 57% of the residential zones. The proportion of protected vegetation is therefore similar between the zones, with the main difference being in relation to the commercial/industrial zones having approximately twice as much urban forest in the highest protection category (13% compared to 7%).

![Figure 16: Protection status of urban forest within Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board (industrial/commercial areas)](attachment)

![Figure 17: Protection status of urban forest within Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board (residential areas)](attachment)
6.4.1 Significant Ecological Areas

For SEAs (High Protection Class), these have been identified in the Auckland Unitary Plan resulting from a specialist study assessing areas of vegetation against five significance criteria. The terrestrial SEA extent within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board is shown in Figure 18. By far the largest SEA area is located across Maungarei-Mt Wellington, encompassing the entire park area. Smaller SEAs are scattered around other large parks including Mt Smart, Maungakiekie-One Tree Hill and Mutukaroa-Hamlins Hill. There are no SEAs on private residential property in the entire local board area.

6.4.2 Notable Trees

For Notable trees (High Protection Class), these have been identified by individual landowners as specimens with “exceptional arboricultural characteristics” (Schedule 10, Auckland Unitary Plan), with the data for this report having come from the current schedule, as outlined in the methods section. The distribution of Notable trees within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board is shown in Figure 19, with the concentration of protected trees being overall much higher in the more established western suburbs such as One Tree Hill and Onehunga. The species information indicates a range of both native and exotic trees, with pōhutukawa, oak, and London plane being highly represented species. In total there are approximately 780 trees within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board identified in the Unitary Plan Notable Tree Overlay.

6 The current SEA overlay is based on the Operative Unitary Plan, whereas the data used in this study in relation to protection status is from the Proposed Unitary Plan (as of 2013). There is a slight variation between the two versions of the plan relating to submissions to the Proposed overlay and consequent removals/additions, with the main removal having occurred over exotic tree stands in northern Cornwall Park. However overall the overlay within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board has stayed more or less the same.

6 There are several small errors within the current notable tree Schedule, including recognition that some trees are no longer present on the ground. However these errors represent a very small proportion of the entire list and will not significantly alter the information represented in this report.
Figure 19: Distribution of Notable trees within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
6.4.3 Protection Status by Suburb

As observed in Figure 19, for notable trees at least there appears to be a gradual decrease in protection levels moving further west through the Local Board. To further examine this trend, the protection status of each of the main suburbs has been categorised and is represented in Figure 20. As shown, the majority of suburbs have a higher proportion of unprotected than protected urban forest, with the exception of One Tree Hill. The high proportion of protected urban forest in One Tree Hill is attributed to Maungakiekie-One Tree Hill and Cornwall Park covering a large proportion of the suburb. Penrose, Point England and Wai-o-Taiki Bay have the next highest levels of protection, with close to half of the urban forest having some degree of protection (53%, 43% and 49% respectively). The suburbs with the largest total areas of urban forest have the lowest proportions of protection (Mt Wellington with 35% protected and Onehunga with only 28% protected).

![Figure 20: Protection status of urban forest within main suburbs of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board]

6.5 Urban Forest in Relation to Socio-Economic Factors

6.5.1 Population

Across the urban areas of the Auckland Region, there is a wide spread of proportion of urban forest cover in relation to population (Figure 21). Overall the general trend is for urban forest cover to decrease as population increases, however for the area covered by the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board there appears to be no apparent trend.

This is shown on a more local scale in Figure 22, which compares population density within the Census Area Units (CAU) of the Local Board area to density of urban forest, presented as a percentage of
Figure 21: Total population compared to proportion of urban forest cover for the 2013 Census Area Units of urban Auckland

Figure 22: Urban forest cover of Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Census Area Units in comparison to population density
urban forest cover in relation to the total area of each CAU. There appears to be no relationship within the local board between population density and urban forest cover, however the figure provides a useful representation of the locations where urban forest could be increased. Most notably, Onehunga North West has a very high population density compared to urban forest cover, followed by Oranga, Hamlin and Onehunga North East. Penrose and One Tree Hill Central have a relatively high proportion of urban forest compared to population, with the latter being attributable to the less residential land use in favour of public parkland.

6.5.2 Health

The proportion of urban forest per CAU within Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is compared to the number of children and the numbers of cars in Figures 23 and 24, with the pretext that urban forest improves health in children, and in adults through encouragement of walking rather than driving. However, in both indicators, the urban forest cover appears to be unrelated.

Figure 23 does highlight the CAUs that have a relatively high number of children compared to urban forest cover (ie areas where cover could be improved), such as Oranga, Onehunga North West, and Point England. More industrial areas such as Penrose and Ellerslie South have both a low number of resident children and low percentage urban forest cover.

Figure 24 highlights a range of car numbers corresponding to urban forest cover, with only One Tree Hill showing relatively low numbers of cars compared to more urban forest. Penrose, Te Papapa and Ellerslie South have a high proportion of cars relative to urban forest cover.

![Figure 23: Urban forest cover of Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Census Area Units in comparison to child population density](image-url)
In terms of health within local parks, **Figure 25** displays canopy cover of parks featuring children’s play areas (playgrounds). Out of the 105 local parks within the local board area, 20 of these have playgrounds. None of the parks with playgrounds have more than 50% canopy cover of urban forest, and the majority have less than 20%. However, the canopy cover that is present is generally located near the playground, with 75% of the playgrounds having some or little shade. Only 5 out of the 20 playgrounds do not have some form of shade provided by trees.

**Figure 24:** Urban forest cover of Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Census Area Units in comparison to number of cars per adult

**Figure 25:** Canopy cover of parks with playgrounds within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board, showing (a) canopy cover across whole park; and (b) shade by trees over playgrounds
6.5.3 Income

A comparison of urban forest cover in different CAU within the Local Board area as a function of median household income for the CAU is shown in Figure 26. Overall there appears to be a general increase in forest cover as the average income increases, however statistical analysis of this trend has indicated this relationship is not significant, as there are likely many other contributing factors such as the land tenure within each CAU. For example, the highest median household incomes were found in the One Tree Hill CAUs, which also have a low population density due to large areas of public parks.

![Figure 26: Relationship of urban forest cover within CAU and median household income of CAU](image-url)
7.0 DISCUSSION

7.1 Urban Forest Cover 2013 Overview

Examination of the overall urban forest cover maps within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board shows that there are some obvious areas of urban forest concentration, while there are also areas that are lacking urban forest. The lowest cover tends to be in the south of the local board (Penrose, Southdown, and Panmure), while the north-eastern and western parts of the local board, around One Tree Hill, have the highest cover. The western suburbs also have larger trees and higher degrees of tree protection, such as notable trees.

The initial data analysis showed two distinct zones of urban forest cover within the local board area, being classified as the industrial/commercial zone and the residential zone. The residential zones have almost three times higher urban forest cover. As an overview, this analysis shows that initially it would be beneficial to concentrate tree planting and/or incentives to retain existing trees within the industrial and commercial areas, assuming one of the aims of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board is to increase overall tree cover.

7.2 Urban Forest Distribution

Over the whole local board, gaps in urban forest are generally associated with three general categories, the first being large industrial areas. These are mainly found in the south of the board area on the northern fringes of the Manukau Harbour, such as the Southdown Industrial Area. At this location, as an example, the Metroport Container Terminal and surrounding properties represent over 100ha of land almost entirely devoid of vegetation (Figure 27).

![Figure 27: Example shaded in red of over 100ha of land with no urban forest present, Southdown](image)
The second category of gaps in urban forest cover is represented by high density buildings and commercial areas. This is most noticeable in the commercial area of Onehunga, Mt Wellington, and the Sylvia Park shopping complex. Spaces in between buildings are characterised by footpaths and carparks, as well as roads, with little opportunities for urban forest growth.

Gaps associated with both industrial areas and commercial areas are representative of high concentrations of impervious surfaces. Figure 28 displays the extent of impervious surfaces within the Local Board area, and reflects the areas of low density urban forest as previously observed. These include the industrial areas of Penrose and Southdown, and the large commercial area at Sylvia Park. The figure also demonstrates that over half (52%) of the local board is covered in impervious surfaces, which presents an opportunity to plant urban forest as a direct remedy.

Trees are a well-known solution for stormwater management, as their extensive canopies and subsurface root systems are capable of capturing and pumping substantial amounts of water (Berland et al. 2017). Establishing trees within impervious surfaces will act to intercept rainfall before it reaches the ground, having follow on benefits for stormwater management systems such as underground pipes and nearby waterways (Dwyer and Miller 1999). Gaps in impervious surfaces necessary to plant trees (tree pits) also assist in stormwater management by capturing stormwater flows via infiltration. Trees and other ‘green infrastructure’ solutions, including rain gardens, permeable pavements, bioswales, and green roofs, will also supply economic, social, and environmental benefits in addition to stormwater control functions, and would be worth implementing at a greater scale.
Figure 28: Extent of impervious surfaces in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area.
The industrial areas of Penrose and Onehunga provide an evident example of where more tree planting is needed.

The final category of urban forest gaps on a local scale is associated with extensive grasslands typical of sports fields. In the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board this includes Waikaraka Park, Mt Smart Stadium, Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve, Pt England Reserve, Bill McKinlay Park, and larger school complexes such as Onehunga High School. While planting urban forest within the sports complexes is not feasible, works could involve increasing forest cover on the edges of the fields and elsewhere in the parks. Mt Smart Stadium, for example, retains indigenous urban forest cover on the property to the south of the sports ground.

7.3 Urban Forest Structure

Research has shown that many of the benefits attributed to urban forest are disproportionately provided by larger trees (Davies et al. 2011, Nowak et al. 2013, Moser et al. 2015). Large trees typically: create more shade per tree due to a larger and wider canopy spread (Moser et al. 2015); intercept larger amounts of particulate pollutants and rainfall due to significantly larger leaf areas; contain more carbon and have higher carbon sequestration rates (Beets et al. 2012, Berland et al. 2017, Schwendenmann and Mitchell 2014, Dahlhausen et al. 2016); are often less susceptible to careless or malicious vandalism by passers-by once established; can be pruned to provide higher canopy clearance over roadways, parking lots and pedestrian footpaths; typically contribute more to calming and slowing traffic on local streets than small trees; and absorb more gaseous pollutants. For example, Nowak and Crane (2000) found that large trees greater than 80cm diameter remove 70 times more air pollution annually than small trees less than 8cm diameter.
In the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board, trees over 20m tall cover just 5% of the total urban forest, and are mainly found within One Tree Hill, most likely within the park complex. The residential zones have overall around twice as many trees over 15m tall than the industrial/commercial zones, which is promising in terms of the health and safety benefits of these trees having follow on benefits to residents.

Some parts of the local board, for example Onehunga, Panmure and Penrose, have less than 10% trees more than 15m tall, and less than 25% trees more than 10m tall. The industrial and commercial dominated areas of the local board are severely underrepresented in this sense. Larger trees in these suburb areas should be a priority for protection, to ensure they are not removed prior to younger trees being able to grow tall enough to replace them, and their associated benefits.

The relatively high proportion of smaller trees across the local board (around 75% less than 10m tall) may be partially caused by a recent surge of tree planting, assuming the smaller stature trees correspond to younger trees. Further analysis of more recent LiDAR data in comparison to the 2013 data covered in this report will highlight whether this trend is occurring, or whether some of the urban forest has simply reached its maximum height. Examples of this may include smaller trees planted in road reserves beneath powerlines or in residential backyards where larger trees have not been planted as these may block sunlight entering dwellings.

It is expected the portion of shorter trees may increase in future data sets due to existing and future restoration planting efforts associated with development, for example the Sylvia Park shopping complex and the Onehunga foreshore redevelopment. In Onehunga, extensive planting has been undertaken within the new Onehunga Bay and Taumanu Reserve, which is unlikely to have been tall enough to qualify as urban forest in the 2013 LiDAR survey. Areas such as this may appear as urban forest in the next survey, increasing the portion of shorter trees even if there is no loss of the total area of urban forest in taller height categories.

*Onehunga Bay reclamation and beach restoration work has provided a valuable link to the Manukau Harbour*
7.4 Urban Forest Tenure

Approximately half of the urban forest in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is located on private property, which is reflective of parts of the local board area being colonised relatively early in Auckland’s history. Some of the suburbs, such as Onehunga and Panmure, were the first to be developed within the Auckland urban area (c. 1870s, Auckland Regional Council 2010). This has allowed nearly 150 years of urban development within the local board including the establishment or urban forest in private gardens and lawn areas.

However, based on this history, the urban forest cover on private land within the local board area is much lower than would be expected, with only 9% coverage. This is attributed to the high proportion of privately owned commercial and industrial sites, rather than an absence of urban forest on residential properties. The large tracts of commercial and industrial land with large buildings, warehouses, and concreted yards, provide few opportunities for urban forest development aside from in road reserves. It is a priority for the local board to take available opportunities to increase private land coverage in these locations, particularly around Penrose. There are smaller parts of the local board, for example Glen Innes, where cover on residential properties could also be improved.

Aside from private land, public parks are a good place to focus additional urban forest planting as they comprise approximately 15% of the local board land area and are widely distributed. In addition, public parks offer the best opportunities for long-term sustainable management of the urban forest due to the lower chance of conflict with future housing intensification, less infrastructure conflicts (which is often an important negative associated with street tree plantings), more considered selection of appropriate species and location for planting, better arboricultural management (provided this is adequately funded)\(^2\), and a coherent policy for ongoing planting of replacement trees.

The development of community groups dedicated to preserving the urban forest of public reserve land would assist this process, as would future planning incorporating more public parkland, such is occurring in Tāmaki (Auckland Council 2017). Urban forest cover within public parks could also be increased in Point England, Onehunga and Penrose.

Public parks are also better able to accommodate the types of large trees which provide many urban forest benefits, and which may not be suitable for streets or private land due to space limitations. The wider accessibility of trees on public parkland also means that the benefits they provide (e.g. better shade and increased emotional well-being for park users) apply to a larger number of people, which is a major positive in terms of overall cost-benefit outcomes.

Moving forward, it will therefore be important to ensure any trees removed from public parks are replaced with new trees, so the public interaction with nature will still occur. The work occurring on Mount Wellington is a good example of planned work to undertake native restoration planting in place of removing aging pine trees. Similar work could be undertaken in other locations throughout the local

\(^2\) As trees get bigger and older they need to be cared for more frequently. However, Council arborists are concerned that Auckland Council’s standard model for asset depreciation does not provide sufficient funding to achieve the level of maintenance necessary to manage very large trees to international standards. Therefore at time trees that could be retained through expensive maintenance are felled instead.
board where exotic dominant vegetation could be replaced, such as Ōtāhuhu- Mt Richmond and Maungakiekie-One Tree Hill.

Street trees also have a role in the provision of urban forest in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, particularly in the western parts of Onehunga and One Tree Hill, and in Point England in the northeast of the board. Protecting existing street trees and establishing new street tree plantings in areas where they have less prominence (e.g. Mount Wellington, Panmure and Penrose) provides a good opportunity to increase urban forest cover within the local board. In particular, establishment of trees in the road reserves of Southdown and other industrial areas will greatly improve the urban forest in these locations, where there are fewer opportunities to establish trees on private land.

Pine trees on Maungarei have been removed and replacement planting with indigenous species

7.5 Urban Forest Protection Status

The protection status of urban forest outlined in this report has been derived from the planning provisions outlined in the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan, and now finalised in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part). The protection classes (Table 3) have been determined based on the likelihood of obtaining resource consent to clear vegetation, with approximately 59% of the urban forest within the Local Board area able to be cleared without resource consent, ie as a permitted activity (no protection class). In theory, this means over 238ha of urban forest could be cleared within the Local Board without any assessment of the cumulative effects of this clearance.
In reality it is highly unlikely that a level of clearance this drastic would occur, however a study on urban forest loss in the Waitemata Local Board (Lawrence et al. 2018) did determine a higher rate of tree clearance within urban forest with no protection, being 60% higher than would be expected based on area alone. For trees requiring resource consent for removal, there was little evidence in this study of increasing rates of tree canopy protection with increasing protection status, indicating perhaps that the protection classes outlined in this study do not reflect the ease (or difficulty) of obtaining consent.

In regards to the highest level of protected urban forest, being SEA and Notable Trees, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is under-represented compared to other local boards within the Auckland urban area. It is the local board with the lowest representation of urban forest in the Class 4 protection category, which makes up only 8% of the total urban forest. In comparison, the local board with the most forest in the Class 4 category, Upper Harbour, has 57% in this category. The areas of SEA that do exist are generally small, and none are located on private land. This is positive in terms of the SEA being at risk from future development, as this risk is low given public parkland is unlikely to be developed. However, this also represents a lack of significant ecology across the local board which could be an area of improvement.

In contrast, for notable trees a large portion are located on private land which does present a risk should these properties be further subdivided or otherwise developed in the future. These trees are concentrated around north-western Onehunga and One Tree Hill, which were the earliest parts of the local board to be developed (Auckland Regional Council 2010). While similar large trees occur in other parts of the local board, in many instances they are not represented in the overlay and there are large areas of the board with no notable trees at all. These include Wai o Taki Bay, southern Mt Wellington (around Sylvia Park), and Penrose, and it may be a review of these areas is required to ensure no trees that would qualify as notable have not been registered in the overlay.

7.6 Urban Forest in Relation to Socio-Economic Factors

Potential socio-economic factors on urban forest have been investigated on a broad scale level in this study, with comparisons undertaken based on population, population density, number of children, number of cars, playgrounds, and median income levels. The overarching theme of this investigation has been to determine whether the urban forest is located where it will have the greatest benefit. Benefits of urban forest for people are well-documented and summarised in various documents including Stanley (2018). Exposure to urban forest is important in terms reducing mental health issues, reducing stress levels, and improving physical health through providing air filtration, shade and reduced temperatures.

To achieve the greatest benefit from the existing urban forest for people, it would be preferable to have higher levels of urban forest in areas with greater population density. In the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board, there was no apparent relationship between forest cover and population density. The data did indicate the areas that lack urban forest compared to population density, which represents parts of the local board where there are less opportunities for residents to interact with nature. These include South and West Onehunga, Orange and Hamlin. This pattern is generally mirrored when focussing solely on children (under 19 years old).
In addition to increasing urban forest on private land in these areas, an increase in urban forest cover of local parks could provide more universal benefits as a greater number of people are likely to encounter the forest. A Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board study undertaken in 2015 (reported in Auckland Council 2017) indicated that 73% of respondents recognised neighbourhood parks as playing some or a large role in their overall recreation, including relaxing, socialising, leisure and recreation. 89% of respondents in total visited neighbourhood parks, with 23% of respondents indicating they visited parks to interact with nature. Suggested improvements to parks included an increase in shade, so an increase in urban forest could consequently give local residents more reason to visit parks and increase the percentage of those looking to interact with nature.

Analysis of playground data suggests there is a need within the Local Board to provide more urban forest and larger urban forest around playgrounds where benefits such as providing shade will make the playgrounds more attractive for families to bring their children. For example, Fong Reserve and West Tamaki Reserve have only three trees present each, but have playgrounds. The lack of shade trees in this park is not the only concern, as currently there is also little opportunity for park users to interact with trees and nature whilst in the park. The results from the shade analysis study highlight further opportunities to develop work programmes to plant new specimen trees for playgrounds in local parks, and in parks where a low percentage tree cover exists.

In terms of income, previous studies suggest more affluent parts of Auckland are likely to have more urban forest. An example of this is shown in the Wyse et al. (2015) study which looked at distribution of Notable Trees within Auckland and determined that more socially deprived areas of Auckland contain fewer notable trees than less deprived areas. However, this same study indicated no correlation between vegetation cover and socio-economic deprivation, perhaps suggesting that there is a greater degree of protection offered to urban forest in more affluent areas, but not necessarily more urban forest overall. The current study also suggests no significant relationship between income and urban forest cover.
8.0 PROPOSED FUTURE INVESTIGATION AND FOCUS

8.1 Priority Areas for Increasing Urban Forest

At present, 9.5% of road reserves are covered in urban forest within the local board, 9.2% of private land, 21.6% of public parks, and 10% of other publicly owned land. All land tenures have room for improvement for urban forest cover, with public parks and other public land presenting the most readily available opportunity to establish further urban forest.

The type of planting that could be carried out within the existing public reserve network falls into two main categories. The first category is plantings around the margins of sports parks where this does not conflict with the sports fields themselves (e.g. Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve, Pt England Reserve); these parks have grassy margins and/or odd shaped corners that are separated from the playing fields. The second category is establishing urban forest in reserves zoned for informal recreation use that are currently dominated by grassland (e.g. Mt Wellington-Maungarei, Hamills Hill-Mutukaroa, Gloucester Reserve, Peterson Reserve). It is noted there are some new areas of planting around the Manukau Harbour waterfront, particular at Onehunga Bay, which may increase the urban forest proportions in these locations when registered for being over 3m tall in future LiDAR surveys.

A good starting point for deciding where to establish new urban forest within public reserves would be to look at the locations of existing SEAs, as extending these to cover wider areas will have additional benefits for biodiversity as well as the amenity and health benefits of the forest. Examples of areas where SEAs could be extended include within Gloucester Reserve, the park complex along Omaru Creek, and the coastal plantings along the eastern side of Pt England Reserve. The SEA along Omaru
Creek is shown in Figure 29, and it is noted this area has already been earmarked for further planting by the local board (Auckland Council 2017).

![Figure 29: Significant Ecological Area within public parks surrounding Omaru Creek](image)

Following on from the planting around Omaru Creek, the local board has also earmarked various other reserves for further planting in the Draft Tāmaki Open Space Network Plan (Auckland Council August 2017). These reserves include Apirana Reserve and the reserve network in the east of the local board alongside Tāmaki Estuary, including Riverside Reserve, Dunkirk Reserve, Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve, Panmure Wharf Reserve, and Pt England Reserve. This planting is to be implemented over the next 15 years. The Open Space Network Plan also includes provisions to acquire more local parks to create open spaces in locations where these are generally lacking, which in turn will provide increased opportunities for increasing urban forest cover in public parks.

While there are many benefits to establishing a higher density of trees – and large trees in particular – on public land, it is acknowledged that there are some potential conflicts and costs in replacing extensive areas of grassland with urban forest and/or treeland. These include perceptions of public safety with areas of dense vegetation on public land (Jansson et al. 2013), which is a recognised issue within Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, particularly for forested reserves within industrial areas. Southdown Reserve is an example of this, which was considered unsafe for pedestrian access by local users before it was closed.

Other potential conflicts include the additional cost of managing more large trees for a parks department that currently struggles to meet the competing demands of different park users, and ensuring that urban forest plantings are compatible with existing use such as sports fields, open space for dog recreation etc. Nevertheless, many of these conflicts can be resolved through appropriate species selection, planting design and location, and good community consultation.
Some of the key points recommended for consideration in the growing phase of the ngahere programme, particularly for public parks, are:

- To prioritise new plantings in existing reserves with little or no urban forest, with locations determined through consultation with park users;
- To ensure plantings allow for open green space to be retained in parks for recreational purposes;
- To ensure tree plantings are designed to add value to a space, for example providing shade for play areas;
- To focus initial opportunities for urban forest growth in locations where existing forest is in poor health and/or providing less than 30% coverage;
- To determine if existing trees are safe and in good condition, or otherwise where trees could benefit from further active management;
- To work with the local iwi and community to plant trees which will provide natural shade for current and future generations; and
- To regularly review the Auckland Urban Forest Strategy and monitor whether the right trees are being planted in the right locations.

On private land within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board, opportunities for increasing urban forest are more limited due to existing built development. Further trees could be planted in residential gardens, however on industrial and commercial based private land there are often only concreted surfaces and buildings. On these properties there are therefore no surfaces in which to plant trees,
unless areas of concrete can be removed for this purpose, or trees grown in artificial garden beds. As previously discussed, if the creation of tree pits is possible, this will have follow on benefits for stormwater management in areas with extensive impervious surfaces, in addition to the stormwater management offered by the trees themselves (Berland et al. 2017). Establishing tree canopies where possible within these areas may also assist in climate management and air-conditioning costs by providing increased shade to cool surface temperatures outdoors and in adjacent buildings (Dwyer and Miller 1999).

![Example of tree planting in new residential development – Church Street, Onehunga](image)

An alternative to planting trees would be to explore the possibility of developing green roofs on large industrial and commercial buildings, such as around Sylvia Park and Penrose. While green roofs may not register in a LIDAR survey due to the majority of vegetation being less than 3m tall, they will have other benefits that urban forest represent such as increases in amenity value, air filtration, and interaction with nature (Hui, 2006). With an increase in amenity value of the industrial parts of the local board, this may in turn increase attraction of these areas for pedestrian use, extending northwards from the Manukau Foreshore Walkway. Adding green roofs to existing buildings will also decrease the extent of impervious surfaces within the local board (see Figure 27), decreasing pressure on stormwater infrastructure and potentially freeing up funds for further urban forest projects.

### 8.2 Utilising Native Species for Growing Urban Forest

The exotic component of the urban forest in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is representative of historical colonisation and development by European settlers, along with preference for exotics in garden planting due to larger or more colourful flowers. This has resulted in areas dominated by exotic species, some of which are now identified weeds. For example, a study by Stanley (2018) determined approximately 10% of the scheduled Notable Trees across Auckland are declared weed species, such as Phoenix palm. While many of the benefits of urban forest, for example stormwater and pollution filtration, shade, and contact with nature, can be achieved by both native and exotic species, other benefits, such as biodiversity, will be achieved to a greater degree by planting native species only. It is therefore important to convey, moving forward, a preference for selection of native species where possible.
At present, the urban forest data does not distinguish between native and exotic species, and such an analysis would be difficult to achieve with the LiDAR methods used. However, Auckland Council has undertaken a separate analysis of vegetation cover across the region, outlined in Singers et al. (2017) and presented on Auckland Council GeoMaps. This study has classified ecosystem types according to the dominant vegetation, with exotic dominated vegetation categorised separately from indigenous ecosystem types. While not available at a tree level, this mapping provides a useful reference for larger patches of urban forest and how these could be improved and connected.

Identifying gaps in urban forest and selecting new locations to plant also presents an opportunity to re-establish threatened native ecosystems and species, where appropriate for new planting locations. Appropriateness would be determined by considering the natural species assemblages of each particular location and highlights the importance of eco-sourcing. Eco-sourcing refers to harvesting seeds from local vegetation for the propagation of plants to be replanted in the same area in the future, to maintain biodiversity and increase chances of plant survival. Reference to the historic mapped ecosystem types also included in the Singers et al. (2017) study could provide a basis for selecting species for new planting projects, including threatened species. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board, for example, originally contained volcanic rock forest, to a much wider extent than what is currently present (Lindsay et al., 2009). This ecosystem type, featuring māngai, titoki, karaka, māhoe, houpara, and pūriri (Smale and Gardner 1999), is now Critically Endangered (Singers et al. 2017).

Ecological input into new planting projects will allow an assessment of suitability for restoring particular ecosystem types and species to be made and ensure appropriate management of this special urban forest moving forward. Ecological input would also allow for the identification of urban forest stepping stones to be utilised by other native species such as birds.

While Maungakiekie-Tāmaki has patches of native bush throughout the local board, such as in Hamlin’s Hill Regional Park, there are opportunities to strategically extend existing or plant new urban forest patches to extend ecological corridors to other local boards. For example, the urban forest connection across the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Ōrākei Local Boards could be strengthened by linking new urban forest in Apirana Reserve along adjacent reserves to the west down Pōrewa Valley.

In addition to the biodiversity benefits, focussing on native species during the growing phase of urban forest for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki will have cultural advantages and allow for incorporation of mana whenua values. Ngahere traditionally had many uses, including customary harvest for food (kai) and medicine (rongoa). Plants were also harvesting for carving, weaving, and building (Maami Whenua). Incorporating mauri principles into an urban forest strategy will further allow for reconnection with nature, on a cultural basis as well as a social basis. Planted areas can include specific plants for weaving and medicinal use, as has been achieved by the Te Pā Harakeke o Te Iwi o Project Twin Streams (Henderson-Massey Local Board). Improving urban forest cover would be in line with the holistic nature of hauora (Māori well-being), with improvements in taha wairua (spiritual health), taha hinengaro (mental health), and taha tinana (physical health) (Environment Protection Authority).

8.3 Analysis of Urban Forest Changes 2013-2016

The data presented in this report is a ‘snapshot’ of urban forest cover in 2013; a one-off measure of canopy distribution and height within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area. One of the most controversial issues relating to urban forest in Auckland, and the most important unknown, is the rate of change in the urban forest canopy. Questions such as:
1. How has the total area of urban forest in the board area changed following the removal of general tree protection?

2. How has the size-structure changed? For example, has there been an increase in smaller trees and a decrease in larger trees, or vice versa?

3. If there have been significant gains and/or losses in tree canopy cover are they concentrated on a particular type of land tenure, or a within a specific geographical area?

are critical to the future management of Auckland’s urban ngahere in terms of understanding which issues and locations to focus management efforts such as community education, tree planting and subsidies.

Auckland Council has undertaken another aerial LiDAR survey (October 2016) and the outputs of this survey are expected to be available for further analysis later this year. The time period between these two LiDAR surveys (i.e. three years between 2013 and 2016) covers the same time period that anecdotal evidence from Auckland Council and external arborists suggest coincides with a dramatic increase in the felling of trees on private land. This has occurred throughout the Auckland metropolitan area, including the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board. In order to assess change in the urban forest canopy the 2013 LiDAR data needs to be compared with this more recent LiDAR dataset that has been collected using the same methodology.

8.4 Safe-guarding Urban Forest through New Zoning and Development Potential

Combining the urban forest layer with other spatial datasets (for example Auckland Unitary Plan zoning) is a useful tool for predicting the possible impact of growth pressures on the tree cover and size-class distribution of urban ngahere. The location of un-protected trees has a significant impact on how likely a tree is to ‘survive’ the intensive phase of growth and development that is currently underway in Auckland. For example, all other things being equal, we would expect that trees on a large private land section that is zoned ‘Residential – Single House’ are less likely to be felled than trees on a large site that is zoned ‘Residential – Mixed Housing Urban’.

A more sophisticated approach to this type of analysis is also possible, by combining urban forest spatial data with information from the Auckland Growth Model (Fredrickson and Balderston 2013). The growth model incorporates Unitary Plan zoning with a range of data on topography, location, lot size and other planning restrictions to predict the economic return of constructing new dwelling(s) on a specific lot. Combining the economic return of constructing new dwellings on individual sites with the current urban forest cover on the same sites should give a better indication of the potential loss of urban ngahere cover from development involving an increase in dwelling density within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area.

Maps showing potential future growth areas, based on land supply and infrastructure upgrading, are included in the appendix of this report (Placeholder maps to be produced). A large degree of new growth in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board will occur in association with the Tāmaki Regeneration Programme, primarily in the suburbs of Glen Innes, Point England and Panmure. It is
aimed to build over 7,500 new homes over the next 20 years, and create training, employment and business pathways for the community to prosper (see www.tamakiregeneration.co.nz). The new homes are largely to be built in the location of existing residential development, at a higher density.

Examination of recent development under this scheme indicates removal of urban forest is occurring, with Figure 30 showing an example of this in Glen Innes. As shown in these images, a relatively high coverage of urban forest was present in the northwest of the development footprint prior to commencement of the development. However, aside from trees in the road reserve, only one of these trees appears to have been able to be retained throughout the earthworks and construction period. It is likely retaining the remaining trees would have comprised the development potential of the site or presented difficulties for construction. This demonstrates a scenario whereby urban forest loss is occurring for development, and presents a need to ensure new developments such as this incorporate new urban forest plantings to match and extend the urban forest that has been lost.

In the north-eastern parts of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board, and around Onehunga, much of the land is zoned ‘Residential – Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings’, which is the highest density zone for urban residential development. Converting existing residential properties into this new land use could lead to a greater loss of urban ngahere, particularly in regards to trees that can be removed as a permitted activity (ie no protection status), as tree removal may increase the development potential of the site as demonstrated above. For trees that do require consent for removal, while considered on an isolated basis the effects may be considered small, however on a cumulative basis the effects may be large, and these impacts are generally beyond the scope of what is assessed in an application. Incorporating urban forest plantings in new developments will therefore become essential in retaining and increasing urban forest cover throughout the board area.

![Figure 30: Change in urban forest cover of residential development (outlined in red) in Glen Innes (Overlea Road) between 2010-2017 (images sourced from Auckland Council GIS viewer)](image-url)
Old and new street tree plantings alongside new residential development – George Terrace, Onehunga

It is important to understand that enabling these development opportunities further reduces the space available for medium- to large-sized trees on private land, and potentially also in road reserves as these may obstruct nearby buildings. To this end, the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board is encouraged to work with Auckland Council to readdress the current rules for tree and vegetation protection. A recommended first step is to commence a programme to record noteworthy trees in the local area on a simple list to be added to the Notable Tree Overlay in any future plan changes. Ideally, the process would be reviewed to allow the Notable Tree schedule to be updated every five years via submissions from individual local boards.

Protecting existing and adding to the numbers of trees in the road corridor is another important and ongoing measure to retain and extend urban forest cover, as the tree cover in the road corridor is currently low. The importance of trees in the street environment is going to increase, and will, in time, incorporate the only accessible trees for some residents.

It will also likely to be necessary to implement non-regulatory rules in addition to Auckland Council’s regulatory tools that act to protect the urban ngahere. Since the removal of blanket tree protection rules, non-regulatory tools will become increasingly important to control the removal of trees and vegetation, particularly on private properties. Examples include landowner advice and assistance with tree care and planting, community education and outreach programmes, and raising awareness of the value and benefits of the urban ngahere. These tools, if implemented effectively, will help to instil pride for privately owned trees reducing the risk of these being removed, for future development or otherwise.
9.0 FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR GROWING URBAN FOREST IN MAUNGAKIEKIE-TĀMAKI

The assessment of urban tree cover in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board presented in this report aims to assist in the knowing phase of the Auckland Urban Forest Strategy. The analysis of existing tree cover distribution, structure, tenure, and protection, provides the Local Board with a basis for determining where to focus efforts in improving urban forest cover during the growing phase, to be initiated in the near future. The summary below provides a starting point for actions that could be taken to grow urban forest in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, with priorities assigned based on the data included in this report.

The immediate actions that could be taken to improve Maungakiekie-Tāmaki’s urban forest are:

- Initiate tree planting programmes in the commercial and industrial areas including Penrose, Southdown and Onehunga, particularly in locations of high public use, for example around Sylvia Park.
- Identify unprotected large trees (>15 metres tall) in industrial and commercial areas, particularly Onehunga, and assess whether the protection level of these can be increased (e.g. through Notable Tree Overlay or land covenant).
- Identify parks containing playgrounds with low tree shading (e.g. Fong Reserve, West Tamaki Reserve, Hobson Reserve) and obtain funding for large grade specimen trees to plant.
- Prioritise parks in parts of the local board with a high population density e.g. Onehunga North West, Oranga.
- Initiate tree planting where possible in unused corners or edges of sports parks, including Point England Reserve.
- Locate to plant large growing trees close to playgrounds to provide for future shade. Include tree planting in the park seat renewal program.
- Hold community group meetings throughout the local board to allow members of the public to nominate local or road reserves for tree planting.
- Involve local iwi in decision-making process for urban forest improvements, including identifying the best locations to plant for incorporating cultural values of urban forest (e.g. around streams and the coast).
- Examine opportunities to increase urban forest cover in the Southdown Industrial Area.

Mid term actions (e.g. within five years) that could be taken to improve Maungakiekie-Tāmaki’s urban forest include:

- Advocate for new community groups and volunteers to ensure regular maintenance of new plantings is carried out, such as the plantings in Onehunga Bay and Taumanu Reserve.
- Carry out a localised study of urban forest on private land and road reserves in Penrose and Glen Innes, and develop initiatives for funded tree planting within urban forest gaps.
- Consult with NZTA and Auckland Transport regarding ongoing management of native vegetation in the motorway and highway corridors.
- Work with schools (e.g. One Tree Hill College, Onehunga High School) to increase urban tree cover on school grounds, with opportunities for students to be involved in planting.
- Undertake a review of the Notable Tree Overlay within the board area and consider nomination of further trees for inclusion, particularly in suburbs with little or no notable trees e.g. Glen Innes, Wai O Taiki Bay, Point England
• Investigate potential for retrofitting and including green infrastructure in new commercial and residential developments, and how this could become a requirement for developers.
• Continue to undertake planting in local reserves in line with the Tāmaki Open Space Network Plan.

Long term actions that could be taken to improve Maungakiekie-Tāmaki’s urban forest include:

• Undertake connectivity analysis of native plantings (e.g. along Omaru Creek) and determine target locations for increasing urban forest cover in parks and road reserves to create ecological corridors to other concentrated vegetation.
• Target areas to restore volcanic rock forest, if possible.
• Identify opportunities to target urban forest around the coast to connect the Manukau Foreshore Walkway with surrounding industrial and commercial land.
• Set up long term study to monitor biodiversity improvements resulting from the growing phase of the urban forest strategy (e.g. regular bird count stations).
• Encourage residents to protect and plant taller tree species on private property where there is available space to achieve this.

It is recommended a growing programme targeted to the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board is produced to guide efforts in restoring the urban forest, including ongoing monitoring of existing and future initiatives to ensure the Local Board goals for each growing stage are achieved.
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Classifying land at Waikaraka Park

File No.: CP2019/15318

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To declare and classify Waikaraka Park land held under the Local Government Act 2002, and to classify land held under the Reserves Act 1977 and approve public notification where required.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. We have completed a land status investigation of all parcels in Waikaraka Park (Attachment A). Classification of reserves is an essential task in developing a reserve management plan that complies with the Reserves Act 1977.

3. We have considered the benefits and disadvantages of the Reserves Act 1977 (RA) and Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) in managing and enabling the use, protection and development of each local park, and developed criteria to guide the assessment of each land parcel.

4. Of the 21 parcels that make up the park, the investigation identified that currently 13 parcels are held under the RA, and seven parcels are held under the LGA.

5. One parcel, being land described as ‘Part Manukau Harbour Bed’, does not currently have a Record of Title. We are currently working with Land Information New Zealand and the Department of Conservation to resolve its land status.

6. The local board generally have the option to hold park land under the LGA or the RA.

7. For the seven land parcels of park land in Waikaraka Park held under the LGA, the local board has the option to continue to hold land under the LGA or declare the land as reserve under the RA and classify it appropriately.

8. The proposed land status of the LGA parcels have been analysed in greater detail (Attachment C) due to differing views between the local board and mana whenua.

9. For the seven land parcels held under the LGA we propose that:
   - two parcels are retained under the LGA
   - four parcels are declared as reserve and classified under the RA
   - one parcel is declared and classified under the RA and is publicly notified.

10. The 13 land parcels held under the RA are all unclassified and require classification to be included in the reserve management plan. Each individual parcel of reserve land has been assessed and classification actions are proposed (Attachment E). We recommend that the local board approve classifying the 13 land parcels held under the RA.

11. This assessment uses guidance from the Reserves Act 1977 Guide, consideration of the local park’s values, current and likely future use of the local park, workshop feedback from the local board and consultation with mana whenua.

12. Completing the reserve declaration and classification will enable staff to proceed with preparing the draft reserve management plan for Waikaraka Park.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) confirm Part Lot 1 DP 25356 and Part Allotment 80 Small Lots Near Onehunga will continue to be held under the Local Government Act 2002

b) approve public notification of the intention to declare and classify Allotment 87 Small Lots Near Onehunga as local purpose (community use and access) reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

c) approve Allotment 96 Small Lots Near Onehunga to be declared a reserve and classified as local purpose (community buildings) reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

d) approve Section 1 SO 410849 to be declared a reserve and classified as recreation reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

e) approve that part of Part Allotment 86 Small Lots Near Onehunga shown as Area A in Attachment D to be declared a reserve and classified as recreation reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

f) approve that part of Part Allotment 86 Small Lots Near Onehunga shown as Area B in Attachment D to be declared a reserve and classified as local purpose (community buildings) reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

g) approve that part of Lot 3 DP 329311 shown as Area A in Attachment D to be declared a reserve and classified as local purpose (cemetery) reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

h) approve that part of Lot 3 DP 329311 shown as Area B in Attachment D to be declared a reserve and classified as recreation reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

i) approve the proposed classification of 13 parcels of reserve land under sections 16(1) and 16(2A) of the Reserves Act 1977 as described in Attachment E.

Horopaki
Context

13. On 23 April 2019, the local board resolved to approve public notification of its intention to prepare a reserve management plan for Waikaraka Park and invite written suggestions on the proposed plan (MT/2019/45). A masterplan will be developed concurrently. These will collectively guide the future use, development, protection and management of the park.

14. The reserve management plan will be a statutory reserve management plan prepared in line with section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977. The plan will cover park land held subject to both the Reserves Act 1977 (RA) and Local Government Act 2002 (LGA).

15. As part of preparing the reserve management plan, we have reviewed whether land parcels to be included in the plan are held under the LGA or RA, and if they are held under the RA whether they have been correctly and appropriately classified.

Findings

16. Twenty-one land parcels, covering the Waikaraka Park speedway, sports fields, cemetery, and park extension, were investigated (shown in Attachment A).

17. Of these, one parcel, being land described as 'Part Manukau Harbour Bed', was identified to have been historically overlooked by the Onehunga Borough Council and does not currently have a Record of Title.
18. Of the other 20 land parcels within scope, 13 land parcels are held under the RA, and seven land parcels are held under the LGA.

19. The 13 land parcels held under the RA are all currently unclassified.

20. This report makes recommendations on actions for both land held under the RA and land held under the LGA.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

21. The local board have the option to hold park land under the LGA or the RA, except where the land has underlying Crown ownership.

22. For land held under the LGA we have considered the following options:
   - continue to hold the land under the LGA
   - declare land currently held under the LGA to be reserve under the RA and classify appropriately.

23. For land held under the RA, the following options have been considered:
   - classify according to its primary purpose
   - reclassify to align to its primary purpose
   - revoke the reserve status and hold the land under the LGA
   - continue to hold the land as unclassified reserve under the RA (status quo).

24. We have discounted the status quo option as it would mean that the reserve management plan would not comply with the RA. This means that the council would not be meeting its statutory obligations under the RA and public notification of the draft plan (once completed) could not take place.

25. We have also discounted the option to reclassify land as all land held under the RA is currently unclassified.

26. Attachment B summarises the different options for land held under the LGA and the RA.

27. In assessing the options for each land parcel, we have considered:
   - the intended purpose of the land when it was acquired, for example, whether it was vested for recreation or cemetery purposes
   - the long-term protection that the RA provides from inappropriate use and development
   - whether underlying Crown ownership of the local park prevents the reserve status being revoked
   - whether statutory processes and future decision-making will be streamlined
   - the need for greater flexibility and choice in how local parks are used by the public
   - whether revoking the reserve status of a particular land parcel would materially lead to a greater range of park activities being able to occur.

28. The following sections outline in more detail the options for land held under the LGA and RA and the criteria for assessing each land parcel.

Proposed actions for land held under the LGA

29. When reviewing the future land status options for the seven parcels of land held under the LGA, we considered the following questions:
   - Why does the council own the land and how was it acquired?
   - What is the primary purpose of the land?
• What is the status of adjacent land parcels in the same park?
• What is the current and likely future main use of the land?
• What potential does the land have for protection, enhancement and development?
• Is there likely to be a need to retain flexibility for future use?

Proposal to retain some land under the LGA
30. Applying the criteria above, we have identified two parcels of land best suited to remain under the LGA (Attachment C) as the future use of these parcels of land will need to be determined through the reserve management plan process.

31. The local board has the option to revisit the land status of the LGA parcels at the time that the draft reserve management plan and masterplan are approved. A confirmed future use for this part of the park would better inform whether the land parcels should remain under the LGA or be declared and classified under the RA.

Proposal to declare and classify some land currently held under the LGA
32. Any land held under the LGA which the local board wishes to manage under the RA must be declared reserve and classified appropriately in accordance with the RA.

33. We have recommended five parcels of land held under the LGA be declared as a reserve under the RA and classified (Attachment C). The main reason for declaring and classifying these land parcels is to reflect the primary purpose of the land; either recreation or local purpose classifications.

34. Two of the parcels require resurveying to indicate which parts of each parcel will be classified for different purposes (refer to plans in Attachment D).

35. Section 14(2) of the RA requires public notification when declaring and classifying park land as reserve, where the Auckland Unitary Plan does not make provision for the use of the land as a reserve.

36. The parcel described as Allot 87 Small Lots Near Onehunga is zoned Special Purpose – Cemetery under the Auckland Unitary Plan. Public notification will be required for this parcel to be declared and classified as a local purpose (community use and access) reserve. This process will require:
   • public notification of the local board’s intention to declare a reserve under section 14(2) of the RA and a call for objections to the notice
   • a period of one month to be given for the making of objections
   • consideration of objections and resolving whether to proceed with declaring the land to be a reserve
   • Ministerial consideration of the resolution and any objections received; and a decision on whether to gazette the resolution or refuse to do so. This consideration is currently delegated to the General Manager of Community Facilities.

37. The remaining four parcels do not require public notification and we recommend that the local board declare and classify the land identified in Attachment C.

Proposed actions for land held under the RA
38. As outlined in paragraphs 23 to 251, there are two valid options for land held under the RA – classification or revocation of the RA status.

39. In the context of this investigation, we have not identified any parcels of local park that warrant revocation of the reserve status and holding the land under the LGA.
Classification of land held under the Reserves Act 1977

40. Our investigation found that 13 land parcels are currently held as unclassified reserve under the RA, requiring classification. Classification involves assigning a reserve (or part of a reserve) a primary purpose, as defined in sections 17 to 23 of the RA, that aligns with its present values. Consideration is also given to potential future values, activities and uses.

41. We have considered the Reserves Act Guide\(^2\) and the following questions when determining the primary purpose and appropriate classification for each land parcel.

- Why does council own the land? Why was it acquired?
- What are the main values of the land or potential future values, uses and activities?
- What potential does the land have for protection, preservation, enhancement or development?
- What potential does the land have for protection, enhancement and development?
- Is there likely to be a need to retain flexibility for future use?

42. We recommend that the local board classify the 13 parcels of reserve land pursuant to sections 16(1) and (2A) of the RA identified in Attachment E. Public notification is not required.

Proposed actions for land described as ‘Part Manukau Harbour Bed’

43. The land described as ‘Part Manukau Harbour Bed’, does not currently have a Record of Title. This parcel contains Waikaraka Cemetery plots.

44. We have started the legal process to survey this parcel. We have requested that Land Information New Zealand declare the land to be Crown land under the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011.

45. The Department of Conservation will then complete the declaration and classification of this land parcel under the RA and vest the land in trust in Auckland Council.

46. The local board is not required to take any further action for the land parcel described as Part Manukau Harbour Bed.

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

47. We have discussed the land classification analysis with council units including Parks, Sport and Recreation, Community Facilities, Legal and Parks and Places. Feedback to date has been generally supportive of the recommended actions.

48. Multiple departments within Auckland Council and council-controlled organisations, including Panuku Development Auckland and Auckland Transport, have an on-going interest in Waikaraka Park through various projects in the area. The investigations for land classification have considered potential impacts on these projects, and the recommended actions will not negate the ability for these internal stakeholders to carry out their projects.

49. The project team for Waikaraka Park Reserve Management Plan will maintain on-going communication and collaboration with the various council units and council-controlled organisations to ensure successful delivery of this project and integration with other projects in the area.

---

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

50. Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board has decision-making responsibility for all land parcels in Waikaraka Park.

51. We initially discussed the outcomes of the land investigation and the land classification programme with the local board at a workshop on 7 May 2019.

52. The local board supported an approach that would allow for flexibility of future use of park land.

53. We discussed the land status options for five LGA parcels at local board workshops held on 11 June and 6 August 2019 to consider mana whenua feedback.

54. Local board feedback has been considered when making the recommendations in the report.

55. We have also considered the potential impact of land classification on central government agencies such as New Zealand Transport Agency and Transpower New Zealand. The recommended actions will not negate the ability for these agencies to carry out their projects or maintain their assets.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

56. We have been working with interested mana whenua on classifying land as part of the reserve management plan. We attended the Parks, Sport and Recreation South-Central Mana Whenua Forum on 27 March 2019 and introduced the reserve management plan project.

57. Mana whenua representatives from Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei, Te Ākitai Waiohua, Ngāti Tamaoho, Te Patukirikiri, Ngati Whanaunga, Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Tai Ki Tāmaki and Ngāti Te Ata o Waiohua attended one of the four hui held in May and July 2019. A mana whenua representative from Te Ahiwaru who was unable to attend any of the hui has expressed interest in the project.

58. We provided classification information and feedback received from the hui held on 29 May 2019 to all mana whenua with an interest in the Auckland Isthmus. This has enabled all participating mana whenua to review all land classification recommendations for the project.

59. Mana whenua generally supported our assessment, rationale and proposals for land classification under the RA.

60. For the LGA land parcels (Attachment C), mana whenua expressed a desire to declare and classify land and give them a higher level of protection under the RA. The reasons for this include safeguarding the land from inappropriate use and development, maintaining access to the coast and protecting public open space.

61. Following engagement with the local board, amendments were made to land classification recommendations in response to mana whenua feedback.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

62. Financial implications include:

- costs for public notices to declare and classify land held under the LGA (where required)
- survey and gazette costs where a parcel is to be classified for different purposes (Attachment D indicates areas which will require resurveying).

63. The operational budget of the council’s Community Facilities department will cover these costs.
64. There are no financial implications associated with retaining land under the LGA.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

65. The following table outlines the risks and mitigation associated with classification of reserves and declaring and classifying land to be reserve:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception that the LGA offers park land less protection from sale or disposal than if held under the RA</td>
<td>Both Acts requires the public to be consulted when there is a proposal to dispose of land. Retaining land under the LGA has only been recommended where flexibility for future use is likely to be beneficial (e.g. commercial use).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA classifications constrain the range of uses for that land</td>
<td>We have followed the considerations in paragraph 29 above and the Reserves Act Guide in assessing the current and likely future use of each individual parcel we propose to be declared and classified under the RA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public objections to proposed classifications delaying the management plan process</td>
<td>As only one parcel requires public notification, we anticipate that the potential impact on timeframes for the management plan to be minimal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

66. Next steps vary depending on whether land is held under the LGA or RA and on the action taken, i.e. declare and classify (notified or non-notified) for land under the LGA and classify under the RA.

67. Attachment F outlines the next steps for each action in more detail.
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**Attachments**

<table>
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</tr>
<tr>
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Classifying land at Waikaraka Park

Waikaraka Park

Scale @ A3 = 1:2,500
**POSSIBLE ACTIONS**

**LGA**

Allows flexible use of park land leases, commercial activity, ...

**Retain under LGA**

**Declare a reserve and classify under the Reserves Act**

**RESERVES ACT**

Land is classified to fit the current and the expected main use in the future. All Reserves Act land must be classified, and then managed through a reserve management plan (only local purpose reserves do not need an reserve management plan).

**Do nothing**

If the classification is in place and everybody agrees that it's correct, no action is needed.

**Classify**

If the land hasn't been classified before, choose the most appropriate option to fit the main land use and values from the different reserve classifications.

**Redclassify**

If the main use and values of the land doesn't fit the current classification choose a more appropriate option.

**Revoke**

If the land should be held under the LGA instead (but see whether a new classification might also solve the problem...)
Proposed actions for parcels held under the Local Government Act 2002
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Land status options</th>
<th>Proposed land status</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A         | Part Lot 1 DP 25366 | 1. Retain under LGA  
   a. Defer land status decision until the draft reserve management plan and masterplan has been approved to better inform classification for future use  
   b. No further action as part of the reserve management plan project.  
   2. Declare under RA and classify as recreation reserve (public notification required).  
   3. Subject to survey, declare under RA and classify part of the parcel as recreation reserve (public notification required). | Option one:  
   Retain under LGA  
   - Defer land status decision until the draft reserve management plan (RMP) and masterplan (MP) has been approved to better inform classification for future use. | The primary purpose and values of this parcel are not currently clearly defined. Developing the draft RMP and MP will clarify the future potential use of this part of the park, and whether the land should continue to be held under the LGA or declared and classified reserve. |
| B         | Part Allot 80 Small Lots Near Onehunga | 1. Retain under LGA  
   a. Defer land status decision until the draft reserve management plan and masterplan has been approved to better inform classification for future use  
   b. No further action as part of the reserve management plan project.  
   2. Declare under RA and classify as recreation reserve (public notification required). | Option one:  
   Retain under LGA  
   - Defer land status decision until the draft reserve management plan and masterplan has been approved to better inform classification for future use. | The primary purpose and values of this parcel are not currently clearly defined. Developing the draft RMP and MP will clarify the future potential use of this part of the park, and whether the land should continue to be held under the LGA or declared and classified reserve. |
| C         | Allot 87 Small Lots Near Onehunga | 1. Retain under LGA (no further action).  
   2. Declare under RA and classify as local purpose (community use and access) reserve (public notification required). | Option two:  
   Declare under RA and classify as local purpose (community use and access) reserve – public notification required. | ‘Community use’ provides a degree of flexibility for the existing buildings that were previously associated with the cemetery.  
   ‘Access’ enables the continued use of the internal road and highlights the use of this land to access the coast. Mana whenua have highlighted access to the coast as an important value to be protected in this part of the park. |
| D         | Allot 98 Small Lots Near Onehunga | 1. Retain under LGA (no further action).  
   2. Declare under RA and classify as local purpose (community buildings) reserve (no public notification required). | Option two:  
   Declare under RA and classify as local purpose (community buildings) reserve. | The land is currently occupied by a community building and associated parking, and leased to Dalewood Auckland Brass. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Land status options</th>
<th>Proposed land status</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Part Allot 86 Small Lots Near Onehunga</td>
<td>1. Retain part of parcel occupied by building under LGA (no further action), and declare and classify sportsfield portion as recreation reserve (no public notification required).&lt;br&gt;2. Declare under RA and classify as local purpose (community buildings) reserve and recreation reserve*. (no public notification required).</td>
<td>Option two:&lt;br&gt;Declare under RA and classify as local purpose (community buildings) reserve and recreation reserve*.</td>
<td>Part of the land is occupied by a community building and associated parking, and leased to Auckland Studio Potters. The balance of the land is sports field. Declaring and classifying the land would align with the land status of the remainder of the sports fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 329311 part thereof*</td>
<td>1. Retain under LGA (no further action).&lt;br&gt;2. Declare under RA and classify as local purpose (cemetery) reserve and recreation reserve (no public notification required).</td>
<td>Option two:&lt;br&gt;Declare under RA and classify as local purpose (cemetery) reserve and recreation reserve*.</td>
<td>The local purpose cemetery classification aligns with its current purpose. Classifying the balance of the land as recreation reserve will align with its future use as part of the sports fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Section 1 SO 410849</td>
<td>1. Retain under LGA (no further action).&lt;br&gt;2. Declare under RA and classify as recreation reserve (no public notification required).</td>
<td>Option two:&lt;br&gt;Declare under RA and classify as recreation reserve.</td>
<td>There is an active project to enable the development of this parcel for future sports fields and informal recreation areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*subject to survey - see Attachment D
### Maps relevant to partial classification actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended action</th>
<th>Map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part Allot 86 Small Lots Near Onehunga</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Currently held under Local Government Act 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Currently leased to Auckland Studio Potters (expiry Jan 2022)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Propose to declare land to be held under Reserves Act 1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Area A to be classified recreation reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Area B to be classified local purpose (community buildings) reserve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LOT 3 DP 329311

- Currently held under Local Government Act 2002
- Propose to declare land to be held under Reserves Act 1977
- Area A to be classified local purpose (cemetery) reserve to align with cemetery use
- Area B to be classified recreation reserve to align with adjoining sports and recreational use.
### Unclassified parcels to be classified under the Reserves Act 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Survey Area (sqm)</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>RA77 Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Park</td>
<td>Part Allot N61 Small Lots Near Onehunga</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>S18(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Park</td>
<td>Part Allot N44 Small Lots Near Onehunga</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>S18(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Park</td>
<td>Part Allot N45 Small Lots Near Onehunga</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>S18(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Park</td>
<td>Part Allot N46 Small Lots Near Onehunga</td>
<td>132204</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>S18(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Park</td>
<td>Part Allot 47 Small Lots Near Onehunga</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>S18(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Park</td>
<td>Part Allot 48 Small Lots Near Onehunga</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>S18(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Park</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 329311</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>S18(2A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Cemetery</td>
<td>Allot M61 Small Lots Near Onehunga</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Purpose (Cemetery) Reserve</td>
<td>S18(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Cemetery</td>
<td>Allot S44 Small Lots Near Onehunga</td>
<td>40460</td>
<td>Local Purpose (Cemetery) Reserve</td>
<td>S18(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Cemetery</td>
<td>Allot S45 Small Lots Near Onehunga</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Purpose (Cemetery) Reserve</td>
<td>S18(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Cemetery</td>
<td>Allot S46 Small Lots Near Onehunga</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Purpose (Cemetery) Reserve</td>
<td>S18(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Cemetery</td>
<td>Lot 6 DP 25356</td>
<td>20791</td>
<td>Local Purpose (Cemetery) Reserve</td>
<td>S18(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Cemetery</td>
<td>DP 25943</td>
<td>2671</td>
<td>Local Purpose (Cemetery) Reserve</td>
<td>S18(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possible local board (LB) decisions

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2002

- LB decision to declare and classify; Public notification not required
- Retain under LGA
- LB decision to publicly notify intention to declare and classify;
- No further action required
- Revisit after draft plans endorsed

approval from Minister of Conservation delegate to gazette

Public notification

LB decision to declare and classify (after considering any objections)

Gazetted

Approval from Minister of Conservation delegate to gazette

Gazetted

NEXT STEPS
Possible local board (LB) decisions

RESERVES ACT 1977

LB decision to classify; Public notification not required (s 16(2A) of Reserves Act)

Inform Department of Conservation of classification

(Gazettal optional)

LB decision to classify; Public notification not required (s 16(1) of Reserves Act)

Gazettal

LB decision to publicly notify intention to classify (s 16(1) of the Reserves Act)

Public notification

Hearing (if required)

LB decision to classify (after considering any objections)

Gazettal

NEXT STEPS
Development of a playground at Aveline Park

File No.: CP2019/13306

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval for the development of a playground at Aveline Park within the Fenchurch Special Housing Area subdivision (stage 2B) and accept Tāmaki Regeneration Ltd’s offer to fund the build of the playground and fund the maintenance of the playground for the next 17 years.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board (resolution MT/2017/31) and the Environment and Community Committee (resolution ENV/2017/67) agreed in 2017 to the vesting of a pocket park within Stage 2B of the Fenchurch Special Housing Area.

3. Tāmaki Regeneration Ltd (TRL) have recently landscaped the park and will maintain the site until January 2021 as per the terms and conditions of their resource consent. The local board have agreed to provide for ongoing landscape maintenance costs post January 2021 from their Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) opex budget, estimated to be $1,700 per annum.

4. TRL are now proposing to construct a playground on site at nil capex (construction) cost to council and have confirmed that they will cover the maintenance costs of the playground for the next 17 years, plus renewal costs if there was significant asset failure during this time.

5. Staff recommend that the playground is included as part of the overall build by TRL. This is on the basis that it will lift the quality of the play network and avoid the reputational risk of failing to meet a community expectation that has been raised through consultation.

6. Should the board approve the build of the playground, an Infrastructure Funding Agreement will be required to ensure the asset is built and transferred to council in an appropriate manner and to confirm that the board become responsible for maintenance and renewal costs from 2036 onwards.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) approve the playground construction within the Stage 2B Fenchurch Housing Area subdivision at nil cost to council as detailed in Attachment A.

b) accept Tamaki Regeneration Ltd’s offer to fund the build of the playground and fund maintenance of the playground at a rate of $7,869 per annum (index linked to CPI) for the next 17 years by means of an Infrastructure Funding Agreement that would see the asset transferred into council ownership.

c) note that ongoing maintenance costs for other hard and soft landscape elements within the park will be drawn from the local board’s Locally Driven Initiative opex budget from January 2021 onwards.
Horopaki

Context

7. TRL is working in partnership with Auckland Council to redevelop the Tāmaki area and build 7,500 dwellings over the next 20 years. The company hold a resource consent for the redevelopment of the properties in Stage 2B of the Fenchurch Special Housing Area in Glen Innes. This resource consent includes the proposal to vest a pocket park and playground in council at no cost.

8. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board agreed (resolution MT/2017/31) to the vesting of the park and committing to fund all associated maintenance costs through their LDI opex budget. These costs have been estimated to be $1700 per annum.

9. The Environment and Community Committee met on 16 May 2017 and approved under resolution ENV/2017/67 the acquisition of the 1795m² pocket park within Stage 2B of the Fenchurch Special Housing Area at no cost to council. The relevant resolution had a condition that the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board fund the maintenance and renewal costs from their LDI opex budget:

   approve the acquisition at no cost to council, of approximately 1795m² of land for a pocket park within Stage 2B of the Fenchurch Special Housing Area, Glen Innes … on the condition that the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board funds maintenance costs and renewals from its Local Discretionary Initiative budget and that this be included in the local board agreement.

10. The build of a playground was not included as part of the planned open space development for the site at this stage.

11. The park was vested to council in January 2019 and will, as per a condition of the resource consent, be maintained by TRL until January 2021.

12. TRL have now approached council for formal approval of the playground development concept at the site and confirmed that they (TRL) will fund maintenance of the facility for the first 17 years of its life.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

13. Staff from the Parks, Sports and Recreation (PSR) Department advise that additional play provision in this location is a good outcome for the local community as it contributes to the network of play and will meet additional demand stimulated by housing development.

14. TRL have recently enhanced their playground development proposal by agreeing to pay for the maintenance of the playground for the first 17 years of its life. This period represents the approximate lifetime of the asset before a renewal is required. The maintenance payment of $7,869 per year will be index linked to CPI and is the estimated cost provided by council staff for maintaining the facility during this period. TRL have also committed to cover renewal costs if there was significant asset failure, rather than anticipated wear and tear, over this time.

15. The proposal to develop the playground is not in accordance with the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Open Space Network Plan and if funding was being provided by the board, PSR staff would recommend that the best play outcomes from a network perspective, are achieved by investing in facilities at Elstree North Reserve.

16. However, in this instance the build and initial maintenance funding is being provided from an external source. Because of this and the fact that the facility will lift play provision particularly around the Fenchurch development, staff are recommending that the board approve the build and transfer of the asset (with associated funding conditions).

17. If the board agree to accept the build of the playground, council staff from the Development Programme Office (DPO) have determined that an Infrastructure Funding Agreement is...
needed to ensure the playground is built and transferred to council in an appropriate manner. The agreement would include clear conditions around the TRL obligations to fund future maintenance and reasonable renewal requests.

18. This agreement will ensure council’s interests are protected should TRL responsibilities get transferred to a new entity and no additional operational expenses, in principle, will be incurred for a period of seventeen years.

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

19. Community and Customer Services, the DPO and the Parks and Recreation Policy team are in agreement that the playground would add value to the parks network and be an asset valued by the local community.

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

20. Several workshops on the proposed playground have been conducted with the board between March 2018 and July 2019. Local board direction was to consider a playground on the site and that alternative sources of funding for the maintenance of the asset be investigated.

21. At the most recent board workshop held on 2 July 2019, board members sought confirmation regarding the following points:
   a) will the detailed playground design be workshopped with the board
   b) what are the playground build and renewal costs
   c) why are both general park maintenance and playground maintenance budgets being drawn from board LDI discretionary funds rather than Asset Based Services budgets and would this change over time
   d) can examples of similar scenarios, where land has been vested to council on condition that the relevant board covers maintenance costs, be provided.

22. In response staff can confirm that:
   a) The draft design for the play space will be workshopped with the board.
   b) The playground build and installation costs are $90,000. The renewal costs for the play items only (i.e. without need for site prep, earth works, foundations etc) at today’s rates are estimated at $46,600. The annual landscape maintenance costs (which exclude playground maintenance) are estimated to be $1700.
   c) Acquisitions that are deemed not to be a priority for council, are conditional on the local board allocating ongoing maintenance funds from their LDI discretionary budget. It is not anticipated that this will change over time.
   d) Two current examples of where the governing body has determined that land will be acquired on the basis that the relevant local board commits LDI budget in perpetuity for maintenance and renewals are:
      i. 375 Rodney Street, Wellsford
      ii. 90B Grove Road, Papakura.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

23. The proposed park does not contain any known sites and places of significance or value to mana whenua but the contribution of park outcomes is of significant importance to tangata whenua, their well being, values, culture and traditions.
24. There is a large Māori community living in Glen Innes and they, along with other sections of the community, will benefit from the proposed play development.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

25. The local board in supporting the vesting of the reserve, understood that the maintenance, other than that relating to a playground, would be funded from its LDI opex budget. This cost is estimated to be no more than $1700 per annum. This sum will not have to be paid by the board until January 2021 since the developer will cover all relevant maintenance costs for a period of two years from project completion.

26. The ongoing maintenance costs linked to a playground have been estimated by council staff to be $7,869 per annum. This will be funded by TRL through an Infrastructure Funding Agreement for a period of 17 years. In 2036 TRL will cease to fund maintenance of the facility and all renewal and maintenance budgets associated with the facility will be from this time provided by the local board. These financial commitments will be detailed in the local board agreement.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

27. TRL and their contractor RAWA have consulted widely with the local schools and the community. The immediate community now has an expectation that a playground will be provided in this park. Failure to meet this expectation represents a reputational risk for both TRL and Auckland Council and will undermine overall confidence in the Tamaki Transformation project.

28. If maintenance costs exceed the estimated amount of $7,869 per year, the board would have to meet these additional unanticipated costs. This scenario is considered unlikely given that an extra 20% budget has been factored into the maintenance estimates in order to cover unforeseen maintenance.

29. The risk of TRL having to cover the costs of product failure or significant vandalism is regarded as low due to the application of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles, the high level of passive surveillance created by proximity and orientation of the residential units plus the high design quality of the play items being selected in this instance.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

30. If the board approve the playground in the park, an Infrastructure Funding Agreement will be established between TRL and Auckland Council. The transfer of the asset to the council will be outlined in the Infrastructure Funding Agreement and the board’s LDI commitment regarding maintenance will be set out in the local board agreement in the relevant financial year.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Fenchurch Special Housing Area open space plan</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SANTA & COLE TRAPECIO SEAT 3500mm LONG
Laminated/HD treated pine sections
Hot Dip Galvanised frame
Galvanised footings

NOTE:
THIS DWG IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES AND DOES NOT SHOW THE SPECIFIED ARM REST NOR SKATEBOARD DETERRENTS PROVIDED BY SUPPLIER. REFER TO L8-6001 FOR FURTHER DETAIL.
## Development of a playground at Aveline Park

### Attachment A

#### Item 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIVIES</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>CONT</th>
<th>GTY</th>
<th>BER/MET</th>
<th>GB01</th>
<th>GB02</th>
<th>GB03</th>
<th>GB04</th>
<th>GB05</th>
<th>GB06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meteorococcus kochii</td>
<td>Ruahaba</td>
<td>P2B5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T.S.C.</td>
<td>(Street Tree)</td>
<td>P2B5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wire luma</td>
<td>Ruahaba</td>
<td>P2B5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHRUBS</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>CONT</th>
<th>GAP SPACING</th>
<th>GTY</th>
<th>BER/MET</th>
<th>GB01</th>
<th>GB02</th>
<th>GB03</th>
<th>GB04</th>
<th>GB05</th>
<th>GB06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternanthera condens Matsumura</td>
<td>Haparanga NZ Rock Lily</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>0.3m</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coprosma araeacea</td>
<td>Red/Rhodo</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>1.3m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coprosma repens</td>
<td>Poor Knight's Forget Me Not</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>1.3m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cotyledon mitchellii</td>
<td>Ti Kouka, Cabbage Tree</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>1.3m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euphorbia glauca</td>
<td>Weaia, Shorn Spire</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>1.3m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libertia grandiflora</td>
<td>NZ Iris</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>1.3m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libertia persicaria</td>
<td>Mistabilis</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>1.3m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leptospermum cuneatum</td>
<td>Karaka, Mountain Feu</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>1.3m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophora sp</td>
<td>Kowhai</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>1.3m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUND COVERS</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>CONT</th>
<th>GAP SPACING</th>
<th>GTY</th>
<th>BER/MET</th>
<th>GB01</th>
<th>GB02</th>
<th>GB03</th>
<th>GB04</th>
<th>GB05</th>
<th>GB06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acacia dealbata</td>
<td>Majus</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acacia dealbata</td>
<td>Majus</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Network Planting

**Note:** 100% of all plantings are to be reviewed in line with the Planting Plan 2023-2034.
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To approve the allocation of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) to projects in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. Local boards can use the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) to deliver transport infrastructure projects that they have identified as a priority but are not part of Auckland Transport’s (AT) work programme. There is $1.229 million currently left in the local board’s fund.

3. Potential projects for allocation were workshopped with the local board in May and July. Staff identified two sets of projects as suitable for funding to go to construction.

4. The first project recommended is two raised pedestrian crossings on Line Road and Taniwha Road in Glen Innes that connect Eastview, Taniwha and Maybury Reserves (Attachment A), which are currently at different stages of development. The second project is two raised pedestrian crossings on Onehunga Mall in Onehunga that connect laneways across the town centre (Attachment B) which are part of the Transform Onehunga laneways programme of work.

5. It is therefore recommended that the board allocate $190,000 ($95,000 each) for two raised pedestrian crossings on Line Road and Taniwha Road and $300,000 ($150,000 each) for two raised pedestrian crossings on Onehunga Mall.

6. This would leave $739,000 remaining in the board’s LBTCF.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) approve the allocation of $190,000 from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund towards two raised pedestrian crossings on Line Road and Taniwha Road in Glen Innes that connect Eastview, Taniwha and Maybury Reserves as per Attachment A.

b) approve the allocation of $300,000 from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund towards two raised pedestrian crossings on Onehunga Mall in Onehunga that connect laneways across the town centre as per Attachment B.

Horopaki

Context
7. 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 have identified as a priority but are not part of AT’s work programme.
Projects must:
- 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).

8. Potential projects were workshopped with the local board in May and July. The proposed project in Onehunga to construct two further stages of a shared path and a boardwalk was deferred while AT undertakes a safety audit. Also, the Jubilee bridge proposal is being redesigned. The board has already allocated $700k to this proposal.

9. Staff recommended two sets of projects be supported for funding to go to construction. These include two raised pedestrian crossings on Line Road and Taniwha Road in Glen Innes and two raised pedestrian crossings on Onehunga Mall in Onehunga. Another project, the continuation of the boardwalk along Onehunga Bay Reserve foreshore, is still subject to ongoing investigation and will be considered for funding at a later date.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Raised Pedestrian Crossings, Line Road and Taniwha Road, Glen Innes

10. As identified in the Tāmaki Open Space Network Plan improvements have been delivered, or are about to be, to Eastview, Taniwha and Maybury reserves.

11. These improvements include new or upgraded paths for walking and cycling. This allows for safe travel through the area as well as for exercise and recreation. As the paths leading out of the reserves are almost directly opposite each other, project leads, as part of the improvements, requested AT to investigate the feasibility of raised pedestrian crossings being constructed to facilitate safer crossing for pedestrians and bike riders.

12. The proposed crossings are located on Line Road, between Eastview and Taniwha Reserves, and Taniwha Road, between Taniwha and Maybury Reserves, as per Attachment A.

13. AT engineers have confirmed the crossings are feasible and have provided a rough order of cost (RoC) of $95,000 for each one.

14. Staff recommend that the board allocate the total of $190,000 so that detailed design can begin.

Raised Pedestrian Crossings, Onehunga Mall, Onehunga

15. Onehunga town centre has been identified as a major regeneration and intensification opportunity for Auckland. It is one of the ‘Transform’ priority locations to be delivered by Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku).

16. Within the Transform Onehunga Framework Plan a network of laneways were identified as suitable for redevelopment to enhance the public realm and create a vibrant and interesting laneway network across the Onehunga town centre.

17. In 2017 Panuku commissioned a consultant to complete a Transport Report for Onehunga, which identified key barriers to pedestrian movement and made recommendations for improvements. It also highlighted the lack of crossing opportunities at some intersections making east-west movement more difficult.

18. As part of the improvements, project leads requested AT to investigate the feasibility of two pedestrian crossings that provide a better connection between 152 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 4) and 151-155 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 5) and 210A Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 2) as per the options in Attachment B.
19. AT engineers have confirmed the crossings are feasible and have provided a RoC of $150,000 for each crossing.

20. Staff recommend that the board allocate the total of $300,000 so that detailed design can begin.

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

21. Auckland Transport have consulted Community Facilities and Panuku staff in developing the recommendations. The respective project leads are supportive of the proposals.

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

22. The projects being considered in this report were workshopped with the local board in May and July. Additionally, the broader aspects of the Transform Onehunga and Tāmaki Open Space Network projects are workshopped with the board regularly.

23. These projects will deliver on the local board plan’s objectives of making the community a safer place and making safer access to good-quality open spaces.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement**

24. Impacts on Māori will be considered on a project by project basis. Feedback will also be received through consultation.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications**

25. The two raised pedestrian crossings on Line Road and Taniwha Road cost $95,000 each with a total cost of $190,000.

26. The two raised pedestrian crossings in Onehunga cost $150,000 each with a total cost of $300,000.

27. While noting that a more accurate costing will be known once detailed design is complete, the variation in RoC between the two sites is due to a number of factors. The Line and Taniwha Road raised pedestrian crossings are adjacent to Council reserves, whereas the Onehunga raised pedestrian crossings are in the retail area of Onehunga. The Onehunga works will require a great deal more consultation, stakeholder management and traffic management. There is also a much greater likelihood of the need to avoid or move other utilities (power, water, etc). The tiled finish for the Onehunga project is another factor that increases the cost.

28. The remaining budget in the LBTCF will be $739,000. Further projects can be considered for allocation by the local board in the first half of 2020.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga Risks and mitigations**

29. Both projects will provide greater pedestrian safety and limit the speed of vehicles in the vicinity. With the improved amenity of the reserves and significantly increasing residential population pedestrian numbers will increase so providing safer crossing points will benefit the community.

30. The nature of these projects has minimal construction risk. Raised pedestrian crossings are a common safety improvement especially on roads that have high volumes of traffic.
31. The cost estimates are based on while established methodologies and contingencies, so that there is less likelihood of cost over runs. However as with all construction projects there is some financial risk.

The costs are dependent on:

- lighting requirements
- stormwater issues
- underground services relocation
- AT metro requirements
- stakeholder engagement if the improvement becomes controversial.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

32. Both projects will proceed to detailed design. For the two pedestrian crossings in Onehunga Panuku will work with AT to determine the best option, prior to detailed design.

33. AT will undertake consultation on all of the pedestrian crossings following detailed design.

34. AT will provide updates on the projects’ progress at workshops and through the monthly reporting process.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Raised pedestrian crossings connecting Tāmaki parks</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Raised pedestrian crossing options for Onehunga</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Bruce Thomas, Elected Member Relationship Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon, Manager Elected Member Relationship Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Raised pedestrian crossings connecting Tāmaki parks
Onehunga Laneways Project

Raised pedestrian crossing connecting laneway 4 and 5
RoC = $150k
Item 16

RoC = $150k

Raised pedestrian crossing connecting laneway 2 and 8

Attachment B
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To consider the allocation of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board’s Community Safety Fund to road safety projects in its area and to decide on a prioritised list of projects.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board has put forward a number of potential projects for the Community Safety Fund. These have been assessed, scoped and an estimated cost developed. The scoped and costed list of projects have been workshopped with the local board and a preferred order of progression developed.

3. The Community Safety Fund is a one-off initiative to fund safety projects. The fund covers the 2019/2020 and 2020/2021 financial year. The allocation to projects must occur at this August meeting, or else the fund will be lost.

4. Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board has $1,020,109 to allocate towards community safety in the local board area. The total cost of recommended projects to be funded is $1,270,000. The local board can top up the Community Safety Fund from its Local Board Transport Capital Fund to ensure delivery of all projects.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Maungakiekie Tamaki Local Board:

a) allocate $250,000 from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund to the Community Safety fund.

b) allocate the Community Safety Fund to the following projects:

   i) $300,000 to Selwyn Street pedestrian safety improvements;
   ii) $260,000 to Farringdon Street pedestrian safety improvements;
   iii) $260,000 to Elstree Avenue pedestrian safety improvements;
   iv) $50,000 to Bailey Road pedestrian safety improvements;
   v) $20,000 to Panama Road pedestrian safety improvements;
   vi) $20,000 to Harris Road pedestrian safety improvements;
   vii) $20,000 to safety measures near 57 Grey Street;
   viii) $80,000 to two driver feedback signs on both Apirina Avenue and Dunkirk Road;
   ix) $260,000 to Hamlin Road, pedestrian safety improvements.

c) note that the Community Safety Fund projects are in order of preferred progression of delivery.
Horopaki

Context

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. The Maungakiekie Tāmaki Local Board share of the Community Safety Fund is $1,020,109 over the two-year period.

8. Criteria for the Community Safety 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.

9. The Community Safety 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 demonstrable safety benefit unless they are integral with a safety project.

10. That list of projects has now been costed by AT. This costing is more than the budget allocated to the particular local board under this funding, therefore it is recommended that the option of using any of its available Local Board Transport Capital Fund to top up the project budget.
11. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board indicated its preferred order of progression of the Community Safety Fund projects at its July workshop.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

12. The list of projects put forward for assessment and costing by the local board is below:

<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>Selwyn St pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>Pedestrian refuge between existing zebra and Trafalgar Street. Raise existing zebra near day care.</td>
<td>Qualify</td>
<td>Selwyn St Onehunga.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>CSFMT1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farringdon pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>Raised table for pedestrian crossing.</td>
<td>Qualify</td>
<td>Located at 26a Farringdon Street. Convert existing kea into a raised zebra.</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>CSFMT1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elstree Ave pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>Raised table for pedestrian crossing.</td>
<td>Qualify</td>
<td>Elstree Ave near the pools, approx. 120 Elstree Ave.</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>CSFMT1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Rd pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>Slow traffic in proximity to kea crossing by installing two asphalt speed humps either side of crest.</td>
<td>Qualify</td>
<td>15 Bailey Rd. A new zebra or raised kea would conflict with existing driveways. Therefore, existing kea crossing is the best safety measure and is to be retained.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>CSFMT1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama Rd School pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>High friction surfacing either side of zebra. (30m in length either side)</td>
<td>Qualify</td>
<td>Panama Rd School</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>CSFMT1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Rd pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>Install high friction surfacing either side of zebra. Delineate parking opposite shops with road</td>
<td>Qualify</td>
<td>There is an existing raised table, but the school is down a right of way and not obvious to drivers, With the angle parking and nearby</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>CSFMT1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longford St pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>Enhanced signage and raised zebra crossing to</td>
<td>Qualify</td>
<td>Longford St Mt Wellington. Existing School zone. Parking removal</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>CSFMT1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 17
facilitate kids crossing from Sylvia Park School.

Assessment of additional projects

13. The local board provided feedback at its workshop, raising that a raised zebra crossing on Longford Street was not necessary, given that Longford is a dead-end street. The local board suggested that upgrading the Kea crossing on Hamlin Road would provide a better safety outcome for the school. They asked that this option be urgently investigated.

14. The local board requested that AT also assess putting electronic signs on the following streets:
   - Grey Street (near Golden Grove School)
   - Aprina Avenue
   - Dunkirk Road
   - Hamlin Road
   - Taniwha Street

15. The list of additional projects put forward for assessment and costing by the local board is below. As part of the assessment AT analysed the sites for loss of control crashes and speed data to provide a basis for justification for the driver feedback signs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grey Street</td>
<td>Safety measures near 57 Grey St</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Driver feedback signs were not feasible at this location. Recommend allocating budget to investigate and implement safety measures</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apirana Ave</td>
<td>Driver feedback signs</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>One sign on each side of the road near the bend 2 x $20,000 each</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunkirk Rd</td>
<td>Driver feedback signs</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Recommend 2 electronic feedback signs at either approach to the park/reserve. 2 x $20,000 each</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlin Rd</td>
<td>Raised table for pedestrian crossing.</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Upgrade existing Kea crossing to raised pedestrian crossing</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taniwha St</td>
<td>No measures assessed</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
<td>Taniwha Road layout is changing</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
16. The impact of information (or decisions) in this report is/are confined to AT and do/does not impact on other parts of the Council group.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
17. The projects allocated funding in this report will improve the road safety environment in the communities within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area. The projects assisting delivering the Board’s objective of making the community a safer place.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
18. Engagement with Māori, or consideration of impacts and opportunities, will be carried out on an individual project basis.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
26. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board’s Community Safety Fund is $1,020,109. The rough order costing of the recommended projects come to $1,270,000.
27. AT recommend that the local board top up the Community Safety Fund to the amount of $250,000 out of the Local Board Transport Capital Fund, to meet the rough order costing of recommended projects.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
28. The risks for each project will be assessed as part of detailed design and as part of AT’s internal review process.
29. There is the risk of losing the budget should budget not be allocated at the local board’s August business meeting. It is recommended that the fund be over allocated so that it is fully utilised and mitigates this risk.
30. The costs provided in this report are rough order costings. As a result, there is a risk of not being able to deliver all of the projects depending on the actual cost of delivery. If this occurs AT will come back to the local board with options.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
31. The approved list of projects will go to detailed design and construction phase. The local board will be frequently updated on the projects progress going forward.
Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Assessment of Electronic Feedback Proposals</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
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Assessment of Electronic Feedback Proposals

**Grey St** – Six loss of control crashes (non-injury). No serious or fatal crashes. 85th is 54km/h on the eastern end. Would not recommend electronic feedback signs.

**Apirana Ave** – A number of loss of control crashes on this section of Apirana Ave. There is a serious and a fatal on a slight bend. Recommend two electronic feedback signs at either approach through this section particularly to address the bend.
Dunkirk Rd – Few loss of controls through area highlighted below. Could use two electronic feedback signs at either approach to the park/reserve.

Hamlin Rd – Low, non-injury crash history. No signs required.
Crash severity

F = Fatal: A death occurring as the result of injuries sustained in a road crash within 30 days of the crash.

S = Serious: Injury (fracture, concussion, severe cuts or other injury) requiring medical treatment or removal to and retention in hospital.

M = Minor: Injury which is not ‘serious’ but requires first aid, or which causes discomfort or pain to the person injured.

N = Non-injury: Property damage only
Auckland Transport August Update

File No.: CP2019/15423

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board on transport related matters within the local board area and the region for the period of July 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report updates the board on regional and local matters including Church and Victoria Streets intersection and Free Child Fares on the weekend.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:
a) receive the Auckland Transport August 2019 update report.

Horopaki
Context
3. This report addresses transport related matters in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area.
4. Auckland Transport (AT) is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. Reports are provided monthly to local boards, as set out in the Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important role local boards play within and on behalf of their local communities.
5. Other matters, such as road closures, are reported to the local board on an as needed basis for timeliness.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Church and Victoria Street Intersection
6. Auckland Transport is in final preparatory stages for the construction of a raised platform roundabout at the intersection of Church Street and Victoria Street, Onehunga. There are ongoing crashes at the intersection. Following a recent incident AT was asked to deliver the project as soon as possible.
7. AT will endeavour to expedite the construction of this project where possible, however a number of key elements are required before construction starts, including detailed design, road safety audits and resolution (traffic control legislation) processes.
8. AT are currently in the process of procuring professional services for detailed design and construction services. In light of the recent crashes that have occurred at the intersection, AT is accelerating the design and construction process. AT will endeavour to commence the
detailed design in September and have the construction to begin in early 2020. This is earlier than the previously stated July 2020 date.

9. As an interim measure, Auckland Transport will be installing additional signs and road marking at the intersection, including:
   - Gated (on both sides of the road) “Stop” signage on Victoria Street for both approaches;
   - Advance “Stop ahead” warning sign on Victoria Street for both approaches;
   - Painted flush median improvements, with raised pavement markers to enhance the stop control from Victoria Street;
   - Advance “cross intersection” warning sign on Church Street for both approaches;
   - “High risk intersection ahead” signage at all approaches.

Free Child Fares in the Weekend

10. Auckland Council has approved funding to facilitate free child weekend fares for children using registered AT HOP cards. The free fares apply to public transport operating on the weekend except Skybus, Mahu city express and Waiheke and Rakino ferry services. The free fares apply to children between 5 and 15 years of age. Children under 5 already travel for free when accompanied by a fare paying passenger. Children paying cash will still pay the standard child fare. The free fares also apply to public holidays.

11. The initiative begins on 7 September. A public announcement will be made on 19 August with links to further in information and a series of frequently asked questions.

AMETI

12. The scheduled AMETI workshop for Tuesday 13 August was cancelled. The local board will receive an update memo in the near future.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

13. The delivery of the AMETI project has impacts and overlaps with Auckland Council and Panuku. These are managed and addressed through regular liaison meetings.

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

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

15. The local board receive an update report as part of the monthly business meeting agenda and issues are workshopped as necessary between meetings.

16. Local board members may direct queries on issues via electedmember@at.govt.nz.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

17. Consideration of impacts and opportunities for engagement will be carried out on an individual project basis.
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
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Item 18

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
18. Financial implications are assessed on a case by case basis.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
19. The proposed decision of receiving this report has no risks. Auckland Transport has risk management strategies in place for the transport projects undertaken in the local board area.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
20. The local board will receive updates on other transport matters at workshops scheduled in August.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories
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<td>Authorisers</td>
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</tr>
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Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To seek endorsement from the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board for the concept design of 152 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 4) and 151-155 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 5) as per Attachment A; and

2. To seek approval from the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board for the concept design of Paynes Lane, Onehunga (Laneway 8) as per Attachment A.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

3. Onehunga town centre has been identified as a major regeneration and intensification opportunity for Auckland. It is one of the ‘Transform’ priority locations to be delivered by Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku). The town centre occupies strategic locations with good infrastructure, services and facilities. The programme area has a concentration of council landholdings that are development ready.

4. Within the Transform Onehunga Framework Plan, a network of laneways was identified as suitable for redevelopment to enhance the public realm and create a vibrant and interesting laneway network across the Onehunga town centre. The programme of work includes upgrading eight laneways with the outcome to improve the look and feel of the town centre, improve the safety of the laneways and enhance the local connections. This also aligns with the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Plan outcome of ‘Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is the place to be’ with the objective being, to work with Panuku to leverage the council’s assets and resources to reinvest in transformation projects in the local board area.

5. The first of the laneway series, Laneway 7 located at 5 Pearce Street, Onehunga, was completed in April 2019. It is now recommended that a further two laneways be progressed for completion and another have the concept designs approved.

6. 152 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 4) and 151-155 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 5) are considered the next logical laneways to progress to completion as they have no interdependencies with any other projects within the Transform Onehunga programme. Paynes Lane, Onehunga (Laneway 8) however, will be aligned to the adjacent development of Dress Smart ensuring all construction work is completed within the same programme ensuring ratepayers money is spent wisely and efficiently.

7. 152 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 4) and 151-155 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 5) are privately owned laneways. Paynes Lane, Onehunga (Laneway 8) is owned by Auckland Council and although not a legal road, it is used as a one-way road leading from Onehunga Mall to Dress Smart.

8. Existing council budgets are used to fund operational and capital works for the laneways.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) endorse the concept design of 152 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 4) and 151-155 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 5) as per Attachment A; and

b) approve the concept design of Paynes Lane, Onehunga (Laneway 8) as per Attachment A.

Horopaki
Context

9. Onehunga is identified as a ‘Transform’ location in the Panuku portfolio due to the suitability of the area for intensification and the potential benefits that urban development would have in this location. It is a centre with strong transport connectivity, being 23 minutes by rail to Auckland city centre, proximity to major employment areas and a range of existing community facilities.

10. Within the Transform Onehunga Framework Plan a network of laneways are identified as suitable for redevelopment to enhance the public realm and create a vibrant and interesting laneway network across the Onehunga town centre. Public feedback during the planning phase identified opportunities to improve the experience of the public realm in Onehunga by:

   a) Capitalising on known walking routes and / or destinations within the centre to establish a complete pedestrian network
   b) Providing wayfinding and signage to make routes legible
   c) Improving connectivity and accessibility of the public spaces to ‘guide’ people through town
   d) Ensuring that public spaces are lively, inclusive and inviting for a wide range of users at all times and seasons
   e) Establishing a unique, integrated furniture and lighting palette that celebrates the uniqueness of Onehunga and leads to a more attractive and stimulating experience for users.

11. The laneways programme of work aims to refresh the existing laneways in Onehunga and create enhanced public realm through repaving, artwork, lighting, furniture and planting. Outcomes include improving the safety and amenity of the laneway network and reinforcing the important east-west pedestrian connections between Onehunga Mall and the surrounding streets.

12. To develop the laneways concept designs Panuku engaged with stakeholders and the wider community through several engagement meetings, Social Pinpoint and place activations involving the Onehunga Business Association, historians and the local community.

13. The completion of the remaining seven laneways will be progressed over four years. The first of the laneways, Laneway 7 located at 5 Pearce Street, Onehunga, was completed in April 2019.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

14. The concept designs (Attachment A) for 152 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 4), 151-155 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 5) and Paynes Lane (Laneway 8) aim to provide high quality, safe, functional, flexible spaces using a consistent ‘kit of parts’ that will facilitate their activation and use. Landscape Architects have considered both the wider Onehunga...
context and what has been contributed to successful laneway revitalisation projects both locally and internationally.

Laneways 4 and 5

15. 152 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 4) is a narrow lane running east-west between the bus interchange on Upper Municipal Place and Onehunga Mall. The entrances to the laneway off Onehunga Mall and Upper Municipal Place are not immediately obvious to pedestrians or cyclists as there is no wayfinding signage or site features indicating the pedestrian nature of the lane or the relationship with 151-155 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 5).

16. 151-155 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 5) is also a narrow lane running east-west between the Onehunga Mall and Waller Street car park. The entrance to the laneway has a canopy which partially obscures the lane from pedestrians or cyclists. As with Laneway 4 there is no wayfinding signage or site features indicating the pedestrian nature of the lane or the relationship with Laneway 4.

17. Both Laneways 4 and 5 have buildings on both the north and south boundaries of the lane. The laneways are therefore within building shadow for a large portion of the year, with direct sunlight in the laneways only during the height of summer.

18. Due to the composition of both laneways they are considered more suitable for activation as thoroughfares as there are no active hospitality or retail frontages, and the environmental conditions within the lanes limit its potential as a space for seating.

19. Lighting the entrances to both Laneways 4 and 5 with a combination of street lighting and art installation will create a strong visual connection to both laneways. This will also aid wayfinding along this important mid-block pedestrian link and help create a feeling of safety in the laneways. Lighting and vibrant artworks on the building walls and on the ground plane will also add life to the laneways that reflects the unique identity and character of Onehunga.

20. Both laneways 4 and 5 are privately owned with private adjacent building owners. The Council has easements over the laneways to protect long-term access and use. Engagement was initiated with all parties prior to any design work commencing to understand any issues or concerns they may have with the proposal of upgrading the laneways. To date the feedback on the concept designs has been positive.

21. Concept designs are the foundation of a more detailed design that are consulted further with stakeholders and local board. Once detailed design has been completed, Panuku will seek formal written consent from all parties to implement the design on the laneways and adjacent buildings.

22. As the laneways are privately owned, Panuku only needs to seek endorsement from the local board for the concept design. This helps to ensure the laneways continue to be seen holistically as a network for the town centre.

Laneway 8

23. Paynes Lane, Onehunga (Laneway 8) is a lane running east-west between Onehunga Mall and the Dress Smart shopping centre. The lane is approximately 8.5 metres wide from building to building. Although not a legal road, Paynes Lane is a one-way lane vehicle carriageway, with the width of the road approximately 4 metres wide and footpaths approximately 2 metres wide on either side.

24. As Laneway 8 is multimodal, the entrances are both obvious even though no wayfinding provides information of where it leads to.

25. As part of the scope for Laneway 8, the adjacent streets Brays Rise and Waller Street were included in the concept design to provide some cohesion in the future. Both streets run north-south between Arthur Street and Church Street and are shared by vehicles and pedestrians.

26. The most sheltered part of Laneway 8 which receives the most year-round sunshine is the southern edge of the laneway making it the most desirable location for public seating. Waller
Street also receives year-round sun; however, the vehicular traffic may restrict it to a thoroughfare only.

27. To create a safe multimodal space on Laneway 8, the carriageway has been shifted to the north to create a wider pedestrian space on the sunny southern edge of the laneway. Street trees and planting are proposed to soften the edges of the public realm with lighting and vibrant artworks on the adjacent buildings and ground plane helping to activate the space.

28. Street lighting and art installations at the entrance off Onehunga Mall will create a threshold to the lane that creates a visual connection from Laneway 8 to 210A Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 2), leading to the new development at the Waiapu Lane Precinct, Onehunga.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

29. Panuku are working with the Land Advisory Team and the Streetscapes Team within Community Facilities to help the progression of the project run more cohesively. Both teams have not raised any concerns regarding the concept designs for Laneways 4, 5 and 8.

30. In 2017 Panuku commissioned a consultant to complete a Transport Report for Onehunga, which identified key barriers to pedestrian movement and made recommendations for improvements. It also highlighted the lack of crossing opportunities at some intersections making east-west movement more difficult.

31. Panuku have been working with Auckland Transport to propose to the local board two pedestrian crossings that provide a better connection between 152 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 4) and 151-155 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 5) and 210A Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 2). A report seeking allocation of the local board transport capital fund towards these proposals is being presented to the local board by Bruce Thomas at the August business meeting.

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

Local impacts and local board views

32. Panuku have worked closely with the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board since inception of the Transform Onehunga programme and have provided regular updates to ensure the views of the local board are considered and consistent with the strategic vision outlined in the High Level Project Plan (HLPP) and Framework Plan.

33. The concept designs in Attachment A for Laneways 4, 5 and 8 were presented at the local board workshop on 16 July 2019.

34. The laneway series also aligns with the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Plan outcome of ‘Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is the place to be’ with the objective being, to work with Panuku to leverage the council’s assets and resources to reinvest in transformation projects it the local board area.

Tauākī whakaeweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

35. Panuku is currently undertaking an engagement process with mana whenua to help shape the future direction of projects within the Onehunga town centre. This process adheres to Panuku’s Māori Outcomes Framework is intended to identify key opportunities, themes and aspirations which are important to mana whenua and how they can be incorporated into the various Panuku projects that sit within the Transform Onehunga Framework Plan.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

36. The laneways programme of work will require funding for operational and capital works. The scale of enhancement envisaged by transforming the sites can be achieved through use of existing council budgets assigned to Panuku through the 10-year Budget 2018-2028.

37. Funding for two pedestrian crossings that provide better connections between the laneways is being sought from the local board transport capital fund in a separate report authored by Auckland Transport staff.

Ngā raru tūfono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

38. The following risks for the project have been identified and mitigations are proposed to respond to them throughout the project lifecycle:

a) Risk: Private landowners / building owners may not provide written approval to Panuku to implement the detailed design for the privately-owned laneways.
   Mitigation: Panuku will work closely with the private landowners and building owners to take them on the design journey and consider any feedback provided. Formal written approval will be obtained at concept design and detailed design stage.

b) Risk: The Streetscape Team at Community Facilities may not accept any new assets introduced into the privately-owned laneways.
   Mitigation: Panuku will continue to work closely with the assigned Maintenance Delivery Coordinators for Onehunga to ensure they are a part of the design process and have input on any new assets introduced to the privately-owned laneways. This will confirm the ongoing maintenance from Auckland Council required post project completion.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

39. A business case will be submitted to the Panuku Programme Sponsors Group for approval in September 2019. This will give the project team the mandate to proceed with detailed design and procurement of a contractor for 152 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 4) and 151-155 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga (Laneway 5). Dependent on the availability in the market, work will commence in Quarter 3 of FY19/20.

40. Panuku will continue to work with Dress Smart on their development programme to align the progression of design and construction for Paynes Lane, Onehunga (Laneway 8).

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
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</table>
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Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. This report provides the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board with highlights of Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development’s (ATEED) activities in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area as well as ATEED’s regional activities for the six months 1 January to 30 June 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. This report should be read in conjunction with ATEED’s Quarter 3 report to Auckland Council (available at www.aucklandnz.com) and the forthcoming Quarter 4 report to the Auckland Council CCO Finance and Performance Committee (available 17 September). Although these reports focus primarily on the breadth of ATEED’s work at a regional level, much of the work highlighted has significant local impact.

3. This report provides the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board with relevant information on the following ATEED activities:
   - Supporting local business growth
   - Filming activity
   - Young Enterprise Scheme
   - Youth employment pathways
   - Youth connections
   - Offshore talent attraction
   - Local and regional destination management and marketing
   - Delivered, funded and facilitated events

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) receive ATEED’s six-monthly report to the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board for the period of 1 January-30 June 2019.

Horopaki

Context

4. ATEED has two areas of focus:

   Economic Development – including business support, business attraction and investment, local economic development, trade and industry development, skills employment and talent and innovation and entrepreneurship.

   Destination - supporting sustainable growth of the visitor economy with a focus on destination marketing and management, major events, business events (meetings and conventions) and international student attraction and retention.
6. These two portfolios also share a common platform relating to the promotion of the city globally to ensure that Auckland competes effectively with other mid-tier high quality of life cities.

7. ATEED works with local boards, Council and CCO’s to support decision-making on local economic growth and facilitates or co-ordinates the delivery of local economic development activity. ATEED ensures that the regional activities that ATEED leads or delivers are fully leveraged to support local economic growth and employment.

8. In addition, ATEED’s dedicated Local Economic Development (LED) team works with local boards who allocate Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) budget to economic development activities. The LED team delivers a range of services such as the development of proposals, including feasibility studies that enable local boards to directly fund or otherwise advocate for the implementation of local initiatives.

9. ATEED delivers its services at the local level through business hubs based in the north, west and south of the region, as well as its central office at 167B Victoria Street West.

10. Additional information about ATEED’s role and activities can be found at www.aucklandnz.com/ateed

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

11. As at 30 June\(^3\), 3303 businesses had been through an ATEED intervention or programme. Of these, 154 businesses were in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area – 29 businesses went through Destination-related programmes and 125 businesses went through Economic Development-related programmes.

Economic Development

Supporting Local Business Growth

12. This area is serviced by the Business and Enterprise team in the North hub, based in the B: Hive. The team comprises of two Business and Innovation Advisors and administration support. The role of this team is to support the growth of Auckland’s key internationally competitive sectors and to support to provide quality jobs.

13. A key programme in achieving this is central government’s Regional Business Partnership Network (RBPN). This is delivered by ATEED’s nine Business and Innovation Advisors (BIA), whose role is to connect local businesses to resources, experts and services in innovation, R&D, business growth and management.

14. ATEED’s BIAs engage 1:1 with businesses through a discovery meeting to understand their challenges, gather key data, and provide connections / recommendations via an action plan.

15. Where businesses qualify (meet the programme criteria and/or align to ATEED’s purpose as defined in the SOI) the advisors facilitate government support to qualifying businesses, in the form of:
   - Callaghan Innovation R&D grants (including Getting Started, project and student grants [https://www.callaghaninnovation.govt.nz/grants])
   - Callaghan Innovation subsidised innovation programmes [https://www.callaghaninnovation.govt.nz/innovation-skills]

\(^3\) FY 2018/19 result for ATEED’s SOI KPI2
• RBPN business capability vouchers (NZTE), where the business owner may be issued co-funding up to $5,000 per annum for business training via registered service providers. Voucher co-funding is prioritised to businesses accessing this service for the first time, in order to encourage more businesses to engage with experts to assist their management and growth.
• NZTE services such as Export Essentials (https://workshop.exportessentials.nz/register/)
• Referrals to NZ Business Mentors via The Chamber of Commerce.

16. During the reporting period, ATEED Business and Innovation Advisors met with 27 businesses in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area, five for innovation advice and services and 22 for business growth and capability advice and services (one was a returning client). From these engagements:
  • Eight RBPN vouchers were issued to assist with business capability training
  • Seven connections were made to Callaghan Innovation services and programmes
  • Thirteen referrals were made to Business Mentors New Zealand
  • Seven connections were made to ATEED staff and programmes
  • Nearly 100 connections were made to other businesses or programmes.

Other support for new businesses

17. During the period, ATEED also ran workshops and events aimed at establishing or growing a new business and building capability. Fifteen people from the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area attended an event below:
  • Starting off Right workshop - 5
  • Business clinic – 10.

Filming activity within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area

18. ATEED’s Screen Auckland team provides film facilitation services as part of ATEED’s support for the screen and digital sector of Auckland’s economy. Screen Auckland facilitates, processes and issues film permits for filming activity in public open space. This activity supports local businesses and employment, as well as providing a revenue stream to local boards for the use of local parks.

19. Between 1 January and 30 June 2019, 305 film permits were issued in the Auckland region across 379 locations and 404 days of filming. Of these, five permits were issued in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area’s share of film permit revenue was $208.70 for the period (total for all boards combined was $51,191.30).

20. On average, 37 crew works on each shoot day. This does not reflect filming that also takes place in studios, private property or low impact activity that wouldn’t have required a permit. During the period, 81 permits were issued for TV commercials (TVC), making up 27 per cent of permits issued. A quarter of the TVC permits were destined for an international market.

21. Some of the key film productions that were issued permits to film in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area were:
  • Power Rangers
  • Westside S5 (TV series)

22. Auckland is becoming a popular destination for international television networks to pilot an episode of a new TV series to allow them to gauge if a series will be successful. Permits were issued for locations across the Auckland region earlier this year for two new US pilots.
23. The Auckland Chamber of Commerce has delivered the Lion Foundation Young Enterprise Scheme (YES) since January 2018. ATEED maintains a strategic role. During the period, there were 58 schools participating in the Auckland YES programme, representing 1376 students completing the programme. One Tree Hill College, Onehunga High School and Tāmaki College are the three schools from the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area participating in the YES programme.

24. The Go with Tourism campaign was successfully launched on 5 April, attracting 170 employers and more than 700 youth by year-end. The campaign is designed to shift perceptions many young people have about careers in tourism and address the skills gap in the industry.

25. ATEED delivered the Future Ready Summit on 26 June at the Vodafone Events Centre in Manukau. Approximately 250 employers, 40 young people and 20 speakers (eight under the age of 24). The Youth Employer Pledge partners were the primary audience. The Future Ready Auckland: Driving economic development through technology and transformation insights paper was also released, attracting strong media attention - including a lead story on Radio NZ Nine to Noon. The research aims to better understand Auckland’s future skill needs, including future growth sectors. ATEED is currently working with pledge partners to harness the network, with a focus on south and west Auckland now that Youth Connections has transferred to The Southern Initiative.

26. ATEED is the regional partner for the network of Auckland Jobs and Skills Hubs. These multi-agency hubs support employers at developments where there is a high and sustained demand for local labour and skills development. The Auckland network includes Ara (Auckland Airport development), City Centre and Tāmaki hubs. As at 30 June, 377 people had been placed into employment via the ATEED-facilitated CBD hub, 1,914 training outcomes were delivered, and 11 apprenticeships were facilitated. About 36 per cent of those employed are Māori, against a target of 40 per cent. ATEED has developed a school engagement pilot programme with interested employers and schools aimed at engaging students with career opportunities in the construction and infrastructure sector. ATEED also provided funding to a Progressive Employment Programme for at-risk youth, supporting cadet training and developing youth-ready capability within businesses working on the City Rail Link. The City Centre hub is a training partner for this programme.

27. The Auckland. We’re Hiring campaign ran from January to March 2019. The campaign is designed to attract high-skilled offshore construction and technology talent to Auckland. The campaign resulted in 2295 job applications.

28. ATEED continues its involvement and support of the Transform Onehunga Programme, led by Pānuku Development Auckland. ATEED is involved in discussions regarding future tourism opportunities that could be made possible as a result of the Onehunga Wharf upgrades, especially those offering connectivity to Maungakiekie/One Tree Hill and the Onehunga town centre.
Regional destination management and marketing activity

29. The Elemental AKL winter festival website went live on 29 April. The festival ran from 1-31 July and is developed to promote sustainable tourism growth by encouraging visitation more evenly throughout the year, and dispersing visitors across the region. The programme included more than 60 free and ticketed events across the themes of light, food, entertainment, and culture. Elemental Feast went live on 4 June, with 120 restaurants participating in plating up unique festival dishes using ingredients sourced from the Auckland region and inspired by the elements. Forty-seven of these events were held in the central city.

30. The Short Break campaign, aimed at leisure travellers on Australia’s eastern seaboard, ran during Q3 and Q4. There were three bursts of the campaign, focused on themes of nature, food and wine, and ultimate things to do in Auckland featuring different parts of the region. As part of the campaign, ATEED hosted news.com.au and lifestyle.com.au in Auckland, showcasing the city’s unique offering that is promoted in the campaign. News.com.au has a reach of six million and will produce a dedicated feature on Auckland as well as share one article on Facebook with their 1.1m followers. Lifestyle.com.au has a reach of 1.2m unique viewers and will produce two dedicated online features.

Delivered, funded and facilitated events

31. During the period, ATEED delivered the 2019 Auckland Lantern Festival at the Auckland Domain. Customer satisfaction was 89 per cent, an increase of nine per cent compared to the previous year. Some key findings from the customer survey found that respondents were very positive about what the event meant for the city, with 96 per cent of respondents agreeing that Auckland Council should continue to support events like the Lantern Festival and 94 per cent saying that the event brought people from different ethnic and cultural groups together (compared to 95 per cent and 91 per cent respectively in the previous year). The Auckland Lantern Festival’s sustainability objectives through the Cultural Festivals Strategy resulted in 62 per cent of waste being diverted from landfill. This has nearly doubled in two years, with the diversion being 34 per cent in 2017.

32. Given the need to prioritise police resourcing following the events in Christchurch on 15 March, the 2019 Pasifika festival, which was due to run on 23 and 24 March, was cancelled. Although the festival would have been an opportunity to bring Auckland’s communities together at a time of national mourning, given the unprecedented nature of what happened and after discussions with the New Zealand Police, it was agreed that Police must prioritise resourcing to ensure the safety of communities across the city.

33. During the period, residents of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area were also able to enjoy events funded or facilitated by ATEED across the Auckland region, including the ASB Classic, Splore Music and Arts Festival, Sculpture on the Gulf, the New Zealand Comedy Festival, the Auckland Writers Festival, the Auckland Art Fair, Warhorse, and Auckland Wine Week.

34. A full schedule of major events is available on ATEED’s website, aucklandnz.com

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

35. ATEED assesses and manages our initiatives on a case-by-case basis and engages with the Council group where required.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
36. Local board views are not sought for the purposes of this report, but are sought and considered on an individual initiative basis.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
37. The proposed decision to receive the six-monthly report has no impact on Māori. ATEED assesses and responds to any impact that our initiatives may have on Māori on a case-by-case basis.

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

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
39. The proposed decision to receive the six-monthly report has no risk. ATEED assesses and manages any risk associated with our initiatives on a case-by-case basis.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
40. ATEED will provide the next six-monthly report to the local board in February 2020 which will cover the period 1 July to 31 December 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories
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Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

File No.: CP2019/14529

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol, and to provide feedback on the recommended changes to the document.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Auckland Council is currently reviewing the Auckland Film Protocol. The Auckland Film Protocol sets out:
   - the commitment of the council group to supporting filming in Auckland;
   - expectations and rules that filmmakers must abide by when filming in Auckland; and
   - provides guidance for filmmakers on the process for approval to film in Auckland.
3. The purpose of the review was to ensure that the Auckland Film Protocol is up-to-date and identify emerging trends, issues or opportunities that should be addressed. Content of the Auckland Film Protocol was reviewed against legislation referenced in the document and against policies and plans of the Auckland Council group to identify areas where the Auckland Film Protocol should be updated. Engagement with staff involved in the process of assessing and approving film permit applications, from across the council group, was undertaken to inform the review and proposed amendments to the Protocol.
4. A revised draft of the Auckland Film Protocol was reported to the Environment and Community Committee in June 2019 for consideration and was approved for public consultation (resolution number ENV/2019/73).
5. The following is a summary of the key changes made to the Auckland Film Protocol before public consultation was undertaken:
   - **Native species**: new content added stating that Auckland Council may place additional conditions on film permits to protect native species
   - **Kauri dieback**: new content added providing information about kauri dieback and stating that filmmakers will be required to clean equipment to council specifications when filming in areas where kauri are present.
   - **Drones**: new content added stating that a film permit is required for commercial filming and requiring filmmakers to comply with Civil Aviation rules, Auckland Council bylaws and conditions.
   - **Historic heritage**: new content added stating that filming in proximity to historic (including cultural) heritage will be subject to conditions to protect these sites.
   - **Health and safety**: new content added to reflect the new Health and Safety at work Act 2015 and requirements to prepare a site specific health and safety plan.
   - Content of the Auckland Film Protocol was updated to reflect current policy, plans and bylaws of Auckland Council. Some structural and editorial amendments were also made to improve the logic, flow and readability of the document.
6. Public consultation was undertaken over a three week period between 21 June and 12 July 2019.
7. A total of 74 submissions were received during the public consultation period. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board residents provided a total of four submissions on the draft Auckland Film Protocol, representing 5% percent of all submissions. The views of Maungakiekie-Tamaki submitters were generally similar to regional views; although one submitter did not support Auckland Council’s film-friendly policy. Staff are proposing some changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol to address submitter concerns; the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film protocol are shown in track changes in Attachment B.

8. This report provides a summary of public feedback and of proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol to address feedback. The following is a high-level summary of the key changes proposed to the Auckland Film Protocol in response to public consultation:

- **Natural environment**: include stronger messaging about the importance of respecting Auckland’s natural environment, that film permits may be subject to conditions to manage impacts and/or that filming may be subject to restrictions where these impacts cannot be appropriately managed.

- **Native species**: include stronger messages around the potential impact of filming on native species, such as birds and that filming permits may be subject to conditions to manage impacts and/or that filming may be subject to restrictions where these impacts cannot be appropriately managed.

- **Kauri dieback**: amend to ensure that conditions may be placed on film permits in any public open space (controlled by Auckland Council) where kauri are present.

- **Drones**: include additional guidance on the use of drones around native birds and in proximity to other users of public open space and adjoining private properties.

- **Impact on access to public open space**: include stronger messages around the need for filmmakers to be respectful of other users of public open space and state that film permits give limited permission to occupy public open space.

- **Compliance and enforcement**: include stronger messages around the requirement for filmmakers to comply with the Auckland Council policies, plans, bylaws and the terms and conditions of their film permit.

9. Submission themes and proposed changes are summarised in Attachment A.

**Ngā tūtohunga**

**Recommendation/s**

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol

b) provide feedback on the recommended changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol

c) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

**Horopaki**

**Context**

10. The first version of the Auckland Film Protocol (the Protocol) was adopted by the Regional Development and Operations Committee (resolution number RDO/2013/27) on 14 March 2013. A review of fees for filming in the Auckland Region was undertaken in 2014 and a new set of region-wide charges was recommended; providing a simplified and harmonized range of charges. The Governing Body adopted a region-wide schedule of film fees and revised Auckland Film Protocol on 28 May 2015 (resolution number GB/2015/36).
11. Since the Protocol was adopted in 2015 there have been a number of changes to legislation and to Auckland Council’s policy and planning framework. The purpose of the review of the Protocol was to:
   • ensure that the Protocol is up-to-date; and
   • identify emerging trends, issues or opportunities to be addressed in the Protocol.

12. Content of the Protocol was reviewed against legislation referenced in the document and against policies and plans of the Auckland Council group to identify areas where the Protocol should be updated. Engagement with staff involved in the process of assessing and approving film permit applications, from across the council group, was undertaken to inform the review and proposed amendments to the Protocol.

13. Workshops were held in September and October 2018 to engage with local boards that experience a high volume of filming.

14. Engagement to inform the preparation of the revised draft Protocol was also undertaken with:
   • mana whenua: mana whenua interests are represented by 19 iwi (tribal) authorities in Tāmaki Makaurau, Auckland. The 19 iwi authorities were invited, in writing, to inform the review of the Protocol.
   • staff of the Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority to inform the review.
   • screen sector: the screen sector was invited to participate in a survey in April 2019 to inform the review. The survey asked a series of general questions about the Protocol and experiences of filming in public open space in Auckland.
   • public: the People’s Panel in September 2018; a total of 4,762 responses were received. The survey asked a series of questions on views on and experiences of filming in Auckland.

A high-level summary of feedback (including local board feedback) is provided in Attachment C.

15. The review recommended that a range of changes be made to the Auckland Film Protocol, the following is a summary of the key changes proposed to the Environment and Community Committee:
   • **Native species**: include new content stating that Auckland Council may place additional conditions on film permits to protect native species
   • **Kauri dieback**: include new content providing information about kauri dieback and stating that filmmakers will be required to clean equipment to council specifications when filming in areas where kauri are present.
   • **Drones**: include new content stating that a film permit is required for commercial filming and requiring filmmakers to comply with Civil Aviation rules, Auckland Council bylaws and conditions.
   • **Historic heritage**: include new content stating that filming in proximity to historic (including cultural) heritage will be subject to conditions to protect these sites.
   • **Health and safety**: include new content to reflect the new Health and Safety at work Act 2015 and requirements to prepare a site specific health and safety plan.
   • **Filming on Tūpuna Maunga**: update content to reflect that applications to film on Tūpuna Maunga are assessed by the Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority.
   • **Updates to content**: update content to reflect current policy (e.g. smokefree policy), plans (Auckland Unitary Plan) and bylaws of Auckland Council.
   • **Structural and editorial**: amend some parts of the document to improve the logic, flow and readability of the document.
16. The revised draft of the Auckland Film Protocol was approved by the Environment and Community Committee for public consultation in June 2019 (resolution number ENV/2019/73).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

17. Consultation on the revised draft of the Auckland Film Protocol took place from 21 June to 12 July 2019. A total of 74 submissions were received; this represents a substantial increase on the 21 submission which were received in response to the 2015 review of the Auckland Film Protocol. Of the submissions received, 72 were submitted using the online form and 2 non-form hardcopy submissions were received.

18. Submitters were asked to identify if they worked in the screen sector or not, with:
   - 29 submissions (39%) received from individuals or organisations that identified themselves as working in the screen sector
   - 45 submissions (61%) received from individuals or organisations that do not work in the screen sector.

   The questions included in the online form varied depending on whether the submitter identified themselves as working in the screen industry or not.

19. A breakdown of all submissions received by local board area is shown in Table 1 below. The small number of responses from individual local board areas means that an analysis of views by local board area was not possible for all local board areas.

Table 1: Breakdown of submissions made by local board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board Area</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtahuhu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketapapa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoeto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. A series of closed questions were asked of non-screen sector individuals and organisations; a summary of the responses to these questions is shown in Table 2 below. Table 2 shows that:

- most respondents are supportive of Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach and that;
- most respondents think that the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to manage the impact that filming has on residents and businesses, on public open space and historic and cultural heritage.

Table 2: Feedback on the Auckland Film Protocols management of the impacts of filming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage of regional submissions (number of respondents is shown in brackets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you support Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75% (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>20% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to manage the impact of filming on residents and businesses?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56% (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>19% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to manage the impact that filming has on our public open space and environment?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53% (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>33% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to manage the impact of filming on our historic and cultural heritage?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62% (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>29% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10% (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. The main reasons given by those who supported Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Summary of key reasons for supporting Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of key submission points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>• generates employment and economic growth;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• benefits communities and local businesses;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• benefits a broad range of trades and industries;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• attracts investment and businesses to Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and creative</td>
<td>• has cultural benefits allowing and supporting the telling of stories visually;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• supports the creative economy and enables people to find a future in the creative industries;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It’s fun and exciting to see Auckland on the screen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promotion and tourism

- promotes and showcases Auckland to the world;
- creates a positive image of Auckland.

22. Table 4 shows the key reasons that respondents gave for partially supporting Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach.

Table 4: Summary of key reasons given for partially supporting Auckland Council’s film-friendly approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of key submission points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Access      | • the impacts on resident, including parking restrictions, road closures and ability to use public open space while filming is taking place need to be considered and managed;  
             | • need to ensure that film-makers are respectful of other users of public open space.             |
| Notification| • there needs to be sufficient notification to ensure that residents and businesses are aware of open space being used for filming and are not inconvenienced. |
| Balance     | • need to consider and manage the impact that filming has on the environment and impacted residents;  
             | • need to balance the cumulative impacts of filming.                                             |
| Equity      | • need to ensure that fees for commercial use of public places are fair.                          |

23. The key reasons given for not supporting Auckland Council's film-friendly approach were:

- the cost to ratepayers of enabling filming;
- that there is not enough protection for individuals, businesses and residents affected by filming being carried out on private property.

24. A series of open-ended questions were also included to elicit further information about responses to these questions and about a range of other topics. Staff have worked through submissions to determine any changes to be recommended for the final revised Auckland Film Protocol. Attachment A identifies key themes and submission points along with proposed staff responses.

A summary of the most common submission themes and the proposed staff responses are shown in table 5.

Table 5: Summary of key submission themes and proposed staff responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key themes</th>
<th>Summary of proposed responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of drones for filming</td>
<td>Include additional guidance on the use of drones around native birds and in proximity to other users of public open space and adjoining private properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on natural environment</td>
<td>Include stronger messaging about the importance of respecting Auckland’s natural environment, that film permits may be subject to conditions to manage impacts and/or that filming may be subject to restrictions where these impacts cannot be appropriately managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauri dieback</td>
<td>Amend to ensure that conditions may be placed on film permits in any public open space (controlled by Auckland Council) where kauri are present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on native species</td>
<td>Include stronger messages around the potential impact of filming on native species, such as birds and that filming permits may be subject to conditions to manage impacts and/or that filming may be subject to restrictions where these impacts cannot be appropriately managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on access to public open space</td>
<td>Include stronger messages around the need for filmmakers to be respectful of other users of public open space and state that film permits give limited permission to occupy public open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance and enforcement</td>
<td>Include stronger messages around the requirement for filmmakers to comply with Auckland Council policies, plans, bylaws and the terms and conditions of their film permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety</td>
<td>Amend to enable production companies to arrange alternative timeframes for the submission of a site specific health and safety plan by agreement with Screen Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>Screen Auckland to consider operational approaches to achieving wider public notification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on business</td>
<td>No change to the Auckland Film Protocol. The protocol is intended to provide a framework that enables decisions to be made on a case-by-case basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>No change to the Auckland Film Protocol. Fees for commercial use of public open space are set under the Auckland Council Trading and Events in Public Places Bylaw 2015 and amended through the long term plan and annual plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. This report seeks formal feedback from the board at its August 2019 business meeting on the recommended changes to the revised draft Auckland Film Protocol in response to consultation feedback.

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

26. Engagement with staff involved in the process of assessing and approving film permit applications, from across the council group, was undertaken to inform the review and proposed amendments to the Protocol. This included engagement with Auckland Transport, Panuku Development Auckland, and with Auckland Council community facilities, region-wide planning, social policy and bylaws, visitor experience and heritage.

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

**Role of local boards in film permitting**

27. Landowner approval is required to film on any public open space in the Auckland region. Local boards are responsible for landowner approvals for local parks and reserves. Engagement with local boards that experience a high volume of applications for film permits was undertaken in September and October 2018 to inform the review of the Auckland Film Protocol. A summary of the key engagement themes is included in Attachment C and was reported to the Environment and Community Committee in July 2019.

28. A key theme from local board engagement was that the film permit timeframes mean that landowner approval timeframes are very tight, particularly when considering complex or contentious applications. It was also noted that the current timeframes do not allow sufficient time to consider applications at full board meetings or to consult key stakeholders. Given this, the following options on film permit timeframes were presented to the Environment and Community Committee at a workshop in May 2019 and at the June 2019 meeting.

- **Option one:** Status Quo
- **Option two:** amend the permit timeframes
  - **Option 2(a)** the permit time frame is amended to be “up to five working days”.
  - **Option 2(b)** the permit time frame is increased to 5-7 working days.

29. Following direction from the Environment and Community Committee, that increasing timeframes could act as a disincentive making Auckland internationally uncompetitive, the status quo option was retained in the draft Auckland Film Protocol.
30. Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED) has an ongoing relationship with several mana whenua and mataawaka groups, across its whole portfolio of activity. To inform the review of the Protocol the 19 iwi authorities were invited, in writing, to inform the review. In relation to film permit applications Māori views and input may be obtained in several ways where there is a potential impact on particular land or sites. This is usually coordinated either by the film facilitator, or through the relevant parks manager.

31. Specific processes are in place for the tūpuna maunga, with all commercial filming on the maunga requiring the approval of the Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority (Tūpuna Maunga Authority). Screen Auckland facilitates all requests for approval to film on the tūpuna maunga. Approval to film will be subject to conditions and restrictions set by the Tūpuna Maunga Authority. Meetings were held with staff of the Tūpuna Maunga Authority to inform the review and ensure that proposed amendments are consistent with the policy of the Tūpuna Maunga Authority.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

32. The proposed amendments to the Protocol do not impact on existing levels of service and will not impact on operational budgets.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

33. There are no significant risks arising from the local board giving feedback on the proposed changes to the revised draft Auckland Film Protocol at this time.

34. If adoption of the revised Auckland Film Protocol is delayed this would impact on council’s ability to implement the proposed changes.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

35. Public feedback and proposed amendments to the Auckland Film Protocol will be presented to the Environment and Community Committee for approval.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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### Attachment A: Key submission themes and recommended amendments to the draft Auckland Film Protocol based on consultation feedback

Staff are working through the detailed submissions received to determine and recommend changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol. Table 1 shows key submission themes where change to the Auckland Film Protocol was suggested. For each key submission point a proposed staff response and recommended amendments to the Auckland Film Protocol are shown. Table 2 shows minor changes suggested to the Auckland Film Protocol by submitters where staff recommend that these changes be made for clarity. Table 3 shows a summary of themes where submissions indicated a broad level of support for the inclusion of these topics in the Auckland Film Protocol.

All recommended amendments to the Auckland Film protocol are shown in track changes in Attachment B.

#### Table 1: Key submission themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of key submission points</th>
<th>Proposed staff response</th>
<th>Recommended amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of drones</td>
<td>Drones can be harmful to native birds, disrupting nesting and feeding. The potential negative effects, particularly on endangered native species needs to be prevented. Need to consider restricting or prohibiting filming in some locations at some times of the year.</td>
<td>The use of drones is regulated by the Civil Aviation Authority. Auckland Council as a landowner has put in place a Code of Conduct to regulate the use of drones in public open space. The draft Auckland Film Protocol included a new section on the use of drones for commercial filming and requires film makers to apply for a permit to film and to comply with the Auckland Council Code of Conduct and bylaws. As the use of drones for both commercial and recreational purposes has increased concerns about drone may be the result of both recreational and commercial use and the Protocol only manages use for the purpose of commercial filming. The Auckland Council Code of Conduct does restrict the use of drones around birds, to some extent; however, this was not restated in the draft Protocol. It is recommended that a summary of key provisions from the Code of Conduct is included in Section 4.3.11 of the draft Protocol. It is also recommended that Section 3.4.11 be amended to note that filming in some locations may be restricted or subject to additional conditions to avoid harm to native birds and to include additional guidance on drone use where native birds are present at a film location and reference to the protection of native species under the Wildlife Act 1953.</td>
<td>Amend Sections 2.3, 4.3.11 and Key New Zealand Legislation section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drones can spook livestock and horses; in some areas where horse riding is a common</td>
<td>The Auckland Council Code of does restrict drone use in proximity to livestock; however, this was not restated in the draft Protocol.</td>
<td>Amend section 4.3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Summary of key submission points</td>
<td>Proposed staff response</td>
<td>Recommended amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activity this can result in safety risks for the horse and rider. The impact of drones on livestock and horse riders needs to be managed.</td>
<td>It is recommended that a summary of key provisions from the Code of Conduct is included in Section 4.3.11 of the draft Protocol.</td>
<td>Amend Section 4.3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drones can cause concerns for other users and neighbours of public open space. Need to ensure that drone use does not impinge on the privacy of other users and neighbours and that it does not overly impact on other users' enjoyment of public places.</td>
<td>The Auckland Council Code of does restrict drone use in proximity to other users of parks and over adjoining private properties, however, this was not restated in the draft Protocol. It is recommended that a summary of key provisions from the Code of Conduct is included in Section 4.3.11 of the draft Protocol.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Screen sector submitters generally supported the need to permit and regulate the use of drones for commercial filming in public open space. Some submitters noted that other commercial uses of drones should also be regulated as it can result in negative public perceptions of drone use.</td>
<td>When a drone is being used for commercial filming purposes over public open space Auckland Council requires drone users to apply for a permit to film. This requirement is stated in the draft Auckland Film Protocol. Regulating the use of drones for other commercial purposes is out of the scope of the Auckland Film Protocol.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on the natural environment</td>
<td>Overall most submitters agreed that it was important to ensure that the impact of filming on Auckland’s natural environment is managed and most public submitters felt that the Protocol does enough to manage the impact that filming on the environment. However, some submitters felt that the Protocol should contain stronger messaging around the importance of respecting and protecting the natural environment.</td>
<td>The Auckland Film Protocol includes a number of sections which refer to managing the impact of filming on natural environments. To address submitter concerns it is recommended that section 3.9 be amended to include: • stronger messaging about the importance of respecting and protecting Auckland’s natural environment • clarify that film permits may be subject to conditions to manage effects of a film proposal and filming in some locations may be restricted or prohibited where the effects of a film proposal cannot be appropriately managed</td>
<td>Amend Section 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a need to consider the environment impact of filming when assessing permit applications, including the potential impact of special effects on the natural environment.</td>
<td>Assessing the potential impact of filming on a particular natural environment or location requires the consideration of a range of factors, including but not limited to consideration of the nature of the film proposal and scope and scale of filming activity. While one film proposal may be able to appropriately manage the potential impacts on a particular location, another may not be able</td>
<td>Add a new section to Table One and amend section 4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Summary of key submission points</td>
<td>Proposed staff response</td>
<td>Recommended amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauri dieback</td>
<td>Most submitters agreed that it was very important to protect kauri and supported the inclusion of requirements in the draft Protocol. However, it was suggested that the Protocol needs to ensure that these requirements apply to all public open space.</td>
<td>To support Auckland Council efforts to protect kauri across the Auckland region it is recommended that section 4.3.4 be amended to ensure that conditions may be placed on film permits in any public open space where kauri are present.</td>
<td>Amend Section 4.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on native species</td>
<td>Most submitters supported the addition of section 3.12 and noted that it is very important to protect native species. However, it was noted that the section largely focuses on biosecurity and suggested that the Protocol should contain more emphasis on protecting native flora and fauna, in particular native birds from the potential impact of filming.</td>
<td>The impact of filming on native flora and fauna is considered in a number of sections of the Auckland Film Protocol. To address submitter concerns it is recommended that section 3.12 be amended to note that the impact of filming on native flora and fauna will be assessed and filming may be subject to conditions and / or restrictions to protect native flora and fauna. Noise and lighting can have a negative impact on native birds. It is recommended that section 3.1.5 be amended to note that in some</td>
<td>Amend Sections 3.1.5 and 3.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to manage the potential impact of vehicles on beaches and in coastal areas. Filming should avoid the use of vehicles if possible or use only the minimum number necessary.

Auckland Council regulates vehicles on beaches in the Auckland Council Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw and Council must also give effect to Policy 20(1) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. This is reflected in section 4.3.6 of the Auckland Film Protocol. To reinforce existing provisions on the use of vehicles on beaches it is recommended that section 4.3.6 is amended to state that vehicle use should where ever possible be avoided of kept to the minimum necessary.

Amend Section 4.3.6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of key submission points</th>
<th>Proposed staff response</th>
<th>Recommended amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on access to public open space</td>
<td>Overall most submitters felt that the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to manage the impact that filming on public open space. Some submitters noted that while some areas of an open space might be in use for filming there was generally still plenty of space for other users. However, some submitters felt that filming had resulted in significant inconvenience due to restricted access to public spaces such as footpaths, local roads, parks, reserves and beaches.</td>
<td>Under the terms and conditions of a film permit film makers are provided with limited permission to occupy public open space. This means that the public are still able to access public open space, although access to some areas may be restricted for a period of time to avoid interruptions to filming and ensure public health and safety. This condition is not explicitly restated in the Auckland Film Protocol. The draft Protocol requires film makers to ensure (Section 3.1.3), unless expressly permitted, continued public pedestrian access. In addition, film permit terms and conditions require that film makers ensure access for residents, businesses and emergency vehicles are available at all times, that the public is not unduly inconvenienced and that public and private access ways are clear at all times. All part or full road closures, for the purpose of filming, are undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 1974 and are publicly notified. For avoidance of doubt, it is recommended that sections 2.1 and 3.1 are amended to state that a film permit gives production companies limited permission to occupy and use public open space.</td>
<td>Amend sections 2.1 and 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>Notification of local residents. Some submitters noted that they or other residents have been inconvenienced due to filming in their local area. Noting that filming may for example, restrict access to parking, footpaths,</td>
<td>Section 3.1.8 sets out minimum requirements for the notification of residents and businesses in the area impacted by filming, including in relation to road closures. Road closures (including closures of footpaths) for the filming are undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 1974 and must be notified in printed news media.</td>
<td>Amend section 3.1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Summary of key submission points</td>
<td>Proposed staff response</td>
<td>Recommended amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and some parts of a local park or to local roads. In contrast some submitters noted that they experienced filming in their local area and felt that they were well informed.</td>
<td>In addition to this Auckland Transport publishes information about road closures on its website. It is recommended that section 3.1.8 is amended to reference requirements for public notification by print media and that further information about road closures is available on Auckland Transports website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wider notification of filming should occur to enable: • Avoidance of areas where filming is taking place. Some submitters noted that residents travel some distance to access public open space for recreational purposes and can be inconvenienced if filming is occurring. • Interested residents of Auckland to watch filming on location. Some submitters noted that they would like to know where filming is occurring so that they have to opportunity to see filming on location.</td>
<td>Notification requirements in the Protocol focus on informing residents and business in the area impacted by filming. Wider notification of filming could reduce the risk of inconvenience to residents who may intend to use public open space but effective notification would be complicated by a range of operational factors including: • the date and / or timing of location filming is subject to change at short notice, as a result of weather and other considerations, and if notifications were not up-to-date it may not effectively inform potential users; • it would be difficult to put in place a single notification platform or media that would reach all potential users of public open space. Putting in place mechanisms for wider notification does not require an amendment to the Auckland Film Protocol and it is recommended that Screen Auckland consider potential operational approaches to achieving wider notification.</td>
<td>No change Screen Auckland to consider operational approaches to achieving wider notification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance and enforcement</td>
<td>Many submitters noted that while for the most part film makers act responsibly some do not and there needs to be: • a stronger emphasis on compliance in the Protocol; • a stronger focus on enforcement when production companies do not comply with their film permit, rules, regulations or policy of Auckland Council. There should be consequences and / or disincentives for those who do not comply.</td>
<td>The Auckland Film Protocol states in a number of places that film makers are required to comply with Auckland Council policies, plans, bylaws and the terms and conditions of their film permit and that non-compliance may result in enforcement. Enforcement is limited to the powers available to Auckland Council under legislation such as the Local Government Act and the Resource Management Act to enforce breaches of bylaws and policies and plans like the Auckland Unitary Plan. To address submitters concerns it is recommended that sections 3.2 and 3.3 be amended to increase emphasis on compliance.</td>
<td>Amend Sections 3.2 and 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Summary of key submission points</td>
<td>Proposed staff response</td>
<td>Recommended amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety</td>
<td>Most submitters generally agreed that health and safety, for screen sector workers and members of the public, is important and supported the addition of section 4.6. However, some screen sector submitters noted that it is challenging to meet the timeframes specified for submitting a site specific health and safety plan.</td>
<td>Health and Safety in New Zealand workplaces is regulated by the Health and Safety at work Act 2015. Section 4.6 was added to draft Auckland Film Protocol to recognise Auckland Councils obligations under the Act when filming is occurring in public open space. It is recommended that section 4.6.1 be amended to enable production companies to arrange an alternative timeframe for the submission of a site specific health and safety plan under some circumstances. It is also recommended that this section be amended to require production companies to provide general crew safety notes which typically specify general health and safety provisions in place for all crew regardless of location.</td>
<td>Amend section 4.6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Impact on business   | Overall most submitters felt that the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to manage the impact on businesses who are in areas where filming is taking place. However, some screen sector submitters noted:  
  - the permitting process can seem overly bureaucratic and conditions and restrictions placed on filming in some locations can have a negative impact on businesses working with the screen sector  
  - the addition of new requirements and conditions was resulting in increased red tape. | The Protocol is intended to create a framework that enables decisions to be made on a case-by-case basis. This will mean that sometimes conditions or restrictions are required to balance potential impacts of filming in a particular location. | No change              |
| Equity               | The use of public open space needs to consider the cost of providing public open space to ratepayers and ensure that the rates for commercial use of open space are fair and equitable. | Fees for commercial use of public open space including commercial and organised filming are set under the Auckland Council Trading and Events in Public Places 2015 bylaw and are amended through the long term plan and annual plan process. | No change              |
Table 2: Minor changes to the Protocol in response to submitter feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Submitter suggestion</th>
<th>Proposed staff response</th>
<th>Recommended amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges Heritage Areas Act</td>
<td>The draft Protocol made a small number of references to the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Areas Act. It was suggested that the Act needs to be referenced in a number of other parts of the document and that more information about the objectives of the Act should be included.</td>
<td>The Waitākere Ranges Heritage Areas Act recognises the national, regional and local significance of the Waitākere Ranges area. It is recommended that sections 2.1 and 4.2 are amended to refer to the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Areas Act and that the Key Legislation section is amended to include reference to the objectives of the Act.</td>
<td>Amend sections 2.1, 4.2 and Key New Zealand Legislation section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Auckland Reserved Parking document</td>
<td>Section 4.2.1 refers to the Screen Auckland Reserved Parking (SARP) document. It was suggested that this should be defined in the document.</td>
<td>The Auckland Film Protocol refers to the Screen Auckland Reserved Parking Document which outlines operational requirements when reserving parking areas for film activities. It is recommended that a definition be added to the glossary to state this.</td>
<td>Amend glossary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recces</td>
<td>Recces are undertaken to assess the suitability of locations for filming. It was suggested that the Protocol could be clearer that any filming activity undertaken during a recces must be low impact in nature.</td>
<td>Recces are undertaken by screen production companies before a film permit has been granted to assess the suitability of a location for filming. It is recommended that section 2.3 is amended to include a new frequently asked question which clarifies that any recces undertaken must be low impact and production companies must comply with the requirements of the Auckland Film Protocol during recces.</td>
<td>Amend Section 2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Summary of key support for topics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Submitter views</th>
<th>Recommended response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on cultural heritage</td>
<td>Overall most submitters felt that the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to</td>
<td>No change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manage the impact that filming has on cultural heritage. Most submitters noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that it was important to ensure cultural heritage sites are treated with respect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filming on the water</td>
<td>Most submitters supported the addition of section 4.3.7, noting that health</td>
<td>No change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and safety considerations on the water are important. Note all those who</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commented on this matter were individuals or organisations working in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>screen sector.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste and sustainability</td>
<td>Most submitters, including those submitters who work in the screen sector,</td>
<td>No change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agreed that it was important to minimise and manage waste to landfill and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agreed that it was important for the screen sector to play their part.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many of the screen sector submitters noted that they feel practice in this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>area is improving and agreed that it should continue to be a focus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Commitments</td>
<td>Most submitters were supportive of the streamlined Core Commitments section,</td>
<td>No change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>although some submitters noted that it was important to ensure that the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>process of film permitting is also streamlined.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment C: Summary of key themes from pre-consultation engagement

High-level summary of feedback provided in local board workshops.

**Economic benefits**
- Filming has economic benefits for Auckland but the potentially negative impacts of filming must be managed and mitigated.
- It is important to get the criteria for determining when and where filming should or should not take place right.

**Landowner approval timeframes**
- Landowner approval timeframes are very tight, particularly when considering complex or contentious applications.
- The current timeframes do not allow sufficient time to consider applications at full board meetings or to consult key stakeholders.

**Impact on public access**
- Need to give greater consideration of the extent to which filming will reduce service levels or restrict access to public open space and community facilities.
- Usage varies at different times of year, for example many places are busier during school and public holidays, and this needs to be taken into account when assessing applications. Should consider restricting filming in public open spaces and community facilities during periods of high demand.

**Environmental impacts**
- Need to ensure that the potentially negative effects of filming on the environment are managed and mitigated.
- Filming can have a cumulative impact on the environment, particularly in areas of high demand. This needs to be taken into account when assessing applications.

**Drones**
- The increasing use of drones for filming is resulting in a number of issues which need to be managed. Drones can be harmful to birds, for example by disrupting nesting or interrupting feeding. Negative impacts on birds, particularly endangered native species need to be prevented.
- Drones can also cause concerns for other users and neighbours of public open spaces. Filmmakers need to ensure that their use of drones does not impinge on the privacy of other users or neighbours and that they do not unduly impact on other users’ enjoyment of public places.

**Content**
- There should be greater scrutiny of applications where content may be offensive or injurious to the public good. Applications where content does not comply with New Zealand law or is inconsistent with Auckland Council’s legal and policy obligations should not be approved.

**Notification**
- Neighbours, local businesses and affected parties don’t always get sufficient notice of filming and are not always provided enough information about the proposed filming; this impacts on their ability to give feedback.
Other legislative or regulatory matters which should be covered in the protocol

- The Waitakere Ranges Heritage Areas Act 2008 needs to be taken into consideration when assessing applications to film within the area of the Act. This needs to be reflected in the Protocol.
- Reserve Management Plans are site specific plans which set out what types of activities may, or may not, be undertaken in a public open space classified as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. Reserve management plans need to be taken into account when assessing an application to film in a reserve; this needs to be reflected in the Film Protocol.
- The Film Protocol must communicate that all filming must comply with New Zealand law. For example, the film sector have a legal obligation, as employers, to provide a smokefree workplace.

High-level summary of feedback from the screen sector

- Auckland is a great place to film because of the variety of great locations within easy reach.
- 69% of survey respondents felt that the Protocol was reasonably easy or very easy to understand.
- 67% of survey respondents felt that the Protocol provides reasonably clear or very clear guidance on expectations of film makers behavior.
- Main challenges to filming in Auckland include:
  - Length of time required to get a permit
  - Uncertainty around whether a permit will be granted
  - Process can be complex, especially when consultation with multiple stakeholders is required

High-level summary of People’s Panel survey

- When asked about professional filming in Auckland:
  - 84% agree or strongly agree that “filming creates job opportunities”
  - 80% agree or strongly agree that “filming is good for tourism”
  - 69% agree or strongly agree that “filming is great for my community”
  - 57% agree or strongly agree that “filming is vital for our economy”
  - 23% agree or strongly agree that “filming has an effect on the environment”
  - 12% agree or strongly agree that “filming is an nuisance or an inconvenience”

- When asked if they would like to see more or less professional filming in Auckland:
  - 70% of survey respondents would like to see more professional filming in Auckland.
  - 18% would like to see the same amount of professional filming.
  - 2% would like to see less professional filming.

- 62% of survey respondents had encountered professional filming in Auckland.
- Those who had encountered filming were asked what impact it had had on them:
  - 44% said that filming had no impact on them
  - 39% said that filming had a slightly positive or very positive impact on them
  - 16% said that filming had a slightly negative or very negative impact on them.
Those who were negatively impact by filming were asked how they were negatively impacted.

![Bar chart showing various impacts of filming and the percentage of people who experienced each]

Further information on the Peoples Panel survey can be found at: [https://aucklandcouncil.uq.co.nz/surveys/reports/xpQ8lxrOkGiDQjWILUzGzg](https://aucklandcouncil.uq.co.nz/surveys/reports/xpQ8lxrOkGiDQjWILUzGzg)
Delegation of local board feedback on Te Koiroa o te Koiroa - Our shared vision for living with nature

File No.: CP2019/15278

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To delegate responsibility to a member of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board to provide input into Auckland Council's submission on Te Koiroa o te Koiroa – Our shared vision for living with nature.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. On 5 August 2019, the Minister for Conservation released Te Koiroa o te Koiroa – Our shared vision for living with nature, a discussion document for proposals for a biodiversity strategy for New Zealand.

3. The new strategy is scheduled to be in place for 2020, replacing the current strategy Our chance to turn the tide from 2000. The strategy is non-statutory and will be approved by Cabinet in late 2019.

4. The discussion document proposes the following new matapopore/vision for 2070: Nature in Aotearoa is healthy, abundant, and thriving. Current and future generations connect with nature, restore it, and are restored by it.

5. The discussion document sets out a strategic framework providing the pathway to the vision. The foundation of the framework is mātāpono/values from Te Ao Māori, with a set of principles and a series of long-term outcomes, supported by Mātauranga Māori and science.

6. Te Koiroa o te Koiroa suggests five system shifts as the most important changes required in the next five years, including getting the system right and empowering communities to act.

7. The strategy will cover all ecological domains including freshwater, land and the marine environment extending to the outer edges of the Exclusive Economic Zone.

8. It is noted that Auckland Council’s jurisdiction only extends out to the 12-nautical mile limit. The strategy also makes it clear that indigenous species are prioritised over non-indigenous species.

9. A submission from Auckland Council is considered appropriate as the new strategy will be the umbrella for biodiversity management in New Zealand proposing long-term directions out to 2070. Auckland Council has biodiversity and biosecurity functions playing a key role in achieving the vision. The previous opportunity to comment on a national biodiversity strategy was 20 years ago.

10. All twenty-one local boards identify an environmental protection and conservation outcome in their local board plans, including a protected and enhanced environment within their area of responsibility. These also identify working with communities on restoration projects.

11. Some areas of the discussion document that may be of interest to local boards include:
   - New vision and strategic framework (pages 28-33)
   - Implementation (pages 34-35)
   - Five system shifts to support change, particularly Shift 3: Communities are empowered to act (pages 36-59)
   - Summary of discussion questions (pages 62-63).
12. A draft submission on Te Koiroa o Te Koiroa – Our shared vision for living with nature will be circulated to local boards 27 August 2019. The final deadline for local board feedback to be considered in the council submission is 9 September 2019.

13. A draft submission is proposed to be considered by the Environment and Community Committee on 10 September 2019 and finalised before the Department of Conservation deadline on 22 September 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) delegate authority to Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board member(s) to input into Auckland Council’s submission on the Te Koiroa o Te Koiroa – Our shared vision for living with nature.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Mal Ahmu - Local Board Advisor - Mngke-Tmk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Informal local board workshop views on the draft findings of the Animal Management Bylaw 2015 review

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To provide a summary to local boards of informal views presented at recent workshops on the draft findings of the Animal Management Bylaw 2015 review, and to provide an opportunity for any formal resolutions from local boards.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. Auckland Council is reviewing the Animal Management Bylaw 2015 as part of its required five-year statutory review.
3. Staff circulated a draft findings report on the bylaw review to all local boards in May 2019.
4. Eighteen local boards requested individual workshops to ask staff questions and provide informal views on the draft findings. Staff conducted these workshops in June and July 2019.
5. The workshop discussions about the draft findings report included:
   - animal nuisances occurring regionally and locally
   - issues with some definitions in the bylaw
   - requirements to provide identification for owned animals
   - Auckland Council’s processes for managing animals
   - current and suggested controls on specific animals, e.g. stock, bees, horses, and cats.
6. This report summarises the informal views provided at these workshops. These informal views will guide staff in developing and assessing options for managing animals in Auckland.
7. This report also gives local boards an opportunity to formalise any views before staff present findings and options to the Regulatory Committee in early 2020. Staff will seek direction from the committee at that time if the bylaw needs to be confirmed, amended, or revoked.
8. Local boards will have another opportunity to provide formal views when staff develop a statement of proposal following the Regulatory Committee’s recommendations.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) receives this report on informal workshop summary views from local boards on the draft findings of the Animal Management Bylaw 2015 review;
b) provides any formal views on the draft findings of the Animal Management Bylaw 2015 review.
Horopaki

Context


10. The purpose of the bylaw is to provide for the ownership of animals in a way that:
   - protects the public from nuisance
   - maintains and promotes public health and safety
   - minimises the potential for offensive behaviour in public places
   - manages animals in public places.

11. To help achieve its purpose the bylaw enables rules to be made on specific animals in separate controls (Figure 1). The bylaw contains controls for:
   - beekeeping in urban areas
   - keeping stock in urban areas
   - horse riding in a public place.

   Figure 1 – Animal Management Bylaw 2015 framework

The bylaw does not address dogs


13. The bylaw regulates owners of any animal of the animal kingdom except humans and dogs.

The bylaw does not regulate animal welfare

14. The Local Government Act 2002 and Health Act 1956, under which the bylaw was created, provide powers to protect people from nuisance and harm, not animals.

15. Issues with predators eating protected wildlife or animals trampling natural fauna are addressed through other legislation such as the Animal Welfare Act 1999, Wildlife Act 1953 and Biosecurity Act 1993.
The bylaw must be reviewed to ensure it is still necessary and appropriate

16. Auckland Council must complete a statutory review of the bylaw by 30 April 2020 to prevent it from expiring.

17. Following the statutory review, the council can propose the bylaw be confirmed, amended, revoked or replaced using a public consultative procedure.

18. In May 2019 staff completed a draft findings report for the bylaw review. The draft report identified current issues with animal nuisance and potential areas of improvement for the bylaw.

Staff held local board workshops to obtain informal views on the draft findings report

19. Staff provided a copy of the draft findings report to all local boards in May 2019. Eighteen local boards requested workshops which were conducted in June and July 2019.

20. At these workshops local boards provided informal views and asked questions on the draft findings report. These informal views will aid staff in producing a range of options to respond to identified animal nuisance and management issues.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

21. The following sections summarise the informal local board views from the workshops collectively. The sections provide informal views on:

- ongoing animal nuisance issues
- the bylaw's definition of ‘owner’
- the bylaw’s definition of ‘nuisance’
- exclusion rules for companion animals
- identifying owned animals
- the council’s processes for managing animals
- views on existing and new controls for specific animals.

22. The PowerPoint presented at the local board workshops is provided in Attachment A. The subsections below reference the relevant slide pages.

23. Questions from local boards at the workshops are provided in Attachment B. These questions will be further explored during the options analysis.

There are ongoing issues with animal nuisance (Slides 9-10)

24. At the workshops staff presented known animal nuisances occurring regionally and locally. Previous engagement captured many types of nuisance, but local boards added and emphasised the nuisances listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bees</th>
<th>Bees leaving excrement on cars is a minor nuisance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some people, especially those with bee allergies, are fearful of bees coming onto their property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birds</th>
<th>Types of nuisance caused by birds is very subjective.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People are abandoning geese and ducks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breeding parrots is a nuisance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkeys and peacocks are causing a nuisance in rural areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Item 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cats</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Feeding wild pigeons and seagulls is causing a nuisance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are large numbers of stray cats across the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cats breed in construction and development spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cats cause a nuisance by defecating in vegetable gardens.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Abandoned kittens become feral and cause nuisance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cats are eating native wildlife.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In urban areas temporarily keeping pigs for fattening causes nuisance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rabbit infestations on council land cause nuisance to neighbouring properties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roosters are a nuisance and can be vicious, harmful animals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In rural areas people are abandoning roosters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural areas have a higher tolerance for roosters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In rural areas there are issues with fences deteriorating and stock escaping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loose chickens and wandering stock are a nuisance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People complain about vermin and water rats in waterways, low tide or the deep bush.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open composting could create issues with vermin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complaints about rats are increasing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bylaw’s definition of ‘owner’ needs to be reviewed (Slide 15)

25. The bylaw focuses on the responsibilities of owners of animals. It is unclear if someone who is providing for the needs of an animal, such as food or shelter, becomes responsible for that animal as their ‘owner’.

26. Most local boards view that the bylaw’s definition of ‘owner’ should be clearer.

Table 3 - Local Board informal views on the definition of ‘owner’

- Any animal, whether owned or unowned, should be addressed in the bylaw.
- The current definition is useful as it captures a broad scope of animal owners.
- The definition should elaborate on criteria for the phrase ‘under that person’s care’.
- Owner definition should include accountability for feeding wild animals but should:
  - not punish volunteers who care for the animals’ wellbeing
  - allow animal control officers to feed animals to trap them.

27. In response to questions from local boards at the workshops, staff note the following.

- The Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 manages cats that are not microchipped or identified by a collar and that are on significant ecological areas.
- The Wildlife Act 1953 provides that a wild animal is the property of the Crown until it has been lawfully taken or killed. At that point it becomes the property of the killer or trapper. This act specifically excludes some animals, such as cats, pigeons and rats, from being vested in the Crown.
- In areas of high conservation value or where there is serious threat, the council will undertake control of certain pest animals. In general, landowners and occupiers are primarily responsible for managing pests.
The bylaw’s definition of ‘nuisance’ needs to be reviewed *(Slide 15)*

28. The bylaw uses the Health Act 1956 definition of ‘nuisance’. This includes a person, animal thing, or circumstance causing unreasonable interference with the peace, comfort, or convenience of another person.

29. Local boards provided a mix of informal views on the definition of ‘nuisance’. Some local boards commented that the definition should have more specific criteria, while others said the bylaw should retain the current broad definition.

**Table 4 - Local board informal views on the definition of ‘nuisance’**

- The definition of nuisance in the Health Act 1956 is outdated.
- Having specific and measurable criteria for nuisance is good.
- The nuisance definition is difficult to enforce without some specific criteria.
- Intensification and tenancy laws allowing for pets will increase nuisance incidents, so the definition needs more specific criteria.
- Reporting animal nuisance can cause tension between neighbours. Specific criteria would be useful, so neighbours are not left to interpret nuisance on their own.
- A broader definition of nuisance fits with common law and covers more occurrences.
- There cannot be one definition of nuisance since there is no one definition of Aucklanders.
- The definition of nuisance in the bylaw should have both general and specific parts.

Incorporating companion animals into the bylaw needs to be reviewed *(Slide 15)*

30. Currently, the bylaw does not mention companion animals (pets). The bylaw manages animals equally unless they are stock, poultry or bees.

31. Some Aucklanders find it confusing that the bylaw does not specifically address companion animals. There is misunderstanding that stock animals which are kept as pets instead of food, such as pigs and goats, are not subject to the bylaw’s stock controls.

32. Local boards had mixed views about creating a definition for companion animals. Some viewed the rules should apply based on how the animal is kept. Other local boards said the rules should apply regardless if the animal is a pet.

**Table 5 - Local board informal views on adding companion animals in the bylaw’s definitions**

- Companion animals should have separate rules
  - Some animals should be defined as companion animals in the bylaw.
  - The bylaw should make exceptions if any animal is defined as stock but is a pet.
  - Companion animals should be excluded from the bylaw rules.
    - Goats are popular pets and can be good companions.
    - Farm animals as pets can provide the same benefits as traditional pets.
- Companion animals should not have separate rules
  - Companion animals which are stock animals should still require same licensing process as
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other stock animals.

- Companion animals should not have their own rules as some neighbours are not familiar or okay with stock animals being kept as pets.

- Having a specific definition increases complexity and introduces subjectivity. It should not matter what a person says about their animal.

- People should not be allowed to have livestock as pets in urban areas.

- An animal is an animal no matter how it is kept. Since the nuisance effects on neighbours are the same, there should be no distinctions.

33. In response to questions from local boards at the workshops staff note that you cannot buy or take ownership of a pest animal. If you already own a pest animal, you can keep it, but you cannot abandon it, give it to a new owner, or allow the pest animal to breed. The Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 classifies unowned cats as pests.

Requirements for identifying owned animals needs to be reviewed (Slide 17)

34. The bylaw does not require owners to provide their animal with identification.

35. The draft findings report revealed that requiring animal identification would facilitate addressing animal nuisance issues. Most local boards viewed animal identification as helpful but impractical.

Table 6 - Local board informal views on identifying owned animals

- If your animal is going to leave your property, it should be identified.

- Council should offer a form of assistance to identify your animal.

- Every farm animal should be tagged and named.

- Identifying animals would prevent people from feeding unowned animals.

- Identifying animals is useful but impractical.

- The council should collaborate with the National Animal Identification and Tracing database.

36. In response to questions from local boards at the workshops, staff note that provided there is a valid purpose, the council has power to regulate animal registration. Any requirement would need to match the size and scale of the issue and would need to show it would effectively reduce harm and nuisance to people.

There is uncertainty about the council’s processes for managing animals (Slide 17)

37. The draft findings report identified that some Aucklanders are unclear about the council’s processes and protocols for managing animals, especially unowned animals. This confusion reduces people’s willingness to report nuisance, as they are unsure who is responsible. Only two per cent of surveyed respondents who experienced animal nuisance reported it to the council.

38. The draft findings report identified the bylaw could be strengthened by providing information about non-regulatory processes and protocols for managing animals, especially unowned animals. Most local boards viewed that the council’s processes could be clearer.

Table 7 - Local board informal views on council processes for managing animals

- The bylaw should be clear on what the council does and does not do regarding animal
Management.

- The council should clarify the process for reporting unowned animals causing nuisance.
- The bylaw’s animal management processes need to align with the Regional Pest Management Plan.
- The council should offer mediation services for disgruntled neighbours over animal nuisance.

39. In response to questions from local boards at the workshops, staff note the following.

- A property owner may trap and/or lawfully kill an animal on their property. It is a criminal offence to kill an owned animal or destroy the animal inhumanely.
- To prove a legal claim for damage to private property by an owned animal, the property owner would need to show the owner of the animal had failed to take reasonable care to avoid the damage.
- Culling is managed by central government laws and regulations, rather than the Animal Management Bylaw 2015.

Views on existing controls for specific animals in the bylaw (Slide 22)

40. Around 90 per cent of surveyed Aucklanders said the current bylaw controls for bees, stock and horses were about right or had no view.

41. The draft findings report showed council compliance response officers would find limits to urban beehives and more specific requirements for chicken coop locations easier to enforce than the current bylaw controls.

42. Local boards had a mix of views. Some had views on needing more controls, and some had views to keep the controls the same or less.

Table 8 - Local board informal views on the current controls in the bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Current control</th>
<th>Views on more control</th>
<th>Views on same or less control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bees</td>
<td>Any properties, urban or rural, can keep any number of bees. Beekeepers must manage the flight path and temperament of their bees. Beekeepers must ensure nuisance from their bees' excrement is minimised, and the bees have a suitable water source on the premises.</td>
<td>The council should restrict beekeeping if people have bee-sting allergies. Limit the number of beehives in an area to prevent colony competition. Increase awareness and visibility of who keeps bees in an area. Restrict beekeeping to rural areas. Restrict the number of beehives a person can have in urban areas. Restrict hive ownership by size of property. There should be minimum training or qualification to own bees. You need experience. Amateur beekeepers should be treated differently to commercial beekeepers.</td>
<td>Bees are not causing much nuisance, so there is no need for more regulation. We should be encouraging beekeeping. Should regulate rather than overregulate. Do not restrict bees to just urban areas. Bees should be unregulated. Would be concerned if licensing costs for beekeeping were introduced. Should be careful about restricting bees as they are important to the ecosystem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>Local boards are able to set specific controls for horses for local parks and beaches.</td>
<td>The same access rules for dogs on beaches should be applied to horses.</td>
<td>Horse owners should be responsible for removing manure. The bylaw should</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Horses are currently not allowed to be kept in urban areas without a licence from the council unless the premises is larger than 4,000 square metres.

- Do not prohibit horses on beaches but restrict them to off-peak times.
- Should lobby central government to include the same powers that protect native fauna and wildlife from dogs for horses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Current control</th>
<th>Views on more control</th>
<th>Views on same or less control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Horses cont. | Horses are permitted in public spaces if:  
- manure is removed  
- consideration is taken to not intimidate or cause a nuisance for other public space users  
- beach dune damage is minimised. |  |  
- Increase communication and awareness of current controls to horse owners.  
- Would rather have horses on the roads than scooters. |

Chickens, ducks, geese, pheasants and quail are the only stock animals currently permitted by the bylaw in urban areas without a licence from the council. Any other stock animal, including roosters, would require a licence from the council in urban areas unless the premises is larger than 4,000 square metres.

Stock

- Stock should not be kept in urban areas. This is also humane for the animal.  
- There should be penalties for poor stock-fencing by roads in rural areas.  
- The bylaw needs a mechanism to deal with repeat ‘wandering stock’ offenders.  
- The criteria for keeping goats and other herbivores should be defined by the amount of grassy area on the property.  
- There should be restrictions on how far a chicken coop should be from the property boundary.  
- Fewer chickens should be allowed in urban areas.  
- Roosters should not be allowed in rural lifestyle blocks in urban areas.  
- The current stock controls are adequate.  
- Support allowing pheasants in urban areas.  
- There are already legal consequences for not fencing your stock. The bylaw does not need to address.  
- If you have a large property in an urban area, goats should be allowed.  
- Make sure urban pet days are still allowed.  
- It does not matter where the chicken coop sits on the property if it is cleaned regularly.  
- There should not be a complete ban on roosters in urban areas.

Views on new controls for specific animals *(Slide 23)*

43. A quarter of surveyed Aucklanders (26 per cent) said the bylaw should introduce controls for other animals. Of those wanting controls for other animals, over half (57 per cent) wanted controls introduced for cats.

44. The draft findings report identified that council compliance officers and the SPCA support microchipping and registering of cats.

45. Local boards provided mixed views on introducing controls for new animals. The local boards agreed that any regulatory response would need to match the scale of the issue, be cost-effective, and have measurable effects on reducing nuisance.
Table 9 - Local board informal views on controls for cats and other animals

**Informal local board views on controls for cats**

**Informal views on introducing controls for cats**
- The bylaw should limit the number of cats a person can own.
  - Should make sure extremes are restricted, such as having 30+ cats.
- The bylaw should require the de-sexing of cats.
  - The council should work closely with the SPCA in this matter.
  - Make it compulsory for cat owners.
- Local boards have varying support for requiring microchipping of cats including:
  - Full compulsory microchipping across the region
  - Limited microchipping only to cats living in eco-sensitive areas.
- The bylaw should have the same registration process for cats as the council has for dogs.
- There should be a curfew for cats.
- There should be controls to dissuade people from feeding stray cats, as it reinforces the cats’ behaviour.
- Publish best practices for tourists with cats and other animals visiting Hauraki Gulf Islands.
- The council should restrict cats from wandering.
- The council should restrict certain cat breeds, like Bengals.

**Informal views on not introducing controls for cats**
- Cat registration is difficult and has failed before. Auckland Council already has difficulty registering and enforcing dogs.
- Cats naturally wander. Containing them would be cruel.
- The council should invest in substantial long-term public education regarding cats.
- If the council restricts caring for stray cats, it could create animal welfare issues.
- Controlling cats is too trivial for the council to get involved.

**Informal local board views on controls for other animals**
- Rules are needed to restrict feeding wild animals in public, especially birds.
- How many animals a person can own should be restricted by section size.
- There should be a higher management expectation on animal owners in urban areas.
- The bylaw should address the health risks that animals can cause their owners.
- There should be a complete ban on snakes and ferrets.
- Rabbits are a major pest, especially in urban areas. The bylaw should restrict breeding.
- There should be controls on keeping birds in small cages.
- Unless there is a significant problem, neighbours should sort out their own problems.

46. In response to questions from local boards at the workshops, staff note the following,
- Any costs for managing stray cats would be investigated during the options development phase to respond to nuisance issues.
- The Local Government Act 2002 would give the council power to impose a curfew on cats if it was an appropriate response to the scale of the nuisance and would clearly show how the curfew would reduce harm and nuisance to humans.
• The council currently has more legal power to respond to dog nuisance than cat nuisance. The Dog Control Act 1996 gives the council wide-varying powers to address dog issues. There is no similar legislation for cats.

• Rat pest control is addressed through the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029.

• The Regional Pest Management Plan lists some tropical animals that can be treated as pests. These include eastern water dragons, Indian ring-necked parakeets, and snake-necked turtles.

• Chickens were not classified as pests in the Regional Pest Management Plan. The purpose of the plan is to protect the Auckland region’s important biodiversity assets. There are no significant biodiversity benefits to managing feral chickens at a regional level. Feral chickens are primarily a human nuisance issue centred in the urban areas where people feed them.

Other views from local boards

Rights of property owners and protection

47. The bylaw does not explain what options property owners have to handle animal nuisance on their property themselves. It is unclear which animals property owners are allowed to trap and dispose of on their own and which animals are protected.

48. Some local boards said the bylaw should clarify property owners’ rights.

Enforcement

49. Some local boards said the council should be prepared to enforce any rules it may introduce.

50. The Local Government Act 2002 does not give the power to issue an infringement notice under a bylaw. Compliance officers have said this inhibits their ability to address nuisance issues as their next step after trying to elicit voluntary compliance is prosecution. This can be costly to the council.

51. Some local boards provided views that the Local Government Act 2002 should be amended to allow for infringement fines. Some local boards viewed that the bylaw would already be fit for purpose if it could be enforced with infringements.

Education

52. Most local boards said the council needs to increase education and awareness about the current animal management rules. Some local boards viewed that the council should focus more on informing Aucklanders of responsible animal management than increasing regulation.

53. Some local boards also advised that any changes to the bylaw, if required, would need to have a strong communication and awareness plan.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

54. The bylaw affects the operation of council units involved in animal management. These include biosecurity, animal management and compliance response officers. Staff held face-to-face meetings and a workshop with council officers. These views were provided in the draft findings report and workshops.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
55. Staff captured informal local board views through cluster workshops in March 2019. The draft findings report was shared with all local boards in May 2019, and staff attended individual local board workshops through June and July 2019.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
56. Staff sought views from mana whenua at the Infrastructure and Environmental Services Forum in April 2019. The members present at the hui sought clarity that the bylaw’s reference of ‘public places’ does not extend to papakāinga (communal Māori land).
57. Members were also concerned with threats to estuaries, beaches, and waterways from unregulated coastal horse trails. These views were provided in the draft findings report and options development will consider these views.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
58. The cost of the bylaw review and implementation will be met within existing budgets.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
59. There is a risk that the public may perceive this report as formal local board views or an attempt to regulate cats without public engagement. This risk can be mitigated by replying to any emerging media or public concerns by saying that no additions or changes will be made to the Animal Management Bylaw 2015 without full public consultation.
60. Local boards will have an opportunity to provide formal resolutions on any changes proposed to the bylaw in early 2020 before a public consultative procedure.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
61. Following any additional formalised views from local boards, staff will generate and assess options to respond to identified animal nuisances. Staff will present these findings and options in a report to the relevant committee in the new council term in early 2020.
62. Staff will seek formal local board views when developing a statement of proposal once the committee gives direction on animal management.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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What is the bylaw about?

The purpose of the bylaw is to provide for the ownership of animals in a way that:
- protects the public from nuisance
- maintains and promotes public health and safety
- minimises the potential for offensive behavior in public places
- manages animals in public places.

Contains specific controls for:
- keeping of bees in an urban area
- keeping of stock in an urban area
- horses in public places.

Bylaw was adopted in 2015 and replaced 18 legacy bylaws.
What legislation gives the bylaw its power?

Section 145: General bylaw-making power for territorial authorities
A territorial authority may make bylaws for:
• protecting the public from nuisance
• protecting, promoting, and maintaining public health and safety
• minimising the potential for offensive behaviour in public places.

Section 146: Specific bylaw-making powers of territorial authorities
Without limiting section 145, a territorial authority may make bylaws for the purposes of:
• regulating the keeping of animals, bees and poultry
• managing and protecting reserves or other land under the control of the territorial authority from, damage, misuse, or loss.

Section 64: Bylaws
Every local authority may make bylaws for:
• improving, promoting, or protecting public health, and preventing or abating nuisances
• regulating, licensing, or prohibiting the keeping of any animals in the district
• preventing the outbreak or spread of disease by the agency of flies, mosquitoes, or other insects, or of rats, mice, or other vermin.
Why is the council reviewing the bylaw?

Local Government Act 2002 – Statutory review

- Bylaw must be reviewed within five years of being made
- The council must decide whether:
  - a bylaw is the most appropriate way of addressing the perceived problem
  - the bylaw is ‘fit for purpose’
  - the current bylaw gives rise to any Bill of Rights implications
  - to retain, amend, replace, or revoke the bylaw
- Auckland Council Regulatory Committee
Most Aucklanders own animals
People’s Panel data on animal ownership

No animal ownership (pg. 9)

Overall (pg. 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animals on property</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
<th>Average amount (Range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cats</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1.6 (1-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1.4 (1-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens / roosters</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6.7 (1-150,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish (indoor and/or outdoor)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13.2 (1-200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>(1-3,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>(1-50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bees</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>(1-80 hives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cows</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>(1-740)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbits</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>(1-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Included - insects, frogs, hedgehogs, and worms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses / ponies</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>(1-33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(1-950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(1-83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea pigs</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mice / rats</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(1-200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(1-1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owns no animals</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People’s Panel data on animal ownership

Cats (pg. 8)

Chickens and roosters (pg. 10)

Cat ownership rates by local board area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board Area</th>
<th>Cat Ownership Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Ranges</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chicken and rooster ownership rates by local board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board Area</th>
<th>Chicken and Rooster Ownership Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Ranges</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere-Ōtahuhu</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Many Aucklanders are experiencing animal nuisance.
### Council complaints data 2015-2019

**Topic** | **Examples of complaints** | **Total**
--- | --- | ---
Wandering | Stock on roads and property | 117,601 (total)
| Animals getting into left out rubbish | 107,374 (involving dogs) 10,227 (without dogs)
Noise | Barking and crowing | 86,657 (involving dogs) 1,550 (without dogs)
| Wandering animals leaving poop on property | 88,187 (total)
Faeces | Owners not picking up after their animals | 2,206 (total)
| Stock on roads and property | 1,795 (involving dogs) 411 (without dogs)
Dead animals | Dead animals dumped on side of roads | 1,266 (total)
| Dead animals in ponds and storm water fields | 671 (involving dogs) 595 (without dogs)
Smell | Dead animals | 1,244 (total)
| Bad odours attracting mice and rats | 408 (involving dogs) 836 (without dogs)

### People’s Panel April 2019

**Topic** | **Examples of nuisance** | **Total**
--- | --- | ---
None | | 2,350 (35)
Unhygienic behaviour | Animal faeces left in parks, walkways or on private property, especially vegetable gardens | 1,350 (21)
Animal wandering | Animals wandering onto neighbouring property Neighbours harbouring rats in overgrown sections | 806 (13)
Sensory nuisance | Odour from animal excreta Loud animals, especially crowing | 667 (11)
Damage to property | Scratched deck furniture Yard dig up Property damage from animal faeces | 531 (12)
Other | Animals attacking native wildlife | 420 (10)
| Feeding wild animals | Aggressive looking livestock in public areas | 370 (9)
| Aggressive looking livestock in public areas | | 370 (9)
| Deceased animals in public areas | | 370 (9)
| Pets and people being attacked by aggressive animals | | 370 (9)
| Finding the practice of killing animals offensive | | 59 (1)
| Witnessing slaughter or lovers remains | | 59 (1)
Top nuisances (People’s Panel)

Overall nuisance rates (pg. 17)

Which animals have caused a nuisance in the past year? (pg. 19)

- Cats defecating in vegetable gardens, wandering onto neighbouring properties, owners not doing anything about it
- Harbouring vermin in tall grass or rubbish
- Neighbours feeding wild birds
- Smelly chicken coops, loose chickens
- Crowing roosters
How the bylaw currently addresses animal nuisance
**Bylaw structure (1/2)**

- **General nuisance clause**
  - Owners must ensure their animals do not cause a nuisance to any other person or cause a risk to public health and safety.

- **Obligations of animal owners in public places**
  - Owners must ensure their animals do not damage property belonging to another person.
  - Requires licence to keep bees or graze stock in public places.

- **Slaughter, hunting, removal or release of animals**
  - A person must ensure slaughter does not create a nuisance, including animal remains.
  - No slaughtering in public places or urban premises less than 4000 square metres (besides poultry)
  - No release or abandonment in a public place unless written approval from the council
  - No hunting or removing an animal in a public place unless written approval from the council

- **Controls (next slide)**
3 bylaw structure (2/2)

- Controls
  - Keeping of bees in urban areas
    - bee management
    - flight path management
    - provision of water
  - Keeping of stock in urban areas
    - the number of stock that may be kept
    - the conditions in which they are kept
  - Horses in public places
    - general conditions of use
    - places with additional conditions
    - places where prohibited
Uncertainty on some definitions in the bylaw
Definition challenges

- **Owner** — “any person who has an animal in their possession or custody, or under that person’s care, control or supervision.”

- **Nuisance** — bylaw uses Health Act 1956 definition, and “includes a circumstance causing unreasonable interferences with the peace, comfort or convenience of another person.”

- **Animal management** — animal management officers mostly enforce dogs. AMOs not responsible for cats, wildlife, animal pests, birds, marine mammals or urban poultry, bees or stock.
  - **Stock** — “cattle, deer...poultry and any other animal kept in captivity, or farmed, an dependent on humans for their care and sustenance.”

  - **Poultry** — “means any live bird that is kept or raised for the purpose of producing eggs, hatching eggs or poultry products and includes chickens, ducks... roosters and swans.”
Uncertainty on processes and identifying owned animals
Processes and identifying animal owners

- Only two per cent of People’s Panel respondents experiencing nuisance reported their nuisance to the council.

- The council is generally not responsible for pests on your own property.

- The bylaw is difficult to enforce without an identified owner.
Some Aucklanders and compliance staff want additional controls on animals (particularly cats).
**Current bylaw controls (1/3)**

**Horse riding in a public place**

**Beekeeping in urban areas**

**Keeping of Bees Control - Flight path management**

1. Every person keeping bees in an urban area must take all reasonable steps to ensure beehives are positioned and managed in a way that has minimal impact to any other person.

**Keeping of Bees Control - Bee management**

2. Every person keeping bees in an urban area must maintain honey bee colonies with a calm temperament and must take all reasonable steps to control swarming.

**Keeping of Bees Control - Provision of water**

3. Every person keeping bees in an urban area must ensure there is a suitable water source for the bees on the premises on which the beehives are kept.

**Keeping of Bees Control - Bee excrement management**

4. Every person keeping bees in an urban area must take all reasonable steps to minimise nuisance to any other person from bee excrement.
Current bylaw controls (2/3)

Keeping of stock in urban areas (1/2)

Table 1: Number of stock allowed to be kept in an urban area without a licence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stock</th>
<th>Premises smaller than 2000 square metres</th>
<th>Premises larger than 2000 square metres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donkeys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llamas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacocks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peahens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pones</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quail</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanatory note: obligations of animal owners still apply as contained in clauses 6, 7 and 8 of the Animal Management Bylaw.
Current bylaw controls (3/3)

Keeping of stock in urban areas (2/2)

**Keeping of Stock Control – Prevention of wandering stock**

(2) The owner of any stock in an urban area must ensure their stock is restrained within the boundaries of the premises on which they are kept.

---

**Keeping of stock control - Containment of chickens**

(3) The owner of any chicken must ensure that any chickens are confined on the premises in such a manner that the chicken cannot freely leave the premises. This can be achieved by providing either:

(a) an enclosed chicken coop with an attached run, or

(b) an enclosed chicken coop and adequate fencing of the premises.

---

**Keeping of stock control - Location of chicken coops**

(4) The owner of any chicken must not allow their chicken coop to cause a nuisance to any other person.

---

**Keeping of stock control - Chicken coop cleanliness**

(5) The owner of any chicken must regularly clean their chicken coop as appropriate to maintain the chicken coop in a dry, clean condition and state of good repair, free from any offensive smell, overflow and vermin.
Views on existing controls

- **Bees** (*pg. 53*) — restrict to rural, require urban licence, restrict number of hives in urban, excrement unenforceable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About right</th>
<th>No view/don't know</th>
<th>Less control</th>
<th>More control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Horses** (*pg. 56*) — ban from beaches, stricter manure accountability, regulation on roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About right</th>
<th>No view/don't know</th>
<th>More control</th>
<th>Less control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Stock** (*pg. 59*) — no stock in urban areas, ban roosters in urban areas and rural-urban boundary, stricter fencing rules, restrict how close coops to property boundaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About right</th>
<th>No view/don't know</th>
<th>More control</th>
<th>Less control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Views on new controls**

**People’s Panel**

**Should there be controls on other animals?**

- I don’t know: 39%
- No: 35%
- Yes: 26%

**On which animals?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cats</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbits</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrets</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other* includes sheep, snakes, guinea pigs, reptiles, mustelids, stoats, wasps and fish.

- **Cats** - registration, microchipping, de-sexing, more owner accountability, protection of native wildlife

- **Birds** – no birds in small cages, exotic birds should be monitored and licenced
Any other views?
Local board questions from the Animal Management Bylaw review workshops

Local board questions on definition of ‘owner’
- Who is responsible or the owner for cat colonies?
- What happens if someone says it is not my pet when it clearly is?
- Any case law on owner definition of ‘under that person’s care’?
- What happens if you trap an animal and keep the baby?
- If you trap a pest on your property and no one comes and picks it up do you become the “owner”?
- Do compliance officers who seize an animal then become its owner?
- Who owns animals in public spaces? The Crown? The council?
- Who is responsible for unowned animals in public spaces?
- What is council’s responsibility for unowned animals?
- If someone feeds unowned chickens every day are the chickens under their care? At what point do they become an owner?

Local board questions on definition on companion animals
- What is a “pest”?
- Can you keep pests as pets?

Local board questions on identifying owned animals
- Can a bylaw require that owners register their pets on an externally owned database such as the NZ Companion Animal Registry?

Local board questions on council processes
- What are the range of options property owners have to respond to animal nuisance?
- Is the question of culling managed under this bylaw or some other act?
- What is the process for obtaining an animal management licence?
- What is the process for keeping bees?
- How does and can Auckland Council manage pet owners living on boundaries of the Domain and large parks?
- Who enforces grazing stock in public places?
- What is the local board process for changing horse controls?

Local board questions on cats
- What is the cost for managing stray cats?
- Could the council implement a curfew on cats?
- What would a council rat control policy look like?
- What are the controls in place for tropical animals?
- Why are chickens not classified as pests in the Regional Pest Management Plan?
• Why could Omaui consider banning cats?
• What do we do about cats coming onto property and killing birds you’ve been looking after?
• What is the definition of feral cats in the Regional Pest Management Plan? Who is responsible for cat colonies?

Other questions
• Does the Crematoria bylaw cover animal crematoria? If not, does the odour (and nuisance) from them therefore come under the scope of the Animal Management bylaw?
• How do stock rules apply in semi-urban areas?
• How should the bylaw address bees that make toxic honey from contaminated tutu flower pollen?
• Will housing intensification increase animal nuisance problems?
• Should the bylaw manage the behaviour of humans, not animals?
• What are the rules for slaughter outside a regulated space?
• Will the Tenancy Act allowing pets increase the problem?
• Can the landowner take action to destroy animals that come onto their property? What methods will be allowed?
• What are the controls in place for tropical animals?
• What is the definition of wildlife?
• What animal management powers do we have under the Reserves Act?
• Muslim community on views on slaughter? Any approved process?
• Is the question of culling managed under this bylaw or some other act?
• What rights do property owners have to deal with the problem themselves?
• What happens if you abandon a fish in your private steams that runs into public water?
• What happens if your private lake floods and the aquatic pets get into public waterways?
• Could the bylaw say “no feeding of animals in a public place”?
• Can a bylaw require that owners register their pets on an externally owned database such as NZCAC?
• What are the range of options property owners have to respond to animal nuisance?
• Is the Regional Pest Management Plan adopted? Were chickens purposefully not classified as pests?
• If an animal trespasses on my property is this a nuisance?
Local board feedback on the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery

File No.: CP2019/14498

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To inform the local board of the formal feedback Chairperson Chris Makoare provided on the local board’s behalf through delegation on the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. At the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board’s 23 July 2019 Business Meeting it delegated authority to Chairperson Chris Makoare to provide local board feedback on the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery (resolution: MT/2019/99).

3. The local board’s feedback has been approved by Chairperson Chris Makoare and sent to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee to consider.

4. A copy of the local board's feedback has been attached to this report (Attachment A).

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) note the local board’s feedback on the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board's feedback on the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal Ahmu - Local Board Advisor - Mngke-Tmk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback on:
Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery
30 July 2019

To: Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee – Auckland Council

The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board delegated formal feedback to Chairperson Chris Makoare at its July 2019 Business Meeting (resolution: MT/2019/99).

Context

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

2. 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.

3. 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

4. At the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board’s 23 July 2019 Business Meeting, it delegated authority to chairperson Chris Makoare to provide local board feedback on the Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery (resolution: MT/2019/99).

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board feedback on the Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities Bill:

The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) endorse in principle the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery

b) endorse the strategic focus of the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery

c) endorse the focus on community values and priorities; the need to build capacity and capability in order to address barriers to recovery
d) recommend that the Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery details the role of local boards in an emergency

e) recommend that the Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery details what methods and tools will be used to disseminate information such as assembly points, evacuation plans and routes to the community

f) note that the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is diverse with many different languages spoken

g) recommend there be a focus on planning communication with the diverse ethnic communities, particularly for communities where English is their second language

h) recommend the need to maintain communication links with local community groups, continuing to build on their capability and capacity to engage with the community.

Attachment A

Chris Makoare
Chair
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
Local board feedback on the Productivity Commission's input into Local Government funding and financing

File No.: CP2019/14622

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To inform the local board of the formal feedback Deputy Chair Debbie Burrows provided on the local board’s behalf through delegation on the Productivity Commission’s input into Local Government funding and financing. This will be appended to the Auckland Council submission.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. At the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board’s 23 July 2019 Business Meeting it delegated authority to Deputy Chair Debbie Burrows to input into Auckland Council’s submission on the Productivity Commission’s input into Local Government funding and financing (resolution: MT/2019/100).
3. The local board’s feedback has been approved by Deputy Chair Debbie Burrows and sent to the Finance and Performance Committee to consider.
4. A copy of the local board’s feedback has been attached to this report (Attachment A) and will be appended to the Auckland Council submission.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) note the local board’s feedback on the Productivity Commission’s input into Local Government funding and financing.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board's feedback on the Productivity Commission's input into Local Government funding and financing</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

| Author          | Mal Ahmu - Local Board Advisor - Mngke-Tmk                           |
| Authorisers    | Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services                                |
|                | Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager                           |
Feedback on:
Productivity Commission inquiry into local government funding and financing
24 July 2019

The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board delegated formal feedback to Deputy Chair, Debbie Burrows at its 23 July business meeting (resolution: MT/2019/100).

Context
1. In July 2018 Central Government asked the Productivity Commission (the Commission) to conduct an inquiry into local government funding and financing.

2. The Commission’s issues paper was released on 6 November 2018. The council made a submission on the issues paper which was approved by the Finance and Performance Committee.

3. On the 4 July 2019 the Productivity Commission released its draft report relating to its local government funding and financing inquiry.

4. The inquiry’s key aim is establishing whether the existing funding and financing arrangements are suitable for enabling local authorities to meet current and future cost pressures.

5. The inquiry’s terms of reference require the Commission to examine the adequacy and efficiency of the current local government funding and financing framework and, where shortcomings in the current system are identified, examine options and approaches for improving the system.

6. The inquiry’s terms of reference do not call for an assessment of, or changes to, the current scope and responsibilities of local government.

7. At the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board’s 23 July 2019 Business Meeting, it delegated authority to Deputy Chair, Debbie Burrows to input into Auckland Council’s submission on the Productivity Commission inquiry into local government funding and financing (resolution: MT/2019/100).

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board feedback on the Productivity Commission inquiry into local government funding and financing

The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) note the Productivity Commission’s draft report on local government funding and financing

b) endorse the need for new funding tools to address the key pressures arising from:

   i) supplying enough infrastructure to support rapid urban growth
   ii) adapting to climate change
   iii) coping with the growth of tourism
   iv) the accumulation of responsibilities placed on local government by central government
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- note that Auckland Council hosts many of New Zealand’s major events, increasing economic activity and raising the tax take
- recommend that a portion of the tax take that is retrieved from major events be reinvested back to host territorial authorities as another funding tool to address the key pressures arising from growth and tourism
- endorse that while a certain amount of “user pays” is necessary, the local board considers that the “ability to pay” principle should predominate.
- endorse that where local services also benefit national interests, central government should contribute funding and recommend that this should be a minimum of 50%
- note that development contributions do not provide funding for community assets and services, such as libraries and swimming pools
- note that currently development contributions are not returned to the development area that they have been retrieved from
- recommend that development contributions be returned to the area where the development occurred, and growth is expected
- recommend that in an Auckland context, local boards have the discretion and flexibility to decide how to use development contributions that have been retrieved from development in its local board area
- endorse in principle the use of user charges or targeted rates so long that they are measurable, transparent and accountable to the outcome that is being targeted, and recommend that consideration for low socioeconomic communities be prioritised so that there must be a locally driven benefit to impose any additional costs to general rates that can cause increased financial burden on the community
- oppose a national rates postponement scheme as deferring rates payment does not eliminate the financial burden from rate payers that are struggling to afford paying rates
- endorse the use of a rates rebate scheme to address socioeconomic inequity, and recommend that current rates rebate scheme be reviewed to better support the community and outcome it was intended for
- oppose in principle, the proposed option of value capture funding tool as this does not consider disruption, inconvenience and loss of value during the development of new infrastructure. Recommend that if this is progressed further, it be consulted separately regarding all of the potential implications such as timing, enforcement and potential loss of income that could arise from the development of new infrastructure (for example the implications to local businesses and residents due to the city rail link project)
- endorse in principle the proposed new tool of Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) to support high growth councils approaching their debt limits to continue to invest in development of greenfield areas only
- endorse the creation of a new funding stream from central government to local authorities to support new development
- endorse a tax on vacant land
- endorse that the role of NZTA should be extended to critical local roads under threat from climate change
- endorse the recommendation for central government to create a climate-resilience agency and associated fund to help at-risk councils redesign, and possibly relocate and rebuild, wastewater, stormwater and flood-protection infrastructure threatened by the impacts of climate change.
- recommend that the proposed climate-resilience agency is closely associated to the proposed climate change commission that is outlined in the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill
u) oppose the recommendation that the Government should legislate to enable councils in tourist centres to implement an accommodation levy, as it is inequitable to small local businesses

v) endorse a new three-waters regulatory regime to enforce minimum standards improve the performance of the three-waters sector. Noting that the regime would be permissive and flexible about how councils meet these standards, but with a backstop arrangement applied to councils that fail by a specified time period to lift their performance sufficiently to meet minimum health and environmental standards.

Debbie Burrows
Deputy Chair
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
Urgent decision made by the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board for an extra meeting on 27 August 2019

File No.: CP2019/14298

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To inform the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board that an urgent decision was made and approved under delegation by the Chair and Deputy Chair for an extra meeting to be held on Tuesday 27 August 2019 at 1pm, in addition to the meeting at 4pm. Both meetings to be held at the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board office, 7-13 Pilkington Road, Panmure.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. At the 22 November 2016 Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board meeting the board considered the urgent decisions process and passed resolution MTLB/2016/210:
   That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:
   a) adopt the urgent decision-making process for matters that require a decision where it is not practical to call the full board together and meet the requirement of a quorum;
   b) delegate authority to the chair and deputy chair, or any person acting in these roles, to make urgent decisions on behalf of the local board;
   c) agree that the relationship manager, chair and deputy chair (or any person/s acting in these roles) will authorise the urgent decision-making process by signing off the authorisation memo;
   d) note that all urgent decisions will be reported to the next ordinary meeting of the local board. CARRIED
3. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board received a request to have an extra meeting added to the current local board business meeting schedule as the last business meeting for the term is 27 August 2019.
4. The business meeting agenda has a substantial amount of reports. In order for the board to resolve on each of these reports in a timely manner, it is recommended that an extra meeting be held at 1pm on 27 August 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:
   a) note the decision made under the urgent decision-making process on 1 August 2019, adding an extra meeting to the current local board business meeting schedule on 27 August 2019 at 1pm at the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board office, 7-13 Pilkington Road, Panmure.
### Ngā tāpirihanga

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Urgent Decision Memo</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ngā kaihaina

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tracey Freeman - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memo

To: Victoria Villaraza, Relationship Manager Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
From: Tracey Freeman, Democracy Advisor

Subject: Urgent decision request of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

1 August 2019

Purpose
The purpose of this urgent decision is to seek approval of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board for an extra meeting to be held on Tuesday, 27 August 2019 at 1pm, at the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board office.

Reason for the urgency
The last business meeting of the term is on Tuesday, 27 August 2019. As there is no meeting prior to 27 August, an urgent decision is required.

Decision sought from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles)
Approval is sought from the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board to hold an extra meeting on Tuesday, 27 August 2019 at 1pm.

Background
The last business meeting for the term is 27 August 2019 at 4pm, at the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board office. The agenda has a substantial amount of reports. In order for the board to resolve on each of these reports in a timely manner, it is recommended that an extra meeting be held at 1pm on 27 August 2019.
Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process

Signed by V. Villaraza
Relationship Manager, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

Date 2 Aug 2019

Approval to use the urgent decision-making process

Chris Makoare
Chairperson, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

Date 2nd Aug 2019

Debbie Burrows
Deputy Chairperson, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

Date 21/8/2019

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Resolution/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) approve an extra meeting be held on Tuesday, 27 August 2019 at 1pm, at the
   Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board office, 7-13 Pilkington Road, Panmure.

Chris Makoare
Chairperson, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

Date 2nd Aug 2019

Debbie Burrows
Deputy Chairperson, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

Date 21/8/2019
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To present the board with the governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The governance forward work calendar for the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board is in Attachment A.
3. The calendar aims to support local boards’ governance role by:
   • ensuring advice on meeting agendas is driven by local board priorities
   • clarifying what advice is required and when
   • clarifying the rationale for reports.
4. The calendar is updated every month. Each update is reported to business meetings. It is recognised that at times items will arise that are not programmed. Board members are welcome to discuss changes to the calendar.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:
a) note the attached Governance Forward Work Calendar.

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 August 2019</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tracey Freeman - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reports highlighted in blue text reflect a change where a new report is expected or change on the planned date has occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Business meeting report topic</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2019</td>
<td>Productivity Commission’s inquiry into local government funding and financing</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Resilient Recovery Strategy</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Management Bylaw Review</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last business meeting report (delegations for election period)</td>
<td>Local decision-making</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of Aucklands film protocols</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct/Nov 2019</td>
<td>First business meeting report</td>
<td>Local decision-making</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov/Dec 2019</td>
<td>Auckland climate action plan (previously Low Carbon Auckland)</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Record of Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Workshops

File No.: CP2019/14771

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To provide a summary of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board workshops for 30 July, 6, 13 and 20 August 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. Local board workshops are held to give board members an opportunity to receive information and updates or provide direction and have discussion on issues and projects relevant to the local board area. No binding decisions are made or voted on at workshop sessions.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) note the local board record of workshops held on 30 July, 6, 13 and 20 August 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Record of Workshops</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Authorisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Freeman - Democracy Advisor</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workshop record of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board held on 30 July 2019, commencing at 10.00am.

**PRESENT**

*Members present for all or part of the workshop day:*

- Chris Makoare (Chairperson)
- Bernie Diver
- Don Allan
- Alan Verrall
- Maria Meredith
- Norissa Henry

*Apologies:* Debbie Burrows (Deputy Chairperson)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tamaki Regeneration Company Quarterly Update</strong> – Amy Cameron, Joanna Brain, Jo Mackie, Adam Johnstone</td>
<td><em>Keeping informed</em></td>
<td>The TRC Programme Business Case was discussed with the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSR Ngahere Knowing Report</strong> – Rob Gear, Howell Davies, Josh Grigg, Sophia Riley</td>
<td><em>Setting direction / priorities / budget</em></td>
<td>The Ngahere knowing report work findings was presented to the board and feedback was obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AT Community Safety Fund</strong> – Bruce Thomas, Edorado Canal</td>
<td><em>Setting direction / priorities / budget</em></td>
<td>Proposed options for the safety fund was presented to the board for their consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AT Capital Fund</strong> – Bruce Thomas, Katie Walton</td>
<td><em>Setting direction / priorities / budget</em></td>
<td>Proposed options for the capital fund was presented to the board for their consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic Events – Onehunga Christmas Lights</strong> – Angela Radosits</td>
<td><em>Setting direction / priorities / budget</em></td>
<td>The board provided feedback on the upcoming event to enable staff to begin planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panuku</strong> – Anna Papconstantinous, Jessica Laing</td>
<td><em>Keeping informed</em></td>
<td>Auckland Council led open space plan change to rezone a portion of site from Open Space – Informal to Town Centre was discussed with the board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 2.15pm.
Workshop record of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board held on 6 August 2019, commencing at 10am.

PRESENT

Members present for all or part of the workshop day:

- Chris Makoare (Chairperson)
- Debbie Burrows (Deputy Chairperson)
- Bernie Diver
- Alan Verrall
- Nerissa Henry
- Don Allan
- Maria Meredith

Apologies: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panuku update – Gavin Peebles, Andrew Trevelyan, Anna Papaconstantinou, Anna Berthaueme</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The proposed masterplan for Weiapu Lane was presented, and the board’s position and feedback was sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities – Jubilee Bridge – Nick Palmisano, Johan Ferreira, Vincent Perry, Matt Sturges, Jacqui Fell</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Options on the jubilee bridge was discussed with the board including cost estimates and design, as well as works program for delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities – Leasing (Plunket) – Hamish Clintworth Valerie Vui</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>The board was presented with Plunket’s needs and future plans within the local board area, which will help the local board to make informed decisions on leasing applications for this group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Engagement Plan – Lita Brighouse-Fuavao</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>A draft engagement plan was presented to the board, and their position and feedback was sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSR – Te Kete Rukuruku – Anahera Huggins, Leina Cheung, Rob Gear</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Tranche 1 of the naming project was presented and discussed with the local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT Parks: Amenity Service Assessment – Rob Gear, Paul Murphy</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Existing assets were discussed, and areas identified to be assessed for improvements of existing amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Park Land Classification – Elaine Lee</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>The local board’s position and feedback was sought to help inform a decision at their next business meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 3.00pm.
Workshop record of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board held on 13 August 2019, commencing at 10.30am.

**PRESENT**

Members present for all or part of the workshop day:

- Chris Makore (Chairperson)
- Debbie Burrows (Deputy Chairperson)
- Don Allan
- Bernie Diver
- Alan Verrall
- Norissa Henry

Apologies: Maria Meredith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic Events – Karen Colmenares, Toss Langworthy</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>A list of proposed events to be delivered in FY 19/20 was discussed with the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Places – Murali Kumar, Francine Tan, Jade Lee Davis, Naomi Faautaga, Jacqueline Puna-Teauku</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board was provided with an update on project delivery and work plan overview for FY 19/20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF Fergusson Domain Refreshed Concept Plan – Nick Palmisano, David Little, Vandra Kinnari, Jacqui Fell</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Direction on the draft final concept plan was sought from the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Partnerships Broker Intro &amp; CEU Update – Ossie Manuku, Catalina Vercelli, Therese Lanigan, Potelo Esekiela</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>The new broker was introduced to the board, and the board was provided with an update on the CEU project plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art Update – Sarah Edwards</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board was provided with an update on the public art projects in the local board area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 1.45pm.
Workshop record of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board held on 20 August 2019, commencing at 10.00m.

PRESENT

Members present for all or part of the workshop day:

Chris Makoare (Chairperson)
Debbie Burrows (Deputy Chairperson)
Don Allan
Bernie Diver
Maria Meredith
Norissa Henry

Apologies: Alan Verrall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities – Nick Palmisano, Jacqui Fell, Johan Ferreira, Rick Everett</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board was provided with an update on various projects within the local board area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI Onehunga Community Needs Assessment – Sophie Bell, Andy Adams</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board’s position and feedback were sought on the project approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Community Grants – Moumita Dutta</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>All grant applications was discussed and the board was provided with information required to help inform a decision on the applications at the next business meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 1.30pm.
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board with an integrated quarterly performance report for quarter four, 1 April – 30 June 2019, and the overall performance for the financial year, against the agreed 2018/2019 local board work programme.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report provides an integrated view of performance for the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board and includes financial performance and delivery against work programmes for the 2018/2019 financial year.
3. Deferral of budgets of unfinished activities will be added into 2019/2020 work programmes by quarter one reporting.
4. 96 activities within the agreed work programmes were delivered including multi-year projects that have progressed as expected. Eight activities were undelivered, cancelled, put on hold or deferred and 20 projects/activities have not progressed as expected during 2018/2019.
5. Key highlights for quarter four include:
   - the local board allocated $49,782.06 in its final local community grants round
   - funding agreements have been finalised to deliver further Rent Smart programmes in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area
   - YMCA Auckland and Plunket at Onehunga War Memorial pool and Leisure Centre were recognised at the Recognition Aotearoa Aquatic Awards for their partnership delivering affordable lessons to the local community.
6. Key activity achievements from the 2018/2019 work programme include:
   - a total of $131,917 has been allocated by the local board to groups through local community grants to support the delivery of community-led initiatives
   - the board has reallocated $75,000 to the new activity, Waikaraka Park Reserve Management Plan. This plan will enable better park management and integration of works across the entire precinct. A further update will be provided in quarter one
   - the shared path connecting Panmure to Glen Innes along the Tāmaki Estuary foreshore has been completed and is now open for the community to use.
7. Key activities not delivered / not progressed as expected include:
   - the youth connections activity is in progress, but one project is delayed due to external staff changes. Council staff are continuing to progress the collaboration with HLC (Homes. Land. Communities.) to upskill local community groups to support local community members into construction roles.
   - the stone cottage (renew roof and joinery) activity is currently on hold due to seismic implications. Staff will recommend a way forward for this project once investigations are complete.
fewer strategic partnerships have been funded this financial year due to staff changes in
the Strategic Partnerships Broker role. The remaining unallocated budget will be carried
forward to the 2019/2020 financial year.

8. The 2018/2019 financial performance report is attached but under confidential cover. This is
due to restrictions on releasing annual financial reports and results until the Auckland
Council Group results are released to the NZX – expected to be made public 30 September
2019.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) receive the performance report for the financial quarter and year ending 30 June
   2019.

b) note the financial performance report in Attachment B of the report will remain
   confidential until after the Auckland Council Group results for 2018/2019 are released
   to the NZX which are expected to be made public by 30 September 2019.

Horopaki
Context

9. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board has an approved 2018/2019 work programme for
   the following operating departments:
   
   • Community Services (Arts, Community and Events; Libraries and Information; Parks,
     Sport and Recreation; and Service Strategy and Integration) approved on 5 June 2018
     (resolution: MT/2018/108)
   
   • Community Facilities: Build Maintain Renew and Community Leases, approved on 24
     July 2018 (resolution: MT/2018/115)
   
   • Infrastructure and Environmental Services, approved on 5 June 2018 (resolution:
     MT/2018/109)
   

10. Youth Connection activities moved from the Arts, Community and Events to The Southern
    Initiative work programme in quarter two.

11. The graph below shows how the work programme activities meet Local Board Plan
    outcomes. Activities that are not part of the approved work programme but contribute
towards the local board outcomes, such as advocacy by the local board, are not captured in
    this graph.
Local Board Work Programme Snapshot

Key highlights for quarter four

12. The key achievements to report from the quarter four period include:

- **Local events programme – Movies in Parks**: “Ferdinand” was screened on 18 April 2019 at Point England Reserve alongside activations such as face painting, bouncy castle, and a crafting area. Approximately 200 people attended.

- **Dunkirk Road Activity Centre – funding agreement**: the Dunkirk Activity Centre alongside Brain Fit hosted a Neighbour’s Day morning tea with a range of local community groups and organisations attending to discuss local development projects in Panmure and Glen Innes.

- **Riverside Community Centre – programme delivery**: booking hours and participants to programme have continued to increase, with the centre providing a range of programmes for all ages. The centre is now delivering daily activities for youth.

- **Oranga Community Centre – programme delivery**: a healthy eating programme was delivered at the centre in quarter four, interactively teaching local community members that attended culinary skills, healthy cooking tips and food hygiene, as well as providing a space for the community to share cooking knowledge, work cooperatively and eat together.

- **Panmure Community Hall – programme delivery**: in quarter four the community centre hosted six events in collaboration with various community groups including the launch of the Tāmaki Youth Council, a gaming event, a family history Matariki event, and a #REALTALK exhibition.

- **Local community grants**: the local board completed its final round of grants for the 2018/2019 financial year. A total of $49,782.06 was allocated.

- **Ruapotaka Marae support**: a services agreement with the contractor, MarketPro for the creation of a marae development toolkit was signed in June 2019 and research for this has commenced.

- **Strategic partnerships**: fewer strategic partnerships have been funded this financial year due to the departure of the Strategic Partnerships Broker in March 2019. A new
Strategic Partnerships Broker has been appointed and will start on 1 July 2019. The Glen Innes Business Association supported Bradley Lane Illuminated and the Onehunga Business Association delivered the Easter Egg Hunt Competition and the Onehunga Arts Festival.

- **Ready to Rent (now Rent Smart):** funding agreements have been finalised to deliver further Rent Smart programmes in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area. No Six are continuing to develop a youth prototype for the programme, and a regular Rent Smart hub has been established at Riverside Community Centre.

- **Investigate community facility requirements in Glen Innes and Panmure to support TRC and Panuku programmes:** the findings and recommendations of the Glen Innes and Panmure Needs Assessment were approved by the local board at its June business meeting (resolution: MT/2019/8).

- **Low carbon lifestyles:** 786 residents (209 households) have been engaged with to discuss home energy advice. Follow-up conversations have also been completed to identify energy, carbon and financial savings that have resulted from household behavior changes.

- **Experiential learning and action for water in schools:** 113 students from four local schools participated in this programme which involved a trip to either Kelly Tarlton’s or Goat Island to learn how to undertake environmental investigations in their local areas. The students then shared this knowledge with their entire schools which had an action day applying these skills to a local area.

- **Pest education and management for schools:** 117 students from four local schools participated in this programme which involved a trip to Mutukaroa Regional Park where they learnt how to undertake environmental investigations in their local areas. The students then shared this knowledge with their entire school which had an action day applying these skills to a local area.

- **Onehunga War Memorial Pool and Leisure Centre Operations:** YMCA Auckland and Plunket were recognised at the Recognition Aotearoa Aquatic Awards for their partnership delivering affordable lessons to the local community.

- **The following Community Facilities projects are now complete:**
  - Renew libraries furniture, fittings and equipment FY18+
  - Mount Wellington War Memorial Reserve – renew coastal wall
  - Panmure Basin – implement masterplan priorities
  - Mount Wellington War Memorial Reserve – open space improvements
  - Glen Innes Pool – install CCTV cameras in car park, renew roof and spa heat pump
  - T-Bar swings
  - Gerrard Beeson Place – demolish toilet block.

**Overall performance against the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board 2018/2019 work programme**

13. The graph below identifies work programme activity by RAG status (red, amber, green and grey) which measures the performance of the activity. It shows the percentage of work programme activities that have been delivered as expected (completed by the end of July 2019) or multi-year activities which have progressed as planned (green), in progress but with issues that are being managed (amber), and activities that are undelivered or have significant issues (red) and activities that have been cancelled/deferred/merged (grey).
14. The graph below shows the activity status of activities which shows the stage of the activity in each departments the work programmes. The number of activity lines differ by department as approved in the local board work programmes.

Graph 2: Work Programme by RAG status

| Graph 3: work programme activity by activity status and department |

15. The table below shows the overall performance of work programme activities (RAG status and activity status by work programme).

Table 1: End of year Local Board Work Programmes Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAG Status</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>ACE</th>
<th>PSR</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
<th>SS&amp;I</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>Leases</th>
<th>I&amp;ES</th>
<th>P&amp;P</th>
<th>TSI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key activity achievements from the 2018/2019 work programme

16. The key achievements in the delivery of the local board work programmes for 2018/2019 include:
- **Local events programme**: the local board supported many local events throughout the 2018/2019 financial year, some of these include the Panmure Family Fun Day, Glow in the Park, Matariki Light Trail, and the Onehunga Festival.

- **Love Your Neighbourhood**: the local board has approved 16 Love Your Neighbourhood grants aimed at enabling the community to deliver environmental initiatives such as community planting, environmental education for preschoolers, clean-ups and restoration.

- **Ruapotaka Marae support**: the local board continues to work alongside Ruapotaka Marae, supporting the redevelopment of the urban marae. At its 23 April 2019 business meeting the local board agreed to consider a lease proposal and application for land owner approval, subject to all necessary statutory and council approvals (MT/2019/44). The redeveloped marae will enable passive surveillance of Maybury Reserve and continue delivering programmes for the wider community.

- **Strategic partnerships – youth initiatives**: a key initiative in Outcome 1: *Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is an active and engaged community* of the local board plan is to “create opportunities for young people to have their say and work with us on what’s important to them”. The local board has supported multiple community groups to work with and empower youth. The local board have funded the youth voice programme, where the 312 Hub and Flipping East have established youth led boards that help give back to the community.

- **Local Community grants**: a key initiative in the local board plan and the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Agreement 2018/2019 is to support community-led initiatives through the local boards’ grants programme. This financial year the local board has allocated a total of $131,917 to local community grants. This includes the additional $10,500 budget that the local board reallocated into this activity in quarter three (MT/2019/7).

- **Waikaraka Park Reserve Management Plan**: this financial year the local board reallocated $75,000 to the new activity, Waikaraka Park Reserve Management Plan (MT/2019/22 and MT/2019/70). The reserve management plan will enable better park management and integration of works across the entire precinct. It is intended to be the guiding policy framework for managing use, protection and development of Waikaraka Park. It will include general management principles, objectives and policies. Further updates on the progress of this plan will be provided in the local board’s quarter one quarterly performance report for financial year 2019/2020.

- **Tāmaki greenways – develop a shared path**: a three-metre wide shared path has been completed, connecting Panmure and Glen Innes along the Tāmaki Estuary foreshore. The path is open for public use and once a name has been finalised a blessing and activation event will be held to engage with the local community and formally celebrate the completion of the path and the gifting of its name.

### Overview of work programme performance by department

#### Arts, Community and Events work programme

17. In the Arts, Community and Events work programme, there are 22 activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2019 (green), one activity that is in progress but is delayed (amber). Activities that were not completed or progressed as expected (Red and Amber Rag status) are discussed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity name</th>
<th>RAG status</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Explanation and mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Fewer strategic partnerships were funded this year due to a delay in appointing a Strategic Partnerships Broker. The remaining budget will carry forward and distributed in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parks, Sport and Recreation work programme

18. In the Parks, Sport and Recreation work programme, there are eight activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2019 (green), two activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber). Activities that were not completed or progressed as expected (Red and Amber Rag status) are discussed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity name</th>
<th>RAG status</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Explanation and mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Giants Tree Planting Programme</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>This programme is aligning and will occur during the planting season which extends into quarter one of financial year 2019/2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific implementation plan for Auckland’s Urban Forest (Ngahere) strategy</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>The draft Ngahere local assessment has been completed and is scheduled to be workshop by the local board in July.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Libraries and Information work programme

19. In the Libraries and Information work programme, all of the six activities were completed by the end of the year (green).

Service Strategy and Integration work programme

20. In the Service Strategy and Integration work programme, there is one activity, investigate community facility requirements in Glen Innes and Panmure to support TRC and Panuku programmes, that will be completed by the end of July 2019 (green).

Community Facilities: Build Maintain Renew work programme

21. In the Community Facilities: Build Maintain Renew work programme, there are 46 activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2019 (green), six activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber), 2 activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and no activities that have been cancelled and deferred in quarter four (grey). Activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered are discussed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity name</th>
<th>RAG status</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Explanation and mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stone Cottage – renew roof and joinery</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>On hold</td>
<td>This project is currently on hold as it requires further strategic assessment due to seismic implications. The seismic team will undertake an investigation and recommend a way forward for this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Wellington War Memorial – provide new dual toilet facility</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>On hold</td>
<td>On-going discussions are occurring with the rugby club about the location and layout of the toilet block. Staff will continue to investigate options in FY19/20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunkirk Activity Centre – replace roof and renew interior</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>This is a multi-year project that is expected to continue into FY19/20 but has not progressed as anticipated in FY18/19 due to contamination and seismic issues. Staff will recommend a way forward once further investigation has been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Park – improve sports park and extend fields 8, 9 and 10</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>The land currently has a notice of requirement from the New Zealand Transport Agency for the East West Link project. All physical works have been deferred to FY18/19. Additionally, there is a Waikaraka Park Reserve Management Plan that is in progress and will inform scope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of works within the sports park, including the concept design of the sports fields. Further progress will occur once the reserve management plan has been completed.

Community Leases work programme

22. In the Community Leases work programme, there are four activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2019 (green), five activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber), two activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and eight activities that have been cancelled and deferred in quarter four (grey). Activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered are discussed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity name</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Explanation and mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Park, 246 Nielson Street, Onehunga: Lease to Auckland Canine Agility Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>On hold</td>
<td>The local board have funded a Waikaraka Park Reserve Management Plan to inform the future development and integration of activities at Waikaraka Park. All leases at Waikaraka Park cannot be progressed until the reserve management plan has been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikaraka Park, 175-243 Nielson Street, Te Papapa: Lease to Onehunga Combined Sports Trust</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>On hold</td>
<td>The local board have funded a Waikaraka Park Reserve Management Plan to inform the future development and integration of activities at Waikaraka Park. All leases at Waikaraka Park cannot be progressed until the reserve management plan has been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Shaw Reserve, 252A Panama Rd, Mount Wellington: Lease to Auckland Rowing Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>The application has been workshoped with the local board and mana whenua have been engaged. Following this public notification went out on the 8 July 2019. It is anticipated that a report will be presented at a future local board business meeting seeking its approval for this lease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134 Elstree Avenue, Point England: Lease to Te Ao Hou Community Childcare Centre Incorporated</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>The application has been workshoped with the local board and mana whenua have been engaged. It is anticipated that a report will be presented at a future local board business meeting seeking its approval for this lease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konini Park, Waiohua Road Greenlane: Lease to Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Staff completing this report needed to prioritise more pressing leasing matters. It is anticipated that a report will be presented at the local board’s August business meeting seeking its approval for this lease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elstree North Reserve, 38A Elstree Avenue Glen Innes: Renewal lease to Tamaki Model Aero Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Staff have received the application form from the group, and it is anticipated that a report will be presented at a future local board business meeting seeking its approval for this lease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt England Reserve, 122 Elstree Avenue Glen Innes: Renewal airspace lease to Tamaki Model Aero Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>The group have sought a variation to their lease that has been presented at a workshop to the local board. It is anticipated that a report will be presented at a future local board business meeting seeking its approval for this lease.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Infrastructure and Environment Services work programme

23. In the Infrastructure and Environment Services work programme, there are eight activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2019 (green). One activity is in progress but delayed (amber), this is discussed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity name</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Explanation and mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elstree North Reserve, 38A Elstree Avenue Glen Innes: Renewal lease to Tamaki Model Aero Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Staff have received the application form from the group, and it is anticipated that a report will be presented at a future local board business meeting seeking its approval for this lease.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity name</th>
<th>RAG status</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Explanation and mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manukau Harbour Forum</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>This was not able to be delivered within this financial year due to the governance and management review not beginning until June 2019, and the symposium and community forum event being rescheduled from June to August 2019. Accrual of the 2018/2019 budget allocation for the symposium event will occur to cover costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Southern Initiative

24. In the Southern Initiative work programme, there is one activity, *youth connections*, that is in progress but delayed (amber), this is discussed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity name</th>
<th>RAG status</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Explanation and mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Connections</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>The youth connections programme delivery transferred from the Community Empowerment Unit to the Southern Initiative (TSI) in quarter one. This activity is delayed as Toll Group programming is on hold due to dedicated staff being on parental leave. TSI staff will progress once another contact has been identified. In the meantime, staff are working with HLC (Homes. Land. Community.) to develop local community groups in Oranga capacity and capability to support local community members to fulfil construction roles at HLC’s Oranga development site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plans and Places work programme

25. In the Plans and Places work programme, there is one activity, *Mount Wellington planning investigation*, that will be completed by the end of July 2019 (green).

Deferred activities

26. As part of the local board funding policy, activities funded through the Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) operating fund that were not delivered in 2018/2019 will be deferred into 2019/2020 work programmes.

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

27. When developing the work programmes council group impacts and views are presented to the boards. As this is an information only report there are no further impacts identified.

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


Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

29. The local board remains committed to integrating and supporting work that contributes to outcomes for Māori. This includes enhancing partnerships and collaborative ways of working with mana whenua and mataawaka.
30. In June 2018, the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board signed a relationship agreement with Ngāti Pāoa.

31. Some of the activities in the local board’s 2018/2019 work programme (Attachment A) have specific impact on the wider Māori community, this includes:

- continued collaboration with Ruapotaka Marae and their marae redevelopment. Currently a business plan and Marae Development Toolkit is being developed by contractors, using the Ruapotaka marae development as the basis for the toolkit that can be used by other marae and council.
- engaging Ruapotaka Marae to deliver a Rent Smart workshops for vulnerable renters in the local Glen Innes community.
- all three libraries in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area are committed to ‘celebrating Te Ao Māori and strengthening responsiveness to Māori’. Each of the libraries celebrated Matariki and have continually provided learning opportunities for staff and the community to learn about Te Ao Māori and Te Reo Māori.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

32. This report is provided to enable the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board to monitor the organisation’s progress and performance in delivering the 2018/2019 work programmes and to report this to the public. This report is for information only and therefore there are no financial implications associated with this report.

**Financial performance**

33. Auckland Council currently has a number of bonds quoted on the NZ Stock Exchange (NZX). As a result, the Council is subject to obligations under the NZX Main Board & Debt Market Listing Rules and the Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013 sections 97 and 461H. These obligations restrict the release of annual financial reports and results until the Auckland Council Group results are released to the NZX expect to be made public on 30 September.

34. Due to these obligations the financial performance attached to the quarterly report is under confidential cover.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

35. While the risk of non-delivery of the entire work programme is rare, the likelihood for risk relating to individual activities does vary. Capital projects for instance, are susceptible to more risk as on-time and on-budget delivery is dependent on weather conditions, approvals (e.g. building consents) and is susceptible to market conditions.

36. Information about any significant risks and how they are being managed and/or mitigated is addressed in the ‘Activities with significant issues’ section.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

37. Deferral of budgets of unfinished activities will be added into 2019/2020 work programmes by quarter one reporting.
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### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or GCO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Local Events Programme – Maungakiekie and Tamaki (Externally Delivered Events)</td>
<td>- Grow in the Park $10,000 (Maungakiekie Community Trust) - Orange Community Event $5,000 (Orange Community Centre) - Riverside Community Event $5,000 (Riverside Community Centre) - Onehunga Festival $25,000 (Onehunga Festival Committee) - Matavale Light Trail $30,000 (Glen Innes Business Association) - Parcours Family Fun Day $15,000 (Panmore Business Association)</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS: AOE - Events</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
<td>LD: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The funding for the Riverside Community Centre - $5000 was unspent. The local board has confirmed that $2,300 of this money will be used to pay for an event survey of the Matavale Light Trail in Q4. This leaves $2,700 that can be reallocated at the Local Boards discretion. All other grants have been paid out to recipients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Local Events Programme – Onehunga Christmas Lights Event (Internally Delivered Event)</td>
<td>Deliver a Christmas Carols event with the lighting of the tree at Jellicoe Park.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS: AOE - Events</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>LD: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Scheduled event in Q2 was cancelled due to bad weather. The local board redirected the remaining budget to another activity in Q3 (Resolution: MT/2019/07).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Citizenship Ceremonies – Maungakiekie-Tamaki</td>
<td>Deliver an annual programme of citizenship ceremonies in conjunction with the Department of Internal Affairs.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS: AOE - Events</td>
<td>$24,388</td>
<td>ABS: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The Civic Events team delivered three citizenship ceremonies on three separate occasions during Q3 with 197 people from the local board area becoming new citizens. The Civic Events team delivered two citizenship ceremonies on two separate occasions during Q4 with 172 people from the local board area becoming new citizens. No activities occurred during Q4 as no civic events were scheduled. The unspent budget will be carried forward to 2019/2020 for the Tamaki Path Opening event, which was not held in 2019/2020 due to the location name for the path not being chosen yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Local Civic Events – Maungakiekie-Tamaki (Movies in Parks)</td>
<td>Deliver and support civic events within the local board area The following decisions are required: Confirmation of programmes and activities that are to be supported by this line</td>
<td></td>
<td>CS: AOE - Events</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>LD: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The Unveiling of the two Belgium grave placers for the recipients of the Queen Elizabeth medal at Waiakara Cemetery was held on 18 March 2019 with 33 people attending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Local Events Programme – Maungakiekie-Tamaki (Movies in Parks)</td>
<td>Programme and deliver two Regional Movies in Parks series events.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS: AOE - Events</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>LD: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Movies In Parks “Jurassic World: Fallen Kingdom” was screened on Saturday 23 February 2019 at Ferguson Domain, Onehunga, including pre-entertainment and activities, with approximately 300 people attending. “ Ferdinand” is scheduled to be screened on Thursday 18 April 2019 at Pt England Reserve, Pt England. A detailed post-season delivery report will be presented in Q4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Dunkirk Road Activity Centre, Funding Agreement</td>
<td>A three year term agreement with Dunkirk Road Activity Centre Incorporated to facilitate and deliver work plan outcomes, including activities and programmes at Dunkirk Activity Centre for the years 2018-2021, commencing 1 July 2018 and terminating on 30 June 2021. Operational funding amount to be adjusted annually in accordance with Auckland Council’s agreed inflationary mechanism once confirmed.</td>
<td>The local board has an oversight and monitoring role. Q4 Workshop for funding decision in 2019/2020 term</td>
<td>CS: AOE - Community Places</td>
<td>$49,246</td>
<td>ABS: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Programmes and activities at Dunkirk Activity Centre have continued in Q3. Discussions with getting the new Centre Management Agreement which amalgamates the Funding Agreement and License to Manage and Occupy documents into one, will be presented to the Dunkirk Management Committee in Q4. In Q4, the centre work plan for 2019/2020 will be completed and presented to the Local Board for their input and approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 29

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Required</th>
<th>Lead Dept./Unit or COG</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Dunkirk Road Activity Centre - Three year Licence</td>
<td>A three year term with Dunkirk Road Activity Centre incorporated for operation of the Dunkirk Road Activity Centre, 1B Wellington War Memorial Reserve, 14/50 Dunkirk Road, Mt Wellington, being PH Lot 284 (1P) 30828 for the years 2018-2021, commencing 1 July 2018 and terminating 30 June 2021 (Road $11,000 plus GST per year if requested). All other terms and conditions in accordance with the Auckland Council Community Occupancy Guidelines 2017. 2.4.7.7.2 (a) Localised area to be approved by Community Learning Team.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated for FY2018/2019</td>
<td>CS ACE Community Places</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>ARO Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Licence to Occupy and Manage was executed in Q1. Licence to Occupy and Manage was executed in Q4. No scheduled activity in Q4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667</td>
<td>Riverside Community Centre - Transition to Community Led</td>
<td>Continue to develop and support the transition of Riverside Community Centre to community-led, through ongoing partnerships with the Panmarama Community Group.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CS ACE Community Places</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>ARO Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Staff met fortnightly with the Panmarama to progress work and capability plan. Current focus is for the group to practice good meeting protocols and inviting more community members to join to ensure strong capacity within the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td>Riverside Community Centre Program Delivery</td>
<td>To strengthen existing community relationships and initiate programme activations from the Riverside Co-design Project to increase community engagement and participation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CS ACE Community Places</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>LDI Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>During Q3, the Centre has offered three after-school programmes, two exercise classes after hours and a Seniors Workshop with Aroha Foundation. Staff are working with Whare Puakoro Trust and their programmes and providing community empowerment programmes on site with Gardens4Health and Parenting Workshops with Glen Innes Family Centres. The number of booking hours and participants over the last quarter has continued to increase. The Centre delivered eight programmes and activities covering youth to older people, with a range of activities from creative art, mindfulness, health to community gatherings. The Centre now has daily activities for youth. The Community Day has been rescheduled to July 2019 due to supporting a community forum at a local resident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695</td>
<td>Onahunga Community Centre Programme Delivery</td>
<td>Plan, develop, deliver and evaluate a programme of activities in Onahunga ($72,604) -</td>
<td></td>
<td>CS ACE Community Places</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>ARO Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>In Q3, the following were delivered: - A drama-based youth development programme helping 12 youths between the ages of 12 and 18 learn how to deal with emotions and sensitive topics was delivered. The diversity programme, in collaboration with the Auckland Tai Wāhine, Tai Wāhine Language classes focusing on language and culture for 30 young children. - A collaboration with the Onahunga Library to celebrate the Lunar New Year with cultural performances delivered by local groups, food from different cuisines and a Lion Dance. Approximately 80 people attended. Activation and programme focus during Q3 were: - A regional networking event for International Women’s Day with 20 diverse women in attendance. The event resulted in a six-week ‘women’s network’ activation, bringing together diverse women for conversations, cooking and lectures. There were a total of 90 participants for the six-week network event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747</td>
<td>Venue Hire Service Delivery - MT</td>
<td>Provide, manage and promote venues for hire, and the activities and opportunities they offer by - managing the customer booking and access process - continue to develop and deliver service improvement initiatives, aligning activity to local board priorities through management of the fees and charges framework. These include whether activities contribute to community outcomes offered by not for profit and community groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>CS ACE Community Places</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>ARO Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>During Q3, staff updated the local board on fees and charges for 2019/2020, Community dispute sessions were held across Auckland to help히나 with the online booking process. This also gave tenants the opportunity to raise any questions they have with the hire process or the venue they hire. Bookings for 2019/2020 opened on 5 March 2016. By the end of the day there were over 10,000 bookings across the network, 81 per cent was self-service online bookings. Hire satisfaction showed that 81 per cent would recommend the venues they have visited within the local board area. The statistics are based on the first eight months of 2019/2019. During Q4, 72 per cent of tenants indicated that they would recommend the venues they have visited. Participant numbers have decreased by 2 per cent and booking hours have decreased by 6 per cent compared to the same period last year. The top two activity types for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki were religious and arts and cultural events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960</td>
<td>Local community grants</td>
<td>Contestable grant funding to support local community groups. This will be administered through three rounds</td>
<td>Local board to allocate funding to community groups</td>
<td>CS ACE: Advice</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>LDI Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Local Grant Round Three closed in March 2016. Decisions on grants allocations will be made by the local board in Q4. An additional $10,590 was reallocated from locally driven initiative operating expenditure budget to community grants. There was one refund of $2,000 added back into the community grants budget. In Q4 the local board allocated a total of $48,792.66 for local grants round three, leaving a balance of $52,794.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CCD</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>961</td>
<td>Apply the empowered communities approach – connecting communities (MT)</td>
<td>Broker strategic collaborative relationships and resources within the community. This includes five key activity areas: 1. Engaging communities: • reaching out to less accessible and diverse groups - focussing on capacity building and inclusion. • supporting existing community groups and relationships. 2. Strengthen community-led placemaking and planning initiatives - empowering communities to: • provide input into placemaking initiatives • influence decision-making on place-based planning and implementation. This includes urban revitalisation activities, collaborating with relevant council departments and council-controlled organisations. 3. Enabling council • supporting groups to gain access to operational and technical expertise and identify and address barriers to community empowerment. 4. Responding to the aspirations of mana whenua, marae and Māori organisations: • this does not replace or duplicate any stand-alone local board Māori responsiveness activities. 5. Reporting back to local board members on progress in activity areas 1 - 4.</td>
<td>CS ACE Community Empowerment</td>
<td>$0 LDI Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The strategic broker: - worked with Te Akiti O Waikhua and initiated regular monthly meetings with Kā Māori and Metawhakai. This provides an opportunity for council to work more collaboratively and share information with Kā Māori and council. - participated in meetings with a collective of Pāmārere organisations at the Dunkirk Activity Centre to discuss events and programmes being delivered in Pāmārere and any concerns. - participated in the Mā Wellington Collective meeting where new groups joined including Chinese Friendship Group, a local Kapa Haka group and Man Up. - continued to have Maungakiekie-Tāmaki council officer monthly meetings for information sharing and to discuss work collaboration opportunities.</td>
<td>The strategic broker: - reviewed 25 of the 42 applications for the final Local Board Grants. - worked with The Southern Initiative and Tōtū Logistics Freight Company helping youth to be employed on Tōtū Carded programme. - worked with Pāmārere Yacht Club and St Georges Rowing Club to plan the revitalisation of their premises for future use and discuss how they can work with council. - restarted the Onetahi Royal Oak Collective meetings with St John’s Church, Latin American Society of Adequate, and Iam’s Community Centre Onetahi, who are identifying ways to work collaboratively with council. - discussed participation in elections at the Collective meetings. - met with Matsūke to discuss working with them and learn about the work they are doing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 963 | Ruapotaka Marae support | Support Ruapotaka Marae in progressing the marae rebuild and relocation project by working with their members, and relevant council staff and stakeholders to identify needs, and provide capability building/professional advice/services as required (e.g. liaison coordinator, funding advisor) | CS ACE Community Empowerment | $30,000 LDI Opex | Completed | Green | The cross-council team working with Ruapotaka Marae. Marae participated in a meeting with marae representatives, the marae’s design team, Tāmaki Regeneration Company staff and elected members to discuss the area the marae intends to lease, and reconvene the outcomes sought by council and the marae. Staff continue to meet fortnightly to coordinate the council approach to the project and with the marae as often needed. In February 2019, with agreement from Ruapotaka Marae, a media company was contracted to produce videos of the history and stories of Ruapotaka Marae. These are currently being edited. Staff are developing a marae development toolkit project brief Ruapotaka Marae will be invited to input into the project brief. | Staff and representatives from Ruapotaka Marae agreed the Community Empowerment Unit’s work should focus on supporting the marae with the development of a business plan. A services agreement with Market Pro was signed in June 2019, after the contractors were approved by the Ruapotaka Marae Koritai. The marae manager and council staff have reviewed the videos of the history and stories of Ruapotaka Marae. Staff finalized the marae development toolkit brief with input from Ruapotaka Marae and colleagues from across council. A services agreement with Market Pro for the development of the toolkit was signed in June 2019 and research work has commenced. |
## Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

### Attachment A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit / OGD</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1006 | Strategic Partnerships          | Broker strategic partnerships and leverage investment that will deliver projects and programmes that achieve local board plan outcomes:  
- Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is an active and engaged community  
- Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is a community that cares about its environment  
- Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is the place to be  
- Maungakiekie-Tāmaki has quality infrastructure to match growth. | No further decisions anticipated | CS AEC Advisory          | $507,000 LDI: Opex  | In progress   | Amber | Strategic Partnerships: Eleven expressions of interest were received in grants round one. The local board approved funding for Livining Innovation, lidray Lane Illuminated, Hub Zero and Supporting youth into employment. Youth initiatives: Flipping East began developing prototype: - Prototype one engaged six schools and 300 young people to support the set-up of student councils and development of a civics curriculum. - Prototype two engaged 21 young people and 20 community stakeholders to set up a youth forum for Tāmaki and place young people in governance roles. - Prototype three has 15 young people and 20 community stakeholders to establish a youth social innovation network. Thirty-three young people are involved in Blackbeaks. Staff facilitated a viewing session with the 312 Hub and are supporting the transition to a social enterprise model. Over 100 young people participated in the six-week ball and Badminton youth development. Local youth are involved in the Tāmaki Community Trust and Nga Timatanga. Youth initiatives: Flipping East and The 312 Hub presented progress updates to the local board. The funding agreements have been signed and work commenced for the Maungakiekie Youth Network led by Synergy Projects. The 312 Hub, the Tāmaki Youth Trust and Halea Up, and with Flipping East to activate places and connect with youth in Mount Wellington. Business Associations: - Glen Innes supported Bradley Lane Illuminated, Tāmaki Ona Days, and a parent and pre-schooler fitness programme. - Onhunga are preparing an Easter Egg Hunt Competition and the Onhunga Arts Festival in June. - Penmore provided a report for the 2018 Penmore Christmas Street Party. Fewer strategic partnerships were funded this year to an initial delay in appointing Strategic Partnerships Brokers, and then the early departure of the broker in March 2019. The remaining budget will be carried forward to be distributed in the 2019/2020 strategic partnerships fund. A new Strategic Partnerships Broker was appointed in June and will start in the role on 1 July 2019.        |
| 1008 | Operational Expenditure - Te Oro (Council Faculty) | Operate Te Oro as a music and arts centre for youth. | No further decisions anticipated | CS AEC: Arts & Culture | $395,868 ABE: Opex | Completed | Green | During Q3, Te Oro delivered 17 programmes which included 71 programme sessions with a combined total of 1,262 attendees and participants, 17 of which had Māori outcomes. During Q4, Te Oro delivered 68 programmes which included 21 programme sessions with 853 attendees and participants, two of which had Māori outcomes. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or COO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1009</td>
<td>Orange Community Centre programme delivery</td>
<td>Plan, develop and deliver a programme of activities that aligns to the outcome area, “Maungakiekie – Tāmaki is an active and engaged community”, with a strong focus on delivering for young people, building capacity in our communities and celebrating diversity, ensuring community participation enables more residents to feel connected to their community spaces, allowing participants to learn, grow and come together to have fun.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS ACE Community Places</td>
<td>$33,491</td>
<td>ARO, Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>For Q3, focusing on Diversity, two Te Reo Māori classes were introduced in partnership with Te Wanganui a Okahu and Te Awarangi. Māori Music delivered a programme for young people, focusing on children under 16, through free and interactive music sessions. There was a Youth Action programme focusing on enhancing youth employment opportunities for young people of Orange. A youth mentor gained paid employment as a result of this Youth Action programme. In Q4, a quiz night event in Te Roto Māori will be introduced. During Q4, Healthy cooking programmes resulted in participants learning new skills and knowledge. Food parcel distributions with Kwanamessi reduced the negative impacts of food waste by redistributing excess food and helping to create positive social change. Weekly, volunteers package food parcels that provided for an average of 25-30 families under this programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Panmure Community Hall Programme Delivery</td>
<td>Plan, develop and deliver a programme of activities that, “aligns to the outcome area “Maungakiekie – Tāmaki is an active and engaged community”, with a strong focus on delivering for young people, promoting the wellbeing and safety in our communities and celebrating diversity, ensures community participation, enabling more residents to feel connected to their community spaces allows participants to learn, grow and come together to have fun.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS ACE Community Places</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>LDI, Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>In Q4, Panmure Community Hall facilitated and coordinated 22 activations including the delivery of 16 long and short term programmes, 18 events, and 3 projects for the community, and refugee/immigrants’ wellbeing, contributing to social impact, environment and diversity. Six events were held in collaboration with community groups including the launch of Tamaki Youth Council, a gaming event and a family history night event. During Q4, the Tū Rua exhibition, a youth led art exhibition on mental health, suicide and drug abuse conducted by the Tamaki Youth Wellbeing Project was a major highlight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385</td>
<td>Te Oro Business Plan and governance review</td>
<td>Undertake a review of the business plan, including the governance, for Te Oro</td>
<td>The local board will be updated at key points in the project, including approval of the updated business plan.</td>
<td>CS ACE, Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>$8,405</td>
<td>ARO, Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Members of the Governing Committee recommended that staff postpone the community stakeholder engagement workshop that was planned for Q2, and collaborate with the committee on the next steps for the business planning project. Staff will work closely with the Community Empowerment Model for Te Oro with the local board in Q4. Governance options were presented to the local board in Q4, and the local board provided feedback on the recommended options. Staff will provide further details on implementation of the recommended option before providing a report in Q1 of FY2019/2020 for local board approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Antonic Services - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Support and/or deliver Antonic services and pass these within the local board area.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS ACE Events</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>LDI, Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Planning commenced in Q2. Scheduled for Q4. The local board provided grants to the organisations below for delivery of the Antonic Day services: The Onehunga and District RSA ($3,000.00), Wellington Piha RSA ($3,000.00).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2718</td>
<td>Ready to Rent</td>
<td>Work with local community organisations to support tenants becoming ready to rent, by increasing financial literacy and responsibility, supporting potential tenants to access accommodation opportunities in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CS ACE Community Empowerment</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>LDI, Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The Oranga Rent Smart pilot workshop series started with workshops on Maintaining a Warm Home and Healthy Home, Tenants Rights and Responsibilities and Money Management. These were delivered by OIAH, Beacon Pathway and Christian Against Poverty. For future workshops, Rent Smart will partner with the New Zealand Property Investors Foundation to present on how to find a home and how to apply for a rental property, and with The Housing Foundation to discuss future from renting to ownership opportunities. CAB Onehunga was funded to organise a Rent Smart Information Hub and to have a continuous presence at Onehunga Community Centre. Staff engaged Auckland City Council, Onehunga Islamic and Tāmaki Budgeting Services to deliver a similar workshop series to their communities. No Success was engaged to create a youth prototype including profiling youth and designing a Rent Smart messaging campaign that will work for youth. Staff finalised funding agreements with Raukau Taiofaka, Rapihotaka Mānau, Tāmaki Budgeting and Onehunga District Council of Social Services who will deliver the Rent Smart workshops for vulnerable tenants in their communities in Maungakiekie, Tāmaki, following the Orange Rent Smart pilot programme. The pilot group and presenters from the Orange pilot have indicated that they wish to continue their support for the project. Staff will continue to engage and offer support to these programmes and their local coordinators, through sharing the findings and experiences from the Orange pilot. A formal evaluation of the Orange pilot is being finalised. No Success continue to create a youth prototype, including profiling youth and designing a Rent Smart messaging campaign for youth. Beacon Pathway will engage Rent Smart participants in a peer support network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or ECO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2719</td>
<td>Te Oro Programme Delivery</td>
<td>Provide a programme of activities including classes, workshops, events and community engagement at Te Oro (approximately $117,000) that align to the Te Oro Charter and Business Plan</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS ACE, Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ARS Opex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>During Q3, programme highlights included the Seniors CARiGE and Pacific Dance programme that offered dance classes to attendees aged 50 and above, and the late Diane International Women’s day event that was held on 9 March 2019 and attended by over 100 women who participated in a series of conversations and dance workshops.</td>
<td>During Q4, programme highlights included a series of activities as part of ‘Senior’s Language’ which included ‘A Taste of Samoa’ where traditional dances were prepared and shared with the community, and ‘Make your own Pan岛 Head Dressment’ that attracted over 60 participants over a 3-hour period. Bradley Lane illuminated 2019 was bigger and brighter this year thanks to the leadership of Gary Silpa and The Good, The Bad Trust and supported by the Bradley Lane illuminated working group, the Glen Innes Business Association, Glen Innes Library and Te Oro. Musicians performed alongside artists to present a unique view of 21 painted walls across Glen Innes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2809</td>
<td>Community Response Fund - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Discretionary fund to respond to community issues as they arise during the year</td>
<td>The local board will consider strategic assessments of proposed initiatives and/or projects, and approve funding for three projects after consideration of their likely benefits</td>
<td>CS ACE, Advisory</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>LD1 Opex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>MT2018/11/3 - $10,000 - Tamaki Open Network Plan engagement</td>
<td>Balance: Ful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Full Facilities Contracts</td>
<td>The Full Facilities maintenance contracts include all buildings, parks and open space assets, sports fields, coastal management and storm damage</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF, Operations</td>
<td>$4,140,179</td>
<td>ARS Opex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The third quarter of the year has seen higher temperatures and a slowing in grass growth. Use of our open spaces and beaches within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area has increased, with Whauwau Bay in particular being used to host events and seeing a large number of recreational users. The Taylor Avene has been renovated to ensure the public conveniences at these busy sites are clean and functioning. Mulching of sites is continuing throughout the local board area, with emphasis on around the Glen Innes town centre. Audits continue to be carried out across the built and open space community facilities to ensure that the facilities are being maintained to the required standard. The audit outcomes and any identified issues are addressed at monthly meetings prior to escalation. Through this a number of larger issues have been identified and have been proposed for inclusion into the draft renewal work programme currently being considered by the local board. Operational Management and Maintenance have been working hard in planning and preparation for the new Streetscape contracts, with the green assets coming across on 1 April.</td>
<td>The fourth quarter of the year has seen higher temperatures than normal, resulting in a slowing in grass growth. The Point England pathway has been completed and now connects with Waio-Taki Nature Reserve, offering great coastal walks for the public. There has been an increase in the amount of illegal dumping identified across the region. Operational Management and Maintenance is working with Waste solutions to lessen this illegal activity. Audits continue to be carried out across the built and open space community facilities to ensure that the facilities are being maintained to the necessary standard. The audit outcomes and any identified issues are discussed as these are found and at monthly contractor meetings. This contractor communication has been very successful in instigating a fast and effective service. Regular monthly meetings with stakeholders at their respective community sites, have continued and are resulting in maintenance items being identified and actioned promptly. Streetscape Green has seen a smooth transition from Auckland Transport to Community Facilities. A number of unmanaged areas were identified and have been added to the contract. Community Facilities is working alongside the contractor to control pool plants that have seen prolific growth over the quarter. A good long-term outcome has been experienced through an increase in audits, contractor communication and fast response times.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or GDP</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Landscape Improvement Contracts</td>
<td>The Arboretum maintenance contracts include tree management and maintenance. No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF Operations</td>
<td>$386,050 ARS Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- *Green* indicates projects that were completed.
- *Amber* indicates projects that are ongoing.
- *Red* indicates projects that were not completed.

### Item 29

A warm autumn saw continued tree growth take its toll. With the diminishing daylight hours the seasonal requests to prune trees to improve sunlight into properties increased. Requests to prune trees to avoid or reduce leaf drop also increased. This may be associated with street sweeping. By the end of June the Arbicultural team were well into replacement tree planting. The progress was very pleasing as early planting allows the best chance for tree establishment.

### Attachment A

- **Item 29**

  - **Dun Laoghaire Activity Centre - replace roof and renew interior**
    - **Overview:** Replace the roof including new framing, flashing, guttering and downpipes. Interior works to include GIB ceilings, insulation, floor coverings, painting and minor carpentry.
    - **Current status:** Stage one - concept design and procurement for professional services. Stage two - deliver physical works. This is a multi-year funded project and is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP/18 B2 2330).
    - **Options to be presented to the board for consultation and approval:** CF Project Delivery $152,000 ARS Capex - Renewals
    - **Current status:** Consultation has been carried out with all stakeholders including the Dun Laoghaire Activity Centre and the Market Club. Preliminary design options have been presented to the local board and changes will be proposed to the board in April 2019.
    - **In progress:** Amber

- **Glen Innes Community Hall - Citizens Advice Bureau - refit first floor interior**
    - **Overview:** Renovate and refurbish the interior of the Glen Innes Community Hall to improve facilities and provide for the relocation of the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB).
    - **Current status:** Stage one - concept design and procurement for professional services. Stage two - undertake detailed design in consultation with the local board and stakeholder engagement. Stage three - deliver physical works. This is a multi-year funded project and is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP/18 B2 2331).
    - **Options to be presented to the board for consultation and approval:** CF Investigation and Design $150,000 ARS Capex - Renewals
    - **Current status:** Building Consent has been granted. Lease agreement has been completed by legal consultants and is being reviewed by the leasing team. Tender documents are being prepared.
    - **In progress:** Green

- **Glen Innes Library - new CCTV system**
    - **Further decision points:** Required.
    - **Lead Dept / Unit or GDP:** CF Investigation and Design
    - **Budget:** $25,000 ARS Capex - Renewals
    - **Completed:** Green

**Project completed December 2018.** The renewal of the closed circuit television system provided a solution of seven new surveillance cameras as well as an access control system to the staff room and Physical security includes staff training for the new system were completed late December 2018.**

---

**Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board**

27 August 2019

---
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## Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CDD</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2128</td>
<td>Glen Innes Pool - comprehensive renewal</td>
<td>Renewal includes carpark marking, pot holes, pool covers, office carpet, skimmer grates, replacement of filter and intank/externtank repait. Replace PA system in the factory and install CCTV cameras in car park, renew roof and spa heat pump. Stage one - investigate, design and scope physical works (including options to propose to the local board for assets that may benefit from an increased level of service). Stage two - physical works commence. This is a multi year funded project and is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2337).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$40,000; AR5; Capex; Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Quote received for the drainage work and car park repair. Work is scheduled to be undertaken during the April shutdown. Next steps: Complete drainage work and car park repair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2129</td>
<td>Jellicoe Park and Onehunga War Memorial Pools - renewal paving</td>
<td>Overview - renewal and upgrade Jellicoe Bridge which includes the design, consultation, cassetts, tender and construction of a new bridge. Current status - stage one - investigate; design, and scope physical works. Detailed design options will be consulted with the local board for approval in advance of physical works. Stage two - deliver physical works. Construction to include demolition of existing bridge and reinstatement where required. This project is a multi year funded project and is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 3025). Estimated completion is yet to be established.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$40,000; AR5; Capex; Renewals</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed. The project was completed in August 2018 with the renewal of the ashphalt footpath, the entrance way through the stone archway and concrete seat bases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2130</td>
<td>Jubilee Bridge - upgrade bridge</td>
<td>Overview - renewal and upgrade Jellicoe Bridge which includes the design, consultation, cassetts, tender and construction of a new bridge. Current status - stage one - investigate; design, and scope physical works. Detailed design options will be consulted with the local board for approval in advance of physical works. Stage two - deliver physical works. Construction to include demolition of existing bridge and reinstatement where required. This project is a multi year funded project and is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 3025). Estimated completion is yet to be established.</td>
<td>Design and funding options to be consulted and approved with the board</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$50,000; AR5; Capex; Development</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Value engineering completed, recommendations to reduce costs are being progressed to reduce the initial estimated development costs. Next steps: Finalise design and procurement strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2131</td>
<td>Lagoon Pool - comprehensive renewal</td>
<td>Overview - comprehensive refurbishment of the pool facilities to include the refurbishment of the outdoor pool and the pool surrounds, renewal of the pool deck changing rooms, replacement of the seats, renewal of the fire system, resetting of the pool and renewal of the flooring. Options for heating the outdoor pool will be investigated and presented to the board for LTD funding consultation and approval. Current status - stage one - complete tender evaluation and select the preferred contractor to deliver the renewal works. Stage two - deliver physical works. Outdoor pool works will be undertaken between mid September and late November 2018. Indoor pool physical works are scheduled to be undertaken during the annual maintenance shutdown period in mid to late January 2019. This is a multi year funded project and is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2346). Estimated completion for the renewal work is February 2019.</td>
<td>Design and funding options to be consulted and approved with the board</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$350,000; AR5; Capex; Renewals; LTD; Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status: Stage 2 work to replace the indoor pool concourse and refurbish upstirs was completed in February 2019. Next steps: Priorise further work to be undertaken this year, as Stage 3 from remaining budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CCO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2132</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - renew libraries, furniture, fittings and equipment FY18+</td>
<td>Overview - renew furniture, fittings and equipment for the following libraries: Onehunga Library, Glen Innes Library and Panmure Library. Current status - stage one - investigate design and scope the works required (including options to propose to the local board for assets that may benefit from an increased level of service). Stage two - plan and deliver the physical works. This project is a multi-year funded project and is a continuation from the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2335). Estimated completion is yet to be established.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$150,000 ARS - Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: As reported in Q2 commentary this project has been unbundled to create separate projects for individual libraries. Onehunga Library is the current project underway. Furniture ordered for Onehunga Library and physical works tender released for the carpet replacement and air conditioning upgrade. Next steps: physical works anticipated to commence by June 2019, depending on contractor availability. Future works for Glen Innes, and Panmure Library are proposed in the future CF work programme to begin in financial year 2019/2020.</td>
<td>Current status: The renewal works for Onehunga Library were completed in June 2019. This project delivered an interior refurbishment including carpet replacement, installation of glass tiling for the children's area and furniture renewal. Works also included an air conditioning upgrade. Next steps: In FY19/20, this project will be unbundled and referred to as Onehunga Library - renew furniture fixtures and equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2133</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - renew pavers, car park and structure FY17+</td>
<td>Renew pavers, carpark and structures at various sites. Priority sites identified as follows: Communal Reserve, Eastview Reserve, Ferguson Domain, Heron Reserve, Johnston Reserve, Merce Reserve, Maunganui Reserve, MGM Parade Reserve, Hall Burgess Reserve, Panmure Basin, Point England Reserve, Rockfield Reserve, Ruapotaka Reserve, Savage Park, Tawhia Reserve and Thompson Park. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2361). Sites to be prioritised by the local board</td>
<td>Sites to be prioritised by the local board</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$30,000 ARS - Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Pavement and structure renewals within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki area are currently being carried out. Next steps: complete pavement and structure works as identified for the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki area to 30 June 2019.</td>
<td>Current status: Pavement and structure renewals within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki have been completed for the 2018/2019 financial year. Next steps: Develop programme of pavement and structure renewals within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki area for implementation in the 2020/2021 year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2134</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - renew park &amp; car parks FY19+</td>
<td>Renew car parks and car parking at various sites. Priority sites identified as follows: Car Parks: Albert Reserve, Bert Hemsley Park, Captain Spring Reserve, Harbours Park, Jardine Park, Maybury Reserve, Park Roads Reserve, Riverhead Reserve, The Great Thicket, Maybury ReserveStage one - investigation (including options for sites that would benefit from an increased level of service to propose to the local board), scope and physical works. Stage two - physical works</td>
<td>Sites to be prioritised by the local board</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$10,000 ARS - Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Assessments for these assets are anticipated to be completed in March 2019 where the scope can be determined for renewal works. Next steps: Once the assessment has been completed, the options for the renewal will be recorded for consideration and prioritisation.</td>
<td>Current status: The field assessment of asset conditions to inform the Long Term Renewals Programme in the Local Board Area. In conjunction with the field activity, the progression of data analysis and early development of discovery documentation: next steps. The prioritisation of asset renewals and development of discovery documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2135</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - renew play spaces FY18+</td>
<td>Renew play equipment at various sites including playgrounds, stands, half courts. Priority sites identified as: Ferguson Domain, Ferguson Reserve, Heron Domain, Onehunga War Memorial Pool, Memboy Reserve, One Tree Hill Domain, Onehunga Bay Reserve, Panmure Basin, Savage Park, Playground Glen Innes ShopsStage one - investigation and design (including options for sites that would benefit from an increased level of service to propose to the local board), Stage two - physical works.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$15,000 ARS - Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Assessments for these assets are anticipated to be completed in March 2019 where the scope can be determined for renewal works. Next steps: Once the assessment has been completed the options for the renewal will be recorded for consideration and prioritisation.</td>
<td>Current status: The field assessment of asset conditions to inform the Long Term Renewals Programme in the Local Board Area. In conjunction with the field activity, the progression of data analysis and early development of discovery documentation: next steps. The prioritisation of asset renewals and development of discovery documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2136</td>
<td>Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve - renew coastal wall &amp; seawall FY19</td>
<td>Mount Wellington War Memorial Reserve seawall renewal. Renewal of the coastal structures at Dunkirk Reserve and Riverside Reserve. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2812). No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$550,000 ARS - Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Construction works are complete. Planting along the cliff face, between the rock revetment and the edge of the Dunkirk reserve will be carried out during winter planting season. Next steps: Complete planting and handover project for operational maintenance.</td>
<td>Current status: The project was completed in March 2019. Damaged areas of the rock wall on the northern end of Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve were rebuilt. Damaged and eroded sections of the rock revetment at Riverside Reserve and Dunkirk Reserve have also been rebuilt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Further Decision Points</td>
<td>Lead Dept / Unit / COO</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Activity Status</td>
<td>RAG</td>
<td>Q3 Commentary</td>
<td>Q4 Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2137</td>
<td>Onetangi Bay Reserve - implement concept plan</td>
<td>Implement concept plan - hard landscaping, car park, footpaths - the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board adopted the Onetangi Bay Reserve Concept Plan in August 2012. Some of the projects were brought forward and prioritised to coincide with Taitamaki Park development. This project aims to deliver the remaining projects which have been prioritised with the number one priority as the play space development followed by the skate park and basketball projects, peripheral lagoon amenity enhancements and improved signage.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2140</td>
<td>Onetangi War Memorial Pool - comprehensive renewal</td>
<td>Comprehensive Upgrade, including:</td>
<td>no further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals, LDI: Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status: Stage 1 work to the Sauna, Steam Room, Plunge Pool, Starting Blocks and Bench Seats is complete. Next steps: Stage 2 works to renew the Changing Rooms and Foyer are to be documented between March and June 2019, with Contractor procurement mid-year in 2019 and works planned for late 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2141</td>
<td>Panmure Basin - renew play space</td>
<td>Renew the playground including the 1 bar swings. Stage one - investigate, design and scope physical works (including options to propose to the local board for assets that may benefit from an increased level of service). Stage two - physical works commence. This project is a multi-year funded project to be initiated as part of the 2018/19 programme.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Concept design approved by the local board. Consent application to be lodged next week. Next steps: Finalise detailed design and tender documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2142</td>
<td>Panmure Community Centre - refurbish interior</td>
<td>Internal renewal of ventilation system, main hall / stage area, both side rooms and kitchen - enhance foyer and toilet areas. This project is a continuation of the 2018/19 programme (previous SP18 ID 2334).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Roof seating and roof leaks remedial works completed December 2018. Next steps: Handover to the operational maintenance team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2143</td>
<td>Panmure Library - refurbish and replace partial roof</td>
<td>Comprehensive building refurb, including carpet and vertical in both public and staff areas. This project is a continuation of the 2018/19 programme (previous SP18 ID 2336).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$658,860</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Water tightness repairs to the roof completed December 2018. Next steps: Handover to the operational maintenance team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2144</td>
<td>Panmure Wharf - refresh</td>
<td>Panmure Wharf Reserve wharf refresh. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2072).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2145</td>
<td>Pearce Street Community Hall - refurbish interior</td>
<td>Interior refurbishment requires renewal of seating, walls, doors, bathrooms and kitchen. Year one - investigations (including options for sites that would benefit from an increased level of service to propose to the local board), scoping and physical works, year two - physical works.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Scoping of interior refurbishment complete, compiling palettes for interior refurbishments and expected costs. Next steps: Complete scoping and gain approval for extent of refurbishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2146</td>
<td>Riverside Community Centre - renew signage and renew fencing</td>
<td>Replace the sign and renew the fence which is falling due to a tree encroachment.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This project was completed in early April 2019. A new Riverside Community Centre sign and boundary fencing were installed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Further Decision Project</td>
<td>Lead Dept / Unit or COGD</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Activity Phase</td>
<td>RAG</td>
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<td>Q4 Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2147</td>
<td>Stone Cottage - renew roof and rainway</td>
<td>Renew roof and rainway to ensure weather tightness. This project is a continuation of the 2017/18 programme (previous SP18 ID 2329).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$20,000 ARS - Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Current status: Project has been identified as not ready for delivery as it requires further strategic assessment from Community Services. Project is currently on hold due to seismic implications. The seismic team will undertake an investigation and recommend a way forward for this project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2148</td>
<td>Waiaraka Park - improve sports park and extend fields 8, 9 and 10</td>
<td>Three soccer playing fields - two artificial turf fields and one astroturf field. Floodlighting to sports fields. Toilet block and changing facilities. An additional 100 car parking spaces. One children’s playground, and football and cycleway connections to the adjacent coastal cycle and walkway, the neighbouring cemetery and Waiaraka Park. Bundled project: Sports field upgrades and improvements - concept and phasing plan. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2373).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$260,000 ARS - Capex - Development; ARS - Capex - Growth</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status: Consultant engaged to start work on site investigation and development of concept. Working with Closed Landfill on options to be considered in concept design. Next steps: Workshop concept design with local board April 2019. Seeking update from REZEA on West End Link. Physical works budget deferred to financial year 2018/2020.</td>
<td>The land currently has a notice of requirement from New Zealand Transport Agency for the East West Link motorway project. Proposed work on the Waiaraka Precinct Master Plan will inform scope of works within sports park. Develop a new concept design subject to New Zealand Transport Agency approval. Physical works budget deferred to financial year 2018/2020. Current status: Sport field layout concepts prepared. Preparing scope of works for an update of geotechnical and contamination investigations and a scope of works for sport field and lighting design. Working with Closed Landfill on options to be considered in concept design. Next steps: Continue working with Sport Strategy and Development Team on Waiaraka Precinct Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2149</td>
<td>Waiaraka Park - Renew Cemetery, park furniture</td>
<td>Waiaraka Park Cemetery paths, roads, seats and tables renewal. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2373).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$197,000 ARS - Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: A topographical survey and pavement design has been completed for the Waiaraka Cemetery access road and pavement renewal. Next steps: Prepare a physical works contract to carry out the access road renewal works as scoped, commencing April 2019.</td>
<td>Current status: A detailed pavement renewal design has been completed for the cemetery access roads. A physical works contractor is being procured to carry out the pavement renewal commencing in July 2019. Next steps: Carry out cemetry access road pavement renewals as designed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2150</td>
<td>Tamaki Greenways - develop a shared path</td>
<td>Creation of a shared path from Panmure Wharf to Waiaraka Nature Reserve. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 2374).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$180,000 ARS - Capex - Growth</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Construction works between Panmure Wharf Reserve and Omaru Creek, Point England are complete and the walkway open for use. The new Omaru bridge is complete however it is still closed off from public access until compliance certification has been granted and the Kanoa Place link completed. Construction of the Kanoa Place path was been delayed due to consent issues however works are now underway and scheduled to be completed by end of April 2019. Next steps: Complete physical works by the end of April 2019, subject to weather conditions. Signage for the path has been placed on hold until a formal route name for the path has been agreed to with the Local Board and Mana Whenua. Planting works have been postponed until the next planting season (between April - June 2019) to allow for better plant survival rates.</td>
<td>Current status: Construction work including planting works are complete and the walkway is open for use. Signage for the path has been placed on hold until a formal route name for the path has been agreed to with the local board and mana whenua. The scope of works included a 3km wide pathway from Panmure Wharf to Kanoa Place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2151</td>
<td>Tamaki Reserve - general park development</td>
<td>Develop park as part of the Tamaki Regeneration. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 3215).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$580,000 ARS - Capex - Growth</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Resource consent pre-application meeting completed with additional supporting material currently being produced. Resource consent lodgement expected before end April 2019. Next steps: Detailed design to follow consent decision with physical works anticipated to start before end 2019.</td>
<td>Current status: Resource consent lodged June 2019. Next steps: Detailed design to follow consent decision with physical works anticipated to start before 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2152</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - LDI minor capital fund 2018/19</td>
<td>Funding to deliver minor capex projects throughout the financial year as approved in the monthly local board workshops.</td>
<td>Options to be approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$50,000 LDI - Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status: Projects to be funded from the LDI minor capex fund are yet to be identified. Potential projects will be presented to the local board for consideration and approval. Next steps: Workshop with the local board to confirm the minor new assets to be allocated Locally Driven Initiative minor Capex funding and submit a report for funding approval.</td>
<td>Current status: Projects to be funded from the LDI minor capex fund are yet to be identified. Potential projects will be presented to the local board for consideration and approval. Next steps: Workshop with the local board to confirm the minor new assets to be allocated Locally Driven Initiative minor Capex funding and submit a report for funding approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
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<td>Decision Points</td>
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</tr>
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<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2153</td>
<td>Onehunga Bay Reserve - build skatepark</td>
<td>Construct a new street style skate facility that will complement the existing wet ramp and complement the range of skateboard provision. The provision of a new street style skate facility will appeal to a broader range of users and age groups which will increase participation and usage. Stages one - investigate, design and scope physical works (including options to propose to the local board for assets that may benefit from an increased level of service). Stage two - physical works commence. This project is a multi-year funded project and is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme. $490,000 of the board's discretionary funding was allocated to this project in 2017/2018.</td>
<td>Design options to be approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$600,000 LDI Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Completed workshop with the local board to refine the design brief so that work can start on consultation with stakeholders. Ground investigations are underway. Consultation with Mana Whenua being scheduled to be undertaken in April 2019. A plan for stakeholder and public consultation is being drafted and will be presented to the local board for feedback by the end of April 2019. Next step: Complete the concept design stage by June 2019.</td>
<td>Current status: Procurement underway for design and commenting for the skatepark and basketball court. Next step: Complete preliminary design and present consultation plans for local board approval in August 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2154</td>
<td>Ferguson Domain - renew and upgrade courts to multi-purpose courts</td>
<td>Renew and increase the level of service of the courts by upgrading to multi-sport courts. Options to be approved by local board</td>
<td>CF Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$18,000 LDI Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: The work is under design as part of the master plan. Next steps: Procurement of Physical work.</td>
<td>Current status: Development of the detail concept design. Next steps: Prepare project procurement process for the delivery of physical works.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2158</td>
<td>Mt Wellington War Memorial - renew sand shed in training area</td>
<td>Sand silts drainage and irrigation. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous SP18 ID 3112). No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF Project Delivery</td>
<td>$260,000 ARS Capex Renewals</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed.</td>
<td>This project was completed in June 2018. The outcomes include: complete installation of an in-ground irrigation system on field number one, installation of a sand carpet on the designated training area, and removal of the sand carpet on field number two.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2759</td>
<td>Eyre View Reserves - develop general park</td>
<td>Develop park as part of the Tamaki Regeneration priority projects. (Details to be provided before the end of the calendar year) Options to be approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$25,000 ARS Capex Growth</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Consultants engaged for professional services with investigations and consultation phase underway. Next steps: Investigations, consultation and preliminary design due for completion before August 2019.</td>
<td>Current status: Investigations and preliminary design underway along with co-design process for Tamaki Reserves Community Engagement Strategy. Next steps: Preliminary design due for completion before December 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2760</td>
<td>Hochstatter Pond - install interpretation signage</td>
<td>Complete investigation and design phase and install interpretation signage for Hochstatter Pond. Options to be approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$15,000 LDI Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Concept design being prepared for local board approval. Next steps: Engage contractor for manufacturing and install of the sign.</td>
<td>Current status: Concept design progressing well, however this sign installation will require resource consent which has caused some delays. Consent application being prepared. Next steps: Concept design anticipated to be ready for Local Board approval by August 2019 when resource consent can also be submitted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2761</td>
<td>Communalist Playground - renew play space</td>
<td>Renew play space. Stage one - investigate, design and scope physical works (including options to propose to the local board for assets that will benefit from an increased level of service). Stage two - playground improvements. Stage two - physical works commence. This project is a multi-year funded project and is a continuation of the 2018/2019 programme.</td>
<td>Options to be approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$50,000 LDI Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Design approved by the local board at the February 2019 workshop. Consent has been approved. Procurement for playground equipment is currently underway. Next steps: Complete procurement to playground equipment and finalise design documentation for construction works tender. Construction works are expected to start in late April 2019.</td>
<td>Current status: Physical works underway to upgrade the playground and install drinking fountain. Next steps: Complete construction works by mid August 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2762</td>
<td>Maybury Reserve - develop general park</td>
<td>Develop park as part of the Tamaki Regeneration priority projects. (Details to be provided before the end of the calendar year). Options to be approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$25,000 ARS Capex Growth</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Agreement in principle reached with Ruapohone Marae on their development location. Discussions with TRC scheduled to seek additional land to allow for reserve development. Next steps: Procurement for professional services to begin following discussions and agreement from TRC on land exchange. Concept design phase anticipated commencing mid 2019.</td>
<td>Current status: Agreement in principle reached with Ruapohone Marae on their development location. Await the Tamaki Regeneration Company response on land exchange proposals to allow for reserve development. Next steps: Procurement for professional services to begin following discussions and agreement from TRC on land exchange. Concept design phase anticipatedcommencing mid 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2777</td>
<td>Waioeka Nature Reserve - develop nature trail</td>
<td>Investigate the options for a nature trail and present to the local board with cost estimates for further decision making. Design to be approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$260,000 LDI Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Presentation to the local board on the scope of works completed. Start on concept designs options for local board review by June 2019. Next steps: Workshop with the local board to confirm scoping and progress through the concept design stage in June 2019.</td>
<td>Current status: Site investigations underway and consultation plan being drawn up for local board approval in August 2019. Project timelines have been adjusted to allow for consultation and also allow for construction in summer when ground conditions are good. Next steps: Complete feasibility stage and provide options to the local board for progress to the next stage by February 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit/ COG</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2778</td>
<td>Panmure Basin - implement mastepillar priorities</td>
<td>Designs to be approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF Project Delivery</td>
<td>$180,000 AB$ Capex - Growth</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Physical works complete. Planting to be undertaken in April 2019. Parking bays to be installed. Next steps: Complete all planting works by end of April 2019. Project is complete. The detailed works include the widening of the footpath between Panmure Reserves car park and the Van Damms lagoon created by the new footbridge.</td>
<td>Project is complete. The detailed works include the widening of the footpath between Panmure Reserves car park and the Van Damms lagoon created by the new footbridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2795</td>
<td>Jellicoe Park - install two lighting</td>
<td>Options to be reviewed by the local board</td>
<td>CF Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$15,000 LDI - Capex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Investigation and design for a permanent lighting solution of the tree in Jellicoe Park will be given in Q4. The board will be advised of initial assessment findings. Next steps: Investigate the potential for a permanent lighting installation of the tree.</td>
<td>The project to investigate options for permanent lighting of the tree in Jellicoe Park is a feasibility phase. A feasibility study will be submitted to the local board to seek further direction. A permanent solution may not be in place for December 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2796</td>
<td>Ian Stanaway Reserve - renew car park</td>
<td>Design options to be reviewed and approved by the local board</td>
<td>CF Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$15,000 AB$ - Capex - Renewals; External funding</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Renewals have not yet begun. Next steps: Project to be assigned and investigation will commence.</td>
<td>Current status: Initiate investigation and design. Next steps: Prepare scope of works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2883</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - upgrade fire system and electrical switchboards</td>
<td>Upgrade fire alarm systems and electrical switchboards, including installation of fire safety building work</td>
<td>CF Project Delivery</td>
<td>$38,104 AB$ - Development</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Physical works have been completed. Next steps: Closing out final documentation for the certification of the new fire system. Building warrant of fitness has been updated accordingly.</td>
<td>This project was completed in March 2019. The upgraded fire and electrical systems are complete and have been certified. Building warrants of fitness have been updated accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2885</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - upgrade fire system &amp; electrical switchboards</td>
<td>Upgrade fire system and electrical switchboards</td>
<td>CF Project Delivery</td>
<td>$24,000 All $ - Capex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Physical works have been completed. Next steps: Issuing closing out final documentation for the certification of the new fire system. Building warrant of fitness has been updated accordingly.</td>
<td>This project was completed in March 2019. The upgraded fire and electrical systems are complete and have been certified. Building warrants of fitness have been updated accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2920</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - renew signage</td>
<td>MT Signage Renewal</td>
<td>CF Project Delivery</td>
<td>$52,273 AB$ - Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status: Identifying the reserves in need of sign replacement in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki. Next steps: Producing plan for local board approval.</td>
<td>Current status: Reserves in need of sign renewal have been identified. Next steps: Local board approves which reserves are the highest priority for sign renewal. Project is complete. The scope of works included the installation of 2 Eteoke toilets (Unisex) and a drinking fountain next to the playground at Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2958</td>
<td>Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve - open space improvements</td>
<td>Upgrade park furniture, signage and connections</td>
<td>CF Project Delivery</td>
<td>$283,973 Growth</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Physical work for installation of new toilets next to the playground are underway. Project completion has been delayed until mid-April 2019, due to delays with Vector connections and requirement for relaxing the toilets. Next steps: Project to be completed by mid-April 2019.</td>
<td>Project is complete. The scope of works included the installation of 2 Eteoke toilets (Unisex) and a drinking fountain next to the playground at Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2962</td>
<td>Glen Innes Pool - install CCTV cameras in car park &amp; renew roof &amp; spa heat pump</td>
<td>Install CCTV cameras in car park, renew roof and spa heat pump</td>
<td>CF Project Delivery</td>
<td>$18,917 AB$ - Capex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Physical works are complete. Next steps: Project is complete.</td>
<td>Project is complete and the CCTV installation has improved the security of provided added confidence to the staff on duty. Since the installation, incidents, costs for repairs and maintenance have declined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2991</td>
<td>Panmure Basin - renew jetty and rock wall</td>
<td>Project includes renewal of Panmure Basin Jetty and Panmure Basin Wall</td>
<td>CF Project Delivery</td>
<td>$50 AB$</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed.</td>
<td>Project is complete and renewed jetty is open for access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2992</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - renew advance pavements</td>
<td>Eastwhare Reserve, Ferguson Domain, Konun Reserve, Parahia Reserve, Simson Reserve, Skinner Reserve, Taunaha Reserve, Te Kawa Reserve, Thompson Park path, car park and road renewals</td>
<td>CF Project Delivery</td>
<td>$64,336 All $ - Capex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed.</td>
<td>The renewal of the loosetops are complete for the following sites: Ferguson Domain, Parahia, Konun and Te Kawa Reserves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
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<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3033</td>
<td>T-Bar Swings - replace in central area MT</td>
<td>Replace T-Bar Swings. This project is carried over from the 2017/18 programme (previous ID 3395)</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$32,957</td>
<td>AR6: Capex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3043</td>
<td>Onetangi War Memorial Pool - remove tree &amp; renew boundary wall</td>
<td>Remove tree, renew boundary wall. This project is carried over from the 2017/18 programme (previous ID 3132).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$30,750</td>
<td>AR8: Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3084</td>
<td>Jordan Recreation Centre - refurbish stadium and changing room</td>
<td>Refurbish the stadium to ensure the facility remains fit for purpose. Change room refurbishment to make and female change rooms in stadium. The project was carried forward from FY17/18, previous SharePoint ID K2345</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$80,946</td>
<td>AR6: Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3107</td>
<td>Orakei Community Centre - renew CCTV system</td>
<td>Renew CCTV system. This project is carried over from FY2017/18, previous SharePoint ID K2333</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$21,830</td>
<td>AR8: Capex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3192</td>
<td>Gerrard Benson Place - demolish toilet block</td>
<td>Overview: Demolish the toilet block which is no longer a functional asset and is a health and safety concern for the local community. Current status - stage one - toilet block has been demolished. Stage two - concrete slab to be removed with approval from Auckland Transport.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>AR8: Regional</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3217</td>
<td>Waitakiri Park - Grandstand - demolish</td>
<td>Demolition of grandstand</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>AR8: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3352</td>
<td>Mt Wellington War Memorial Park - new dual toilet facility</td>
<td>This project will provide a new dual toilet facility</td>
<td>Design to be agreed with local board</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>AR8: Capex - Growth</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Services - Service Strategy and Integration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit / CCO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1399</td>
<td>Investigate community facility requirements in Glen Innes and Panmure to support TRC and Panuku programmes</td>
<td>Improve Glen Innes Hall as part of the future implementation of the Rangakau Reserve Master Plan and investigate possible connections with Te Irirangi. Investigate provision of library facilities in this area giving consideration to facility condition as necessary</td>
<td>Further decision anticipated on business case for Panmure Community Facility in 2019/20 financial year. Further decisions relating to long term future provision of community and library services in Glen Innes to be determined</td>
<td>CS - Service Strategy and Integration</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>AR8: Regional</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept/ Unit/ CGO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 674 | Water Quality Monitoring Follow Up                | To continue to deliver water quality testing in the following areas:  
• Panmure Basin  
• Ian Shaw Park  
• Panmure Water Reserve. | No further decisions are anticipated | N&CS: Healthy Waters | $5,000 | LDI: Opex | Green | Due to the unusually dry summer, water testing has shown good water quality across the five monitored sites. These sites will continue to be monitored as a part of the Tāmaki programme. Microbial source tracking will be undertaken during wet weather events which are likely to occur during quarter four. | A plan to conduct sampling at the eight stormwater outlets during four dry and four wet weather conditions has been finalised. Samples that are above the e. coli standard of 100 MPN/100ml will undergo analysis to determine the source of faecal contaminants (human, dog, avian). This monitoring has been funded by the local board and supplemented with Healthy Waters - Safe Waters funded to deliver a thorough screening. Sampling will begin before the end of the 2018/2019 financial year with all budget allocated. It is estimated that to get adequate samples and targeted wet and dry weather conditions, this could take up to six months. |
| 904 | Tamaki Estuary Environmental Forum Coordinator - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki | To see Te Wa o Taik (the Tamaki Estuary) as 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 Waitakere Harbour and the Hauraki Gulf. (Tamaki Estuary Environment Forum vision).  
Specifically this budget will fund a coordinator at 12 hours per week to support the Tamaki Estuary Environmental Forum (TEEF), and support groups in progressing the above vision for the Tamaki estuary.  
TEEF operates as a collaboration between five local boards, and several community organisations, to advocate for the Tamaki catchment. This year will see exploration of additional funding sources and sponsors to support aspirations of the group. TEEF also hopes to partner with academic institutions to discover more about the environmental issues and social interactions of communities within the Tamaki catchment. | No further decisions are anticipated | N&CS: Healthy Waters | $5,000 | LDI: Opex | Green | Bi-monthly meetings continued during quarter three and new attendees have included Chinese Conservation Education Trust, Our Seas Our Future and a representative from the Hauraki Gulf Forum. Two clean-up events in partnership with Conservation Volunteers New Zealand were completed during quarter three, 49 volunteers attended the events and 850 kilograms of rubbish was collected. A Hurtle Hunt enabling student investigation of micro-plastics around Tamaki Estuary was facilitated during and following sea week in March 2019. | Bi-monthly meetings continued during quarter four. Four clean-up events were organised through Conservation Volunteers New Zealand at locations around the estuary, resulting in 148 volunteers participating and 1000 kilograms of rubbish collected. The Hurtle Hunt project was held at three of these clean-up events. Hurtle Hunts are to highlight the problem of micro-plastics in the estuary and educate about the need for increased enforcement of trade waste and stormwater by-laws for businesses using or producing micro-plastics. A Facebook group for the forum has been set up to share communications about the group and other relevant information. |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or COO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>909</td>
<td>Maungakiekie Harbour Forum</td>
<td>To implement the Maungakiekie Harbour Forum work programme. The proposed work programme includes a governance review, communications plan, symposium, and an education project</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>R&amp;I: Healthy Waters</td>
<td>$18,000 LDL: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>In February the forum supported a community focused Maungakiekie Harbour Forum stall at the Chatsworth Festival, presenting an integrated display with the Our Water Future engagement staff and resulting in at least 80 face to face interactions with the public. The stall was well attended by elected members and supported by council’s Sustainable Schools team and participants from the youth leadership program. February also saw the distribution of the forum’s newsletter and the online publication of the forum’s video project, which was shared and promoted via social media channels. The governance and management review, which was due to begin in quarter three, will begin in April 2019. Planning is underway for a one-day symposium event to be held in June 2019. Planning for the model small site field day event was finalised in March 2019 and the event will be held in Pukekohe on the 18 April 2019. The youth leadership programme workshops will take place over 15 – 17 April 2019. Invitations to forum members to participate in the workshops were sent in late March 2019. This work programme was not able to be delivered within this financial year due to the governance and management review not beginning until June 2019, and the symposium and community event forum being rescheduled from June to August 2019. Accrual of the 2018/2019 budget allocation for the symposium event will occur in the year ended 30 June 2019. Changes to the programme will be made to ensure that the programme is delivered in a comprehensive manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>929</td>
<td>Love Your Neighborhood (EcoMatters Environment Trust)</td>
<td>Provide rapid response assistance up to a value of $500 to support volunteer driven practical environmental initiatives e.g. environmental clean ups and restorations, community planting and food growing; includes providing practical assistance to low-income preschools to enable environmental education initiatives; in particular edible gardens and water saving/collection devices.</td>
<td>No further decisions are anticipated</td>
<td>H&amp;I: Environmental Services</td>
<td>$18,000 LDL: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>In quarter three Love Your Neighborhood did not receive any applications, leaving $4,500 allocated and $4,500 remaining to be allocated. Quarter four will focus on communication to garner further interest in the programme across the community. This will be achieved through emails to schools and early childhood centres, as well as posters in libraries and community centres. Mount Wellington Playcentre received previous benefits from the grant and submitted positive feedback in their accountability report. They were able to purchase high quality composting equipment which, from a health and safety perspective, has removed an environment which was attractive to rats which are a potential hazard. It created a safer outdoor area for children to play in and access to composting bins. Children in the playcentre were therefore able to learn and be encouraged about composting and worm farming. To date 15 applications have been approved in Maungakiekie/Tamaki, with $3,000 of the project budget spent and the remaining $500 is assigned to one further application in the process of being finalised. A meeting to schools and kindergartens generated good responses and one to one engagement with community groups is required. The funding for this programme is being hosted by Environment Trust (ET) who require environmental funding has proven successful at generating applications. Grace International Church has set up a community garden with the grant received. A weekly garden session is held which is available to the 60 residents that live in the accommodation complex of the church. Residents can learn about growing and harvesting the vegetables that grow on site, and cooking events are organised to encourage healthy eating within the community. Currently four adults plus numerous children from the church are involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Required</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or GO</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>Low Carbon Lifestyle - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>The project has two objectives: to reduce residential energy use and associated carbon emissions and improve resident health by limiting energy use. Insulation, efficient heating, and efficient heating are critical to improved health outcomes in poor quality housing. Engagement with residents helps to reduce energy use. The project involves doubling provision of home energy advice and/or energy saving devices to residents, including new migrants, in high-priority locations within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki local board area as determined via census data. Follow-up survey of participants to evaluate effectiveness of action taken as a result of the provision of advice, information, and/or targeted energy efficiency devices for use at home.</td>
<td>No further decisions are anticipated.</td>
<td>IEES: Environmental Services</td>
<td>$25,000 LDR: Oper</td>
<td>Completed Green</td>
<td>The project will take place in the Mount Wellington area in May 2019. The bulk of the delivery will be carried out in quarter four and the project is on track to engage a total of 200 households. Calculations of carbon and energy savings from participants completing recommended actions will be provided in the final report to the local board. Engagement with 209 households has been completed in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki (790 residents), exceeding the target of 200 households. Follow-up conversations with participating residents are now complete and a report will be prepared to establish which energy saving actions were planned and completed, as well as the carbon and financial savings that have resulted from those behavioural changes. This will be made available to the board in quarter one, 2019.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951</td>
<td>Experiential learning and action for Weber in schools</td>
<td>This school project focuses on students connecting to the environment (water focus) through experiential learning resulting in students undertaking actions in their local community.</td>
<td>No further decisions are anticipated.</td>
<td>IEES: Environmental Services</td>
<td>$49,000 LDR: Oper</td>
<td>Completed Green</td>
<td>Auckland Zoo has been confirmed as the contractor for this project. They have a scoped programme of work which will include immersive experiential water education for students. They have engaged with teachers to ensure connections with curriculum, build students' prior knowledge and finalise details for further programme delivery in quarter four.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>952</td>
<td>Pest education and management for schools</td>
<td>This project focuses on educating and empowering school students to undertake pest management in their schools and households to improve biodiversity (focus on rats and moth plant).</td>
<td>There are no further decisions required for 2018/2019.</td>
<td>IEES: Environmental Services</td>
<td>$20,000 LDR: Oper</td>
<td>Completed Green</td>
<td>Auckland Zoo has been confirmed as the contractor for this project. They have a scoped programme of work which will include building students' connections to their local place and knowledge of New Zealand’s biodiversity and threats. Auckland Zoo has engaged teachers to ensure this project connects with the curriculum, builds on students' prior knowledge and the details for programme delivery will be confirmed in quarter four.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CCD</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2854</td>
<td>Healthy Rentals (Maungakiekie-Tāmaki)</td>
<td>The healthy rentals project aims to improve the quality of rental housing and improve household energy efficiency. The programme is targeted at private rental properties with low housing quality, low income tenants, or tenants who have health conditions related to cold/damp housing. Landlords receive assistance to meet their obligations under the current changes to the Residential Tenancies Act and provides incentives for install isolation, clean heating and interventions to control dampness. The project 1. Provides landlords with free independent technical assessment of their rental property using a housing WOF model. 2. Offers subsidies to landlords to make improvements that increase the overall energy efficiency and health of the rental home. The subsidy adds to existing schemes such as EECa “Warm up NZ” insulation subsidies and Retrofit Your Home, to further incentivise landlords to make improvements. 3. Educate tenants on how they can improve the health of their home and save money on their power bills through behaviour changes which they can take with them to future rental properties. Tenants are provided with a gift pack of items to support the goals of the programme. Note: the budget for this activity is deferred from 2017/2018.</td>
<td>No further decisions are anticipated</td>
<td>E&amp;I: Environmental Services</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>LD: Opex</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>The 2017/2018 healthy rentals year-end report was completed and provided to the local board via email in November 2018. All funds carried over from the previous financial year have been utilised. This project is now complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3326</td>
<td>Industry Pollution Prevention Programme - reviews</td>
<td>This project will revisit businesses in the Penrose industrial area who took part in the board’s 2015/2016 Industry Pollution Prevention Programme. Updates of recommendations provided during the initial project were around 50 per cent. Examples of recommendations include ensuring adequate bunding for liquids, spill kits and training for staff, installing signage. The 2016/2017 programme will include a repeat site inspection and discussion with the business owners about potential issues around pollution, as well as waste minimisation techniques and spill training. If changes are recommended, a report will be sent to the business. The revisits will also capture new businesses to the area, or provide opportunity for new staff to be educated on pollution hazards and best practice.</td>
<td>No further decisions required</td>
<td>E&amp;I: Healthy Waters</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>LD: Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This project was approved at the February 2019 business meeting (resolution MT/2019/0/3). The contractor has been engaged and revisits will take place during quarter four.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1139</td>
<td>Provision of Library Service (Maungakiekie-Tāmaki)</td>
<td>Deliver a library service - Help customers find what they need, when they need it, and help them navigate our services and digital offerings. Providing information, library collection lending services and eResources as well as support for customers using Library digital resources, PCs and WiFi. Hours of service - Glen Innes Library for 52 hours over 6 days per week ($344.577). - Onehunga Library for 52 hours over 7 days per week ($507.774). - Panmure Library for 56 hours over 7 days per week ($489.969).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>C&amp;S: Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>$1,241,500</td>
<td>ASIL: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The popular kids library to kids summer reading programme included a selection of digital activities as part of the children’s challenges. Library staff continue to provide extensive one-on-one learning sessions and device troubleshooting to any member of the public who is keen to increase their PC and digital device skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Activity Name - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Further Decision Points</td>
<td>Lead Dept / Unit or COG</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Activity Status</td>
<td>RAG</td>
<td>Q3 Commentary</td>
<td>Q4 Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140</td>
<td>Preschool programming - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Provide programming for preschoolers that encourages early literacy, active movement, and supports parents and caregivers to participate confidently in their children’s early development and learning. Programmes include: Wengie and Rhyme, Rhymetime, Storytime.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ARS: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>All preschool programming across the three libraries restarted in February after a short break during Christmas and New Year holidays, including outreach visits to Early Childhood Centres and Kindergartens. Wengie and Rhyme sessions at Onehunga Library have seen an increase with an average of 68 in attendance per session. Preschool programming continues to play an important part in our day-to-day services. The programme occurs in collaboration with other partners making a learning fun experience. It also offers parents/carers a way to socialise and make connections in the community. Libraries respond to the needs of their communities with resources in a variety of languages, by celebrating events such as language weeks and supporting diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1141</td>
<td>Children and Youth engagement - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Provide children and youth services and programming which encourage, learning literacy and social interaction. Engage with children, youth and whānau along with local schools to support literacy and greater awareness of library resources. Provide a flagship language and literacy building summer reading programme for 5-13 year olds.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ARS: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Ka Mau te Whā, Dare to Explore 2018/19, Auckland Libraries’ Summer Reading Programme for children, concluded on 31 January. All three libraries celebrated an end-of-programme party supported by the local business associations. All children who completed the programme were invited and treated to entertainment, games, refreshments and given certificates to acknowledge their achievement. Some of these parties were attended by Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Members. All three libraries have restated their outreach to school programmes, including supporting the ‘Wake to Schools’ initiative delivered in collaboration with Auckland Libraries Mobile Service. Programmes throughout the year provide a valuable free service to our communities. Collaboration with other Council areas is a great way of providing value for our customers e.g. working with Te Ao Oto and the Parimaru and Oranga Community Centres. Partnership with CU Youth are well serviced with a variety of activities including book groups, cooking club, homework support, crafts and digital opportunities. Over 21,000 participants have been involved in programmes in 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1142</td>
<td>Support customer and community connection and Celebrate cultural diversity and local places, people and places - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Provide services and programmes that facilitate customer connection with the library and empower communities through collaborative design and partnerships with Council and other agencies. Celebrate local communities, cultural diversity and heritage. Gather, protect and share the stories, old and new, that celebrate our peoples, communities and Tāmaki Makaurau.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ARS: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Parimaru Library, in collaboration with Arts, Community &amp; Events (ACE) delivered the Tamaki Expo, showcasing 35-plus services in the Parimaru area and giving them a platform to network, with over 700 in attendance. All three libraries celebrated Lunar New Year, with displays, bilingual Wengie &amp; Rhyme, Rhyme Time and Story Time sessions, along with cooking, dance and calligraphy sessions Onehunga Library worked in collaboration with Onehunga Business Association (OBA) and Onehunga Community Centre. They also hosted a cross-cultural celebration of dance, music, and singing with their Indian community along with support from the Sari Raves Charitable Trust, Onehunga Chinese Association and SCENE Group from Onehunga Community Centre; Parimaru Library celebrated Rātea Tukutuku Day with an outreach visit to WSC Women’s Group promoting Auckland Libraries community languages. Onehunga Library participated in Onehunga Bay Festival and Parimaru Library in Parimaru Basin Fun Day to promote library membership and services with over 500 interactions throughout the day. Parasol Festival was collaborated across all three libraries with displays, bilingual Wengie &amp; Rhyme, Rhyme Time, Story Time, cooking and fas-making demonstrations. Celebrating our diversity and communities is important throughout the year. Language weeks have been incorporated into all libraries with programming ranging from talks, videos, music, arts and crafts. These prove very popular and the success of them is dependent on community input and support, similarly, other cultural events like the Lunar New Year and Diwali are wonderful opportunities to share and learn about other cultures. Local board Libraries also contribute to larger events within their communities in collaboration with other organisations. Libraries also participate in other regional events e.g. Parimaru supports the Jammies in June charity appeal. Working with the community this year they have donated 75 pairs of jammies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1143</td>
<td>Celebrating Te Ao Māori and strengthening responsiveness to Māori - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Celebrating te ao Māori with events and programmes including regionally coordinated and promoted programmes: Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Māori and Māori Language Week. Engaging with te ao Māori organisations: Whakatūpui te reo Māori, champion and embed reo Māori in our libraries and communities.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ARS: Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>All three libraries celebrated Waitangi Day with themed displays and Wengie and Rhymes, Rhyme Time, and Story Time sessions delivered in Te Reo. There is a combined commitment in the Local Board libraries to provide learning opportunities about Te Ao Māori and Te Reo Māori. not only for customers but also for staff. This is happening throughout the year not just focussing on Waitangi and Māori. Events provide the chance to share and learn through talks music and arts. Regular visits to local Kohanga Reo are a positive link into the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit / COO</th>
<th>Budget ($)</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1144</td>
<td>Learning and Literacy programming and digital literacy support</td>
<td>Provide learning programmes and events throughout the year. Support our customers to embrace new ways of doing things. Lift literacy in the communities that need it most. Help customers to learn and grow, and provide opportunities for knowledge creation and innovation.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>A/R  Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Auckland Libraries are now offering the Spark Jump initiative, with Onawhau Library the latest registered site. Glen Innes Library continues to attract huge interest with 39 pop-up families signing up in March alone. Glen Innes Library have introduced a bilingual digital support session for Montmar speakers following customer feedback. The three libraries hold a total of 56 book a librarian sessions this quarter, an increase of 47%. All libraries are committed to lifelong learning and programming to meet the needs of our individual communities. Whether that is classes for our Chinese, Bhutanese or Tamil residents or digital classes for everyone, libraries are responding to the needs in their area. Over 700 adults have attended classes in our libraries for 2019. There has been an increased demand for digital literacy and recently at Glen Innes Library basic introductory classes have been provided by an outside organisation. Groups of mainly women and Pacifica many of them elderly, have enjoyed the 30 hour course which offers a cheap new Chronicle book on completion. Libraries support of the Spark Jump initiative has also made access to digital world more accessible and affordable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>MT: Future Giants Tree Planting Programme</td>
<td>Phase 1: Complete Service Provision Assessment to inform specimen tree planting to improve amenity, landscape and biodiversity with a focus on playground shade provision (PSR led, $L3 OP EX requirement). The assessment will be workshoped with the local board before being implemented. Phase 2: Implement specimen tree planting in parks to improve amenity, landscape and biodiversity with a focus on playground shade provision (CF led, $20K LOD CAP EX requirement).</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS PSR - Park Services</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>LD1: Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Sites and locations for tree planting have been identified and the work will be actioned in this coming planning season (May-Aug 2019). Planting will occur in the current planting season which extends into Q5. Community Facilities are delaying the planting at the approved sites (May-Aug 2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>MT: Community Gardens Service Assessment</td>
<td>Complete Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Community Gardens network review and service provision assessment to provide a strategic level view of current provision and identify potential improvements that could be made to the network. Delivery mechanism: Community accessing local board contestable grant allocation process.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS PSR - Park Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>A/R  Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Q3 analysis and findings will be presented to the board at a Q4 workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>MT: Parks: Dog Exercise Service Assessment</td>
<td>Dog exercise network and needs assessment to provide a strategic level view of provision. This will also include the current provision and current usage. The assessment will identify future improvements that could be made to the network in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS PSR - Park Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>A/R  Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Analysis and findings undertaken in Q3 will be presented to the board at a Q4 workshop. The assessment findings were presented to the board in Q4 and identified the potential to improve facilities for dogs by creating a dog exercise / skills area at Onawhau Bay Reserve. The board allocated $10K of capex to undertake feasibility and design for such a facility in Financial Year 2019/2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>MT: specific implementation plan for Auckland's Urban Forest (Hygine) Strategy</td>
<td>To identify a local board area programme to deliver Auckland’s Urban Hygine (Forest) Strategy - urban forest protection, provision and management for public and private landowners. The initial activity for this, the first year, is to complete spatial mapping of the existing tree canopy cover on public and private land in the local board area, to determine the extent, type and age of urban Hygine. This information will be used to develop options and identify any funding required for the following programmes in this first or in years two and three: Growing - find space for planting new trees using partnerships including community groups and schools; Protecting - direct and indirect methods for the community to nominate and protect trees.</td>
<td>Final Hygine Assessment Report will be presented for approval in Q1.</td>
<td>CS PSR - Park Services</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>LD1: Capex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Continued analysis of the data released from the regional LINZ mapping. Initial drafting of the Local Urban Hygine assessment report underway and a first draft is expected for board review in late May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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## Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Anticipated</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CC</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>MT Ecological volunteers and environmental programme FY19</td>
<td>Programme of activity supporting volunteer groups to carry out ecological restoration and environmental programmes in local parks, including: -Community planting events; -Pest and animal pest eradication; -Litter and green waste removal; -Contractor support; -Toilets and equipment; -Beach/stream clean-ups; -Brochures</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS PSR Park Services</td>
<td>$15,000 LDI  Opex</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Volunteer activities in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Parks have focused on ongoing restoration work and animal pest control, coastal nutrient clean-ups, and tree planting – the latter most notably at Point England Reserve. Animal pest control training also took place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1047</td>
<td>Glen Innes Pool &amp; Leisure Centre - Operations</td>
<td>Glen Innes Pool &amp; Leisure Centre in a safe and sustainable manner, through a management agreement with the YMCA. Deliver a variety of accessible programmes and services that get the local community active. These services include: fitness, group fitness, learn to swim, aquatic and recreation services. Along with core programmes that reflect the needs of the local community.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS PSR: Active Recreation</td>
<td>$80 ARS  Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Glen Innes Pool and Leisure Centre experienced a 16% increase in centre visits when measured against the same period last year (December – February). Fitness memberships remained high and aquatic visits increased by 38%, with a December in particular being a very busy month. This is largely due to hosting water safety programs for Tāmaki College and Te Kahurangi Maru School Scienceville. Selwyn College, Auckland UWT, St Kethers and St Kevins have also utilized the pool for their sports programmes. Customer experience scores were down 4% during quarter 3 (using a 12 month rolling average). This experience is reflected in comments around the maintenance of the changing rooms. Staff are preparing for complaints regarding car parking access due to a significant waste water system upgrade outside the facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Lagoon Pool &amp; Leisure Centre - Operations</td>
<td>Operate Lagoon Pool &amp; Leisure Centre, in a safe and sustainable manner, through a management agreement with the YMCA. Deliver a variety of accessible programmes and services that get the local community active. These services include: fitness, group fitness, learn to swim, aquatic and recreation services. Along with core programmes that reflect the needs of the local community.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS PSR: Active Recreation</td>
<td>$80 ARS  Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Lagoon Pool and Leisure Centre experienced a nearly 20% increase in visits when measured against the same period last year (December-February). The largest increases were in aquatic visits (up 29%), particular during December, and 16-24 swimming in February. Lagoon Pool and Leisure Centre continued to be a popular venue for schools, for both swimming lessons and end of year pool activities. During December 2018 over 3,100 children from different schools utilised the indoor and outdoor pools. During the annual pool maintenance closure the indoor complex was refurbished, the indoor pool concourse was fully tiled and a new sauna was constructed. The centre has seen a reduction in fitness visitations and expect to see a decline due to new commercial fitness centres opening in the area and parking and access challenges from the AMETI Eastern bypass project. Year to date visitor numbers: 8% increase in facility visits. Customer satisfaction is measured by regular Net Promoter Score (NPS) surveys. This survey asks how likely the users are to recommend the centre to their friends and family. Q4 NPS score = 65.9, this is a 3.0 increase compared to Q3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

27 August 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Further Decision Points</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CODE</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
<th>Q4 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Lagoon Stadium</td>
<td>Operate Lagoon Stadium in a safe and sustainable manner; through a management agreement with the YMCA, deliver a variety of accessible programmes and services that get the local community active. This includes: fitness, group fitness, and recreation services, along with core programmes that reflect the needs of the local community.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>CS PSR Active Recreation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>ABS Opex</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The Lagoon Stadium has seen a large increase in visits of around 30% when measured against the same period last year (December–February). Customer experience scores were up 15% during quarter 3 (using a 12-month rolling average). The Stadium maintains an average of 2,500 users per month with a slight increase on last year's visits. Casual basketball at Lagoon Stadium, as well as regular group hireage, remain steady this year. Year to date visitor numbers: 4% increase in active visits. Customers at the centre have started to experience parking and access issues due to the AME 1 project. The Lagoon Pool and Stadium are mitigating the issues caused by AMETI in various ways, including additional signage, weekly meetings with the project manager and a comprehensive communications strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1451 | Onehunga War Memorial Pool and Leisure Centre Operations | Operate the centre in a safe and sustainable manner, through a management agreement with the YMCA. Deliver a variety of accessible programmes and services that get the local community active. This includes: fitness, group fitness, and recreation services, along with core programmes that reflect the needs of the local community. | No further decisions anticipated | CS PSR Active Recreation | $0 | ABS Opex | Completed | Green | Onehunga War Memorial Pool experienced a 14% decrease in centre visits when measured against the same period last year (December–February). The pool was closed for annual maintenance in January and this has impacted the results. Membership remained high with 1,656 members. Compared to the same period last year, aquatics visits and 16s under swimming both decreased by 8% and 4% respectively, however youth recreation activity has grown by 31%. Customer experience scores were down 4.6% during Q3 (using a 12-month rolling average). YMA Auckland and Puketaka were recognised at the Recreation Auckland Aquatic Awards, for the partnership delivering affordable leisure to our local communities. There were three issues which required closures for repairs or extended maintenance. Year to date visitor numbers: 5% decrease in centre visits... Customer satisfaction is measured by regular Net Promoter Score (NPS) surveys. Q4 NPS score – 6.4, this is decrease from Q3. These decreases are likely to be related to the closures. No further allocation in Q4. |

| 2855 | MT: Parks, sports and recreation response fund | Initiatives to improve service provision, by increasing access and utilisation of park, sport and recreation facilities. This is a deficit for the remainder of the FY17/18 activity #1104 budget for $21,600 | No further decisions anticipated | CS PSR Park Services | $21,600 | LDI Opex | Completed | Green | The MTB 4-era investment MTB2/19/1/182 on 27 November 2018 allocated $17,477 from this budget towards the services led by the Parapara Squash Racket club. |

| 1432 | Wellington planning investment | Investigate the need (issues and opportunities) and potential benefits of local spatial planning for the MT Wellington area during 2019/20 only. This may lead to identification of further plan scoping and/or a local spatial plan to be prepared in the future. | CPO: Plans and Places | $0 | Regional | In progress | Green | The item was discussed with Hares and Places staff at a Local Board workshop held on 5 March. The item which involves a scoping study, has very recently commenced and it is intended to update the Local Board on progress during the course of the fourth quarter. |

| 966 | Youth Connections (MKT) | Youth Connections will provide: * Quality advice and expertise on youth employment. Locally, this is done through community-led solutions that identify and support youth for jobs that reflect the youth全力以数 from the job market. Note: the 2018/2019 budget figure shown for this activity includes the $20,000 originally approved plus $3,000 deferred from 2017/2018. * Local opportunities to improve social and economic development outcomes. Aiming for all youth to be meaningfully engaged in education, employment or training, and have clear employment pathways. * Engaged with industry and organisations to identify and address gaps in the youth employment space throughout the council family and the business community. * To build a dynamic environment for youth job seekers and youth employability. | No further decisions anticipated | TSI: The Southern Initiative | $55,800 | LDI Opex, External funding | In progress | Amber | OHE Academy engaged with 17 young people out of this 11 are engaged in further education or training and are working on employment. TSI have engaged with HLC to work with them to identify support and community groups in their capacity building, so they will be able to identify young people from the community and work with them to be able to place in to construction/infrastructure projects. There is expected to be a lot of quality work being done by HLC from opportunities from the housing projects and infrastructure projects in the local area. TSI have also engaged with TOLL New Zealand to place some young people into their cadet programme and use this opportunity to upskill them with training which will assist them to be a valuable staff member who can drive a better income. $7,000 from this budget was not needed to deliver the TOLL: HLC and OHE projects and has been unspent. This budget was reallocated at the local board September business meeting to the local community grants activity (resolution: MT/2019/078). Toll Group programming in on hold as staff member working with us from TOLL is on parental leave. Staff will progress once another contact has been identified. Capacity and capability development of local community groups with HLC – Currently we are on the process of signing the agreement for HLC to work with the local community groups to identify and capability development. HLC has identified the community groups that they are looking to capacity build to provide employment broker role to carry out some construction roles that are coming up in the area. |

Upgrade of Cadet programme at Toll Group - New Zealand – Currently working with the Toll Group to identify the qualifications that can be included to their cadet programme to give the young people the best opportunity in terms of growth within the Toll Group and also to earn more. Currently the staff that has been working on it from Toll Group has gone on parental leave and they are on the process of allocating this to another person in their organisation so we can continue to work on it. Staff will progress once another contact has been identified. |
### Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Entity/Unit or COO</th>
<th>CL- Lease Commencement Date</th>
<th>CL- Right of Renewal Expiry Date</th>
<th>CL- Annual Rent (excluding GST)</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1348</td>
<td>47 Hill Street, Onehunga. Lease to Auckland Playcentres Association Incorporated. Onehunga.</td>
<td>Renew lease to Auckland Playcentres Association Incorporated. Onehunga.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/10/2008</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Completed in quarter three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347</td>
<td>Ian Shaw Reserve, 25A Paname Rd, Mount Wellington. Lease to Auckland Rowing Club Incorporated.</td>
<td>New reserve lease to Auckland Rowing Club. New sublease for premises from Auckland Rowing Club Incorporated to Kings College</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>21/11/2003</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>The group’s lease application will be worked on with the board at the March CF workshop. The matter will go to the Mana Wherene Agenda for May 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345</td>
<td>Mount Wellington War Memorial Reserve, 50 Donnel Road, Panmure. Lease to Mount Wellington Tennis Club Incorporated.</td>
<td>Renew ground and building lease to Mount Wellington Tennis Club Incorporated.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/10/2009</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>Site visit has been arranged with the club, however no lease renewal application has been received. Once all the information has been reviewed and a streamlined renewal process memo will be completed and sent to the local board for their approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349</td>
<td>3 Rowe Street, Onehunga. Lease to Shanti Nives Charitable Trust Incorporated.</td>
<td>Renew ground and building lease to Shanti Nives Charitable Trust.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/02/2014</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Site visit has been arranged with club. Streamlined renewal process memo to be completed thereafter for local board approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350</td>
<td>101 Church Street, Onehunga. Lease to The Asian Network Incorporated.</td>
<td>Renew ground and building lease to The Asian Network Incorporated.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>25/02/2013</td>
<td>1 x 5 years</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Streamlined memorandum for renewal will be presented to local board for approval once additional information has been received from group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351</td>
<td>Waitemata Park, 246 Nelson Street, Onehunga. Lease to Auckland Canine Agility Club Incorporated.</td>
<td>New community ground and building lease to Auckland Canine Agility Club Incorporated.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/04/2004</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Site visit and meeting with club arranged to discuss option of a new lease. This lease matter will be worked on with the local board during March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352</td>
<td>Waitemata Park, 175- 243 Nelson Street, Te Papapapi. Lease to Onehunga Combined Sports Trust.</td>
<td>New community ground lease to Onehunga Combined Sports Trust.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>0/9/1900</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Have followed up information request with the group which to date has not been received. This lease matter cannot be progressed until the Waitemata Park Reserve Management Plan is completed. The timeframe for this is unknown. The issues related to the full agreement costs are being looked into by the Senior Operations, Maintenance and Management Coordinator and Leasing Specialist. This matter cannot be progressed until the Waitemata Park Reserve Management Plan is completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work Programme 2018/2019 Q4 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Department/CCO</th>
<th>CL: Lease Commencement Date</th>
<th>CL: Right of Renewal</th>
<th>CL: Final Lease Expiry Date</th>
<th>CL: Annual Rent Amount (excluding GST)</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q3 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1333</td>
<td>Parramore Stone Cottage, 1 Kings Road, Parramore Lease to Parramore Historical Society Incorporated</td>
<td>New community lease for operation and management of Parramore Stone Cottage to Parramore Historical Society Incorporated</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/09/2009</td>
<td>1 x 5 years</td>
<td>31/12/2018</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>Asset Management Intelligence Support team has committed that the lease for this site can be progressed. A lease application has been sent to the group for completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354</td>
<td>Savage Park, 10 Hamilton Road, Mount Wellington: Lease to Scout Association of New Zealand - Maungakiekie Scout Group</td>
<td>New community ground lease to Scout Association of NZ - Maungakiekie Scout Group</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/04/2014</td>
<td>1 x 5 years</td>
<td>31/03/2019</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>This lease project is not due to commence until quarter four.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355</td>
<td>134 Euston Avenue, Point England: Lease to Te Ao Aho Community Childcare Centre Incorporated</td>
<td>New ground and building lease to Te Ao Aho Community Childcare Centre Incorporated</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/12/2003</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>30/11/2018</td>
<td>$2,688.00</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>This lease application will be workshopped with the local board in March. An engagement will occur in June.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2527</td>
<td>Konini Park, Waiaua Road Greenlane: Lease to Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated</td>
<td>New community lease to Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated. Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/01/2003</td>
<td>2x 5 years</td>
<td>31/12/2017</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>This report for new lease approval will be presented at a business before the end of the financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2558</td>
<td>Ellerslie North Reserve, 38A Euston Avenue: Renewal lease to Tamaki Model Aero Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Renewal lease to Tamaki Model Aero Club Incorporated. Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>1/04/2006</td>
<td>2x 5 years</td>
<td>31/03/2021</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>This lease renewal will be workshopped with the local board when the application and supporting information is received from the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Lead Dept/Unit or COO</td>
<td>CL: Lease Commencement Date</td>
<td>CL: Right of Renewal</td>
<td>CL: Final Lease Expiry Date</td>
<td>CL: Annual Rent (excluding GST)</td>
<td>Activity Status</td>
<td>RAG</td>
<td>Q3 Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2559</td>
<td>Ruapokaita Reserve, 92-96 Link Rd Glen Innes</td>
<td>Lease to RNZ Plunket Society - Glen Innes</td>
<td>Deferral from the 2017/2018 work programme</td>
<td>1/04/2001</td>
<td>2x5 years</td>
<td>31/03/2016</td>
<td>$258.00</td>
<td>Deferral</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>A report seeking board approval for the new lease will be presented at a future business meeting. This activity will be completed in quarter one of the 2019/2020 work programme. A report will be available at the August 2019 business meeting. Staff has been undertaking other lease projects of a higher priority. The business report is being completed and will be available at the August business meeting. As such, this lease project will be carried over to the 2019/2020 community leasing work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2560</td>
<td>Oranga Community Centre, 52 Waiapu Road, Onehunga</td>
<td>Lease to RNZ Plunket Society - Oranga/Cornwall</td>
<td>Deferral from the 2017/2018 work programme</td>
<td>1/04/2006</td>
<td>2x5 years</td>
<td>31/03/2021</td>
<td>$258.00</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A site visit is planned for April. Once this is completed approval of the renewal of lease will be progressed using the streamlined approval process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2561</td>
<td>SC 1060 Link Rd Glen Innes</td>
<td>Lease to Citizens Advice Bureau - Glen Innes</td>
<td>Deferral from the 2017/2018 work programme</td>
<td>01/07/2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30/01/2010</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>Deferral</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>Legal Services have prepared an agreement for Citizens Advice Bureau to review and execute before renovation works can be commenced. Once this has been signed by CAS then a new lease application may be progressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2563</td>
<td>Onehunga Community Centre, 91 Church Street, Onehunga</td>
<td>Lease to Citizens Advice Bureau - Onehunga</td>
<td>Deferral from the 2017/2018 work programme</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30/01/2010</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>Deferral</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>The draft lease has been returned from Council's consultant solicitors following the review of input from Citizens Advice Bureau (CAS) and council staff. The draft deed is being checked by Legal Services and will be sent to CAS for execution. This is anticipated to be finalised in quarter four.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2565</td>
<td>Penmaru Community Centre, 7-13 Pillington Road, Penmaru</td>
<td>Lease to Citizens Advice Bureau - Penmaru</td>
<td>Deferral from the 2017/2018 work programme</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30/01/2010</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>Deferral</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>The draft lease has been returned from Council's consultant solicitors following the review of input from Citizens Advice Bureau (CAS) and council staff. The draft deed is being checked by Legal Services and will be sent to CAS for execution. This is anticipated to be finalised in quarter four.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2566</td>
<td>PI England Reserve, 122 Bossons Avenue, Glen Innes</td>
<td>Renew sublease to Tāmaki Model Base Club Incorporation</td>
<td>Deferral from the 2017/2018 work programme</td>
<td>1/03/2007</td>
<td>2x5 years</td>
<td>28/02/2022</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>This will be worked up with the local board once the application form and supporting information has been received from the group. This matter will be progressed using the streamlined renewal approval process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2577</td>
<td>Affinity Reserve, 50-52 Historic Road Panmure</td>
<td>Lease to The Scout Association of NZ</td>
<td>Deferral from the 2017/2018 work programme</td>
<td>1/07/1997</td>
<td>1x5 years</td>
<td>30/06/2017</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Deferral</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>The Scout group confirmed vacating this site some time ago. Since then, the Waitemata Sea Scouts, connected to NZ Scouts, has been in occupation since 2018. This group were sent a lease application to complete but has not been returned. Once received the matter will be worked with the local board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Auckland Council's Year End and Quarterly Performance Report: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board for quarter four 2018/2019
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Auckland Council Annual Report 2018/2019 is being prepared and needs to be adopted by the Governing Body by 26 September 2019. As part of the overall report package, individual reports for each local board are prepared.

3. Auckland Council currently has a series of bonds quoted on the New Zealand Stock Exchange (NZX) Debt Market maintained by NZX Limited. As council is subject to obligations under the NZX Main Board and Debt Market Listing Rules and the Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013 (FMCA), local boards may not release annual financial results in any form. Therefore, the attached annual report is being presented as confidential.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:
a) adopt the 2018/2019 Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Annual Report as set out in Attachment A;
b) note that any proposed changes will be clearly communicated and agreed with the chairperson before the report is submitted for adoption by the Governing Body by 26 September 2019;
c) note that the draft 2018/2019 Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Annual Report (refer to Attachment A to the agenda report) will remain confidential until after the Auckland Council group results for 2018/2019 are released to the New Zealand Stock Exchange which are expected to be made public by 30 September 2019.

Horopaki
Context
4. In accordance with the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 and the Local Government Act 2002, each local board is required to monitor and report on the implementation of its 2018/2019 Local Board Agreement. This includes reporting on the performance measures for local activities, and the overall Financial Impact Statement for the local board.

5. In addition to the compliance purpose, local board annual reports are an opportunity to tell the wider performance story with a strong local flavour, including how the local board is working towards the outcomes of their local board plan.

6. Auckland Council currently has a series of bonds quoted on the NZX Debt Market (quoted bonds) maintained by NZX Limited. As a result, the council is subject to obligations under the NZX Main Board and Debt Market Listing Rules (listing rules) and the Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013 (FMCA). Under these obligations, local boards may not release annual financial results in any form, including publishing their agenda/minutes containing their
results, until council group results are released to the NZX on 27 September 2019. Therefore, the attached annual report is being presented as confidential.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

7. The annual report contains the following sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mihi</td>
<td>The mihi relates to the local board area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message from the chairperson</td>
<td>An overall message introducing the report, highlighting achievements and challenges, including both financial and non-financial performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local board members</td>
<td>A group photo of the local board members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our area</td>
<td>A visual layout of the local board area, summarising key demographic information and showing key projects and facilities in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance report</td>
<td>Provides performance measure results for each activity, providing explanations where targeted service levels have not been achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding information</td>
<td>Financial performance results compared to long-term plan and annual plan budgets, together with explanations about variances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local flavour</td>
<td>A profile of either an outstanding resident, grant, project or facility that benefits the local community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

8. Council departments and council-controlled organisations comments and views have been considered and included in the annual report in relation to activities they are responsible for delivering on behalf of local boards.

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

9. Local board feedback will be included where possible. Any changes to the content of the final annual report will be discussed with the chairperson.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

10. The annual report provides information on how Auckland Council has progressed its agreed priorities in the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 over the past 12 months. This includes engagement with Māori, as well as projects that benefit various population groups, including Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

11. The annual report reports on both the financial and service performance in each local board area.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

12. The annual report is a legislatively required document. It is audited by Audit New Zealand who assess if the report represents information fairly and consistently, and that the financial statements comply with accounting standard PBE FRS-43: Summary Financial Statements. Failure to demonstrate this could result in a qualified audit opinion.

13. The annual report is a key communication to residents. It is important to tell a clear and balanced performance story, in plain English, and in a form that is accessible, to ensure that council meets its obligations to be open with the public it serves.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

14. The next steps for the draft 2018/2019 Annual Report for the local board are:

- Audit NZ review during August and September 2019
- Report to the Governing Body for adoption on 26 September 2019
- Release to stock exchanges and publication online on 27 September 2018
- Physical copies provided to local board offices, council service centres and libraries by the end of October 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Draft 2018/2019 Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Annual Report (Under Separate Cover) - CONFIDENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>David Gurney - Manager Corporate Performance &amp; Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Kevin Ramsay - General Manager Corporate Finance and Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

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

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
<td>s7(2)(j) - The withholding of the information is necessary to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage. In particular, the report contains detailed financial adjustments, assumptions and judgements that have impact on the financial results of the Auckland Council group as at 30 June 2019 that require final Audit New Zealand sign-off and release to the New Zealand Stock Exchange.</td>
<td>s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
<td>s7(2)(j) - The withholding of the information is necessary to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage. In particular, the report contains detailed financial adjustments, assumptions and judgements that have impact on the financial results of the Auckland Council group as at 30 June 2019 that require final Audit New Zealand sign-off and release to the New Zealand Stock Exchange.</td>
<td>s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</td>
<td>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</td>
<td>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
<td>s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations). In particular, the report contains commercially sensitive information which could affect the outcome of negotiations.</td>
<td>s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>