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Welcome

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

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.

Confirmation of Minutes
That the Howick Local Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Monday, 19 August 2019, as a true and correct record.

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

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

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

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 Howick Local Board. This means that details relating to deputations can be included in the published agenda. Total speaking time per deputation is ten minutes or as resolved by the meeting.

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

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.

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.”
Chairperson's report

File No.: CP2019/16183

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. This item gives the Chairperson an opportunity to update the local board on any announcements and note the Chairperson’s written report.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Providing the Chairperson with an opportunity to update the local board on the projects and issues they have been involved with since the last meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:
 a) note the Chairperson’s verbal update and written report.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Vanessa Phillips - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor update

File No.: CP2019/16185

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. An opportunity for the Ward Councillor’s to update the local board on regional matters of interest.
2. A period of time (10 minutes) has been set aside for the Howick Ward Councillor’s to update the local board on regional matters.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
3. Providing the Howick Ward Councillor’s with an opportunity to update the local board on regional matters of interest since the last meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:

a) note the verbal and written report from Councillor Sharon Stewart and Councillor Paul Young.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Vanessa Phillips - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Transport September 2019 update to the Howick Local Board

File No.: CP2019/16189

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the Howick Local Board on transport related matters in their area, including the Local Board Transport Capital Fund and the Community Safety Fund.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. A decision is not required this month and as this report is the final update report of this electoral term it provides an opportunity to highlight transport achievements in the Howick Local Board area.
3. The report contains information about the following:
   • the wider ‘context’ involving a summary of the strategic projects delivered in the Howick Local Board area in this electoral term
   • an update on Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) projects
   • an update on Community Safety Fund (CSF) projects
   • a summary of Auckland Transport support for board advocacy initiatives
   • a summary of consultation about future Auckland Transport activities (Attachment A).

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:
a) receive the Auckland Transport September 2019 monthly update report.

Horopaki
Context
4. Auckland Transport is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. Auckland Transport reports monthly to local boards, as set out in the Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important engagement role local boards play within and on behalf of their local communities.
5. Auckland Transport delivered a number of strategic projects in Howick in this electoral term and these are discussed below.

Eastern New Network
6. Delivered in late 2017, the Eastern New Network simplified and improved bus routes across Howick. Simplification increased reliability and the number of buses servicing each individual route. The Eastern New Network has been successful and between June 2018 and June 2019 with customer journeys have increased by 11.4 per cent. A ‘journey’ being one point-to-point expedition including transfers between modes. See statistics presented in Table 1.
from the July Auckland Transport Board report below. This equates to approximately 3000-4000 new people using public transport since the previous year.

**Table 1: Bus Patronage Eastern New Network**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Integrated Fares AUG 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-18</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-18</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-18</td>
<td>550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-18</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-18</td>
<td>650,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Auckland’s overall rate of public transport growth in the same time period is 6.3 per cent.

**Airport to Botany Rapid Transport Network (RTN)**

8. In this electoral term, Auckland Council and Auckland Transport started working strategically to create a Rapid Transport Network linking the Airport and Botany. The strategic plan is that the Central Rail Link, AMETI-Eastern Busway, and Airport to Botany and electrification to Pukekohe all finish at roughly the same time creating a ‘skeleton’ of the Rapid Transit Networks able to move people efficiently north/south and east/west.

9. From the Howick Local Board area’s perspective, key projects are the AMETI-Eastern Busway and the Airport to Botany Rapid Transport Network both of which have progressed significantly in this electoral term. In September 2019, the Airport to Botany project team will discuss the project further with the board at a workshop.

**Figure 1: Airport to Botany Rapid Transit Network**
Item 13

AMETI - Eastern Busway.

10. AMETI – Eastern Busway is a $1.4 billion project to build New Zealand’s first urban busway that will provide congestion free ‘bus only’ lanes for commuters from Panmure to Botany. During this electoral term Auckland Transport contractors started working on Stage 1 while work continues planning the second, third and fourth stages that in time will:

- complete a flyover for commuter traffic linking Reeves Road to the South Eastern Arterial
- build a Rapid Transit Network from Pakuranga to Botany
- build a large transport hub at Botany that the Airport to Botany project will terminate at.

11. The stage from Panmure to Pakuranga has started and is progressing well. The main area of interest is the Transit two (T2) lanes provided for the Pakuranga Road express bus service. The lanes have been operational for just over a month opening on 1 July 2019.

Figure 2: AMETI Panmure to Pakuranga Starts

12. Current monitoring suggests that the lanes are working, letting buses and cars with passengers travel quicker, with minimal impact on general traffic. The general observations are that travel times are a little slower, but that traffic is flowing. Auckland Transport’s social media pages report minimal negative comments and occasional positive comments.

13. Auckland Transport opened a Park and Ride at Lloyd Elsmore Park on 12 August 2019 with space for 300 vehicles where people can park and be directly connected to the 728 and 729 express bus services.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

Community Safety Fund

14. This term the Community Safety Fund (CSF) started and will deliver $20 million over two years across all 21 local boards. It is strictly for road safety initiatives. It is designed to deliver safety projects identified by the local board. A local board’s share of the fund is based on a formula that assesses the number of deaths and serious injuries in that area. The Howick Local Board’s share of the CSF is $985,896.

15. Howick Local Board has confirmed that it supports two projects:

- Botany Downs Secondary College Crossing Point – Improving the crossing facilities for Botany Downs Secondary College students who need to cross Chapel Road
- Flatbush School Road Temporary Pedestrian Bridge – Building a temporary bridge over the Flat Bush Culvert (on Flatbush School Road) allowing pedestrians to cross the culvert more safely.
Local Board Transport Capital Fund

16. The Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) is a capital budget provided to all local boards by Auckland Council and delivered by Auckland Transport. Local boards can use this fund to deliver transport infrastructure projects that they believe are important but are not part of Auckland Transport’s work programme. Projects must also:

- be safe
- not impede network efficiency
- be in the road corridor (although projects running through parks may be considered if they support a transport outcome).

17. The fund is designed to allow local boards to build transport focused local improvements in their areas.

18. In this electoral term, the board had $5,887,373 of LBTCF available. The following projects were delivered using the LBTCF:

- **Half Moon Bay Ferry Terminal** - The new ferry terminal at Half Moon Bay, started in the previous electoral term, was completed

  ![Figure 3: Half Moon Bay Ferry Terminal](image)

- **Cascades Road Walkway** – The board funded a walkway that will allow people of all abilities better access from Cascades Road to the Cascades walking track
• **Barry Curtis Park Walkway** – The board funded a new stretch of footpath in Barry Curtis Park running parallel to Flatbush School Road that will provide a safer pedestrian link to the park, pedestrian refuge crossing points and car parking. This project’s cost is $339,500

• **Howick Village Centre Plan** – A sum of $400,000 was made available to support the design process and the board has earmarked another $1 million as a reserve for future delivery of this project.

19. In this electoral term, the Howick Local Board has allocated $3,483,771 of the LBTCF including $1,000,000 held in reserve for the Howick Village Centre Plan. This means a total of $2,403,602 will be transferred to the new board.

**Local board advocacy**

20. The following table is summary of Howick Local Boards advocacy initiatives and progress made on them in this electoral them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy initiative</th>
<th>Key initiative</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A well-integrated efficient public transportation system</td>
<td>Advocate to Auckland Transport to maintain and upgrade existing transportation systems, including improving safety at congestion hot spots</td>
<td>Auckland Transport has supported this ‘key initiative’ by: • The Eastern New Network was introduced improving bus services and has significantly increased bus patronage in the Howick Local Board area • AMETI – Eastern Busway has started and will involve the delivery of approximately $1.4 billion of transport improvements for Howick • Planning for a Rapid Transport Network between the Airport and Botany has started.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well designed and quality development in Howick</td>
<td>Continue to partner with Auckland Transport to develop the Half Moon Bay area as a transport hub</td>
<td>Auckland Transport finished the Half Moon Bay Ferry Terminal and bus turnaround area. Combined with more frequent and regular services being introduced in the Eastern New Network, Half Moon Bay has</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Auckland Transport September 2019 update to the Howick Local Board

Item 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Continue to develop integrated planning solutions which co-ordinate the planning, design and management of public spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport continues to support the Howick Village Centre project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Parks and open spaces allow for a wide variety of recreational activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to extend existing walkways and cycle ways, including informative signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport has provided advice on a range of projects that would contribute to this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

21. No impacts from this month’s activity.

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

Auckland Transport consultations

22. Over the last reporting period, Auckland Transport invited the local board to provide feedback on two proposals. More detailed information is available in Attachment A.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

23. In this reporting period no projects required iwi liaison.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

24. This report does not have any financial implications that have not already been reported.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

25. The proposed decision to receive the report has no risks. Auckland Transport has risk management strategies in place for all of its projects.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

26. Auckland Transport will provide a further update report to the new board next term.

Ngā ūpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Summary of consultation about future Auckland Transport activities</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Ngā kaihaina

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Ben Stallworthy – Elected Member Relationship Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon – Elected Member Relationship Team Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Consultation Information Sent to the Howick Local Board in August 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Proposal</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murphys Road / Redoubt Road</td>
<td>Changes are required for safety</td>
<td>26 Aug 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Intersection Upgrade             | - New, removal of the left turn lane from Redoubt Rd to Murphys Rd (using safe hit posts and separators).  
|                                 | - New friction surface on the eastbound through lane.  
|                                 | - Changing the existing Give-way to a Stop control. |           |
| Cascades Road Pedestrian Refuge  |                                               | 25 Aug 2019|
Investigating the installation of lighting in Tarnica Park

File No.: CP2019/16107

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek a decision on the recommendation to investigate the installation of footpath lighting at Tarnica Park to address night time antisocial activity in and around the playground.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. In March 2019 residents near Tarnica Park in North Park, Botany requested the Howick Local Board fund park lighting to prevent antisocial behaviour at the park.

3. At a July 2019 community meeting, residents made additional requests for the local board to provide council sponsored park activations, a renewed playground and increased park maintenance.

4. The Howick Local Board resolved a Notice of Motion (HW/2019/91) at its meeting on 19 August 2019 which requested staff investigate the installation of a single solar-powered sensor light over the playground in Tarnica Park and provide a report to the September Howick Local Board meeting.

5. Staff from Parks, Sports and Recreation consider that a solar-powered sensor light is only likely to displace antisocial behaviour to another area of the park and could inadvertently encourage more activity in and around the playground at night time. Lighting the park footpath and lifting the number of pedestrians accessing Botany Town Centre through the park, particularly in the evening, is seen as a more effective means of addressing the issue. This could be in collaboration with the police to ensure the site is checked regularly and night time gatherings actively discouraged.

6. It is therefore recommended that the board allocates $10,000 LDI opex to Community Facilities to lead an investigation and design process covering options plus costs for lighting the Tarnica Park footpath connecting North Park through to the Botany Town Centre public transport and shopping precinct.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:

a) approve the allocation of $10,000 LDI opex from the 2019/2020 Community Response Fund to Community Facilities to undertake an investigation and design led process into options for and costings for lighting the Tarnica Park footpath.

Horopaki
Context
7. In March 2019 residents living adjacent to Tarnica Park requested the board fund park lighting to prevent anti-social behaviour taking place at the reserve during the hours of darkness.

8. Youth gather at the park playground to consume alcohol and engage in anti-social behaviour resulting in park damage, noise, disturbance and threatening behaviour to residents.
9. On Saturday 3 July 2019 a community meeting was held at Tarnica Park with local board members, residents, police and council staff to identify options to reduce night-time anti-social behaviour at the reserve.

10. Residents requested that the board fund:
   - park lighting to illuminate the playground and discourage its use as a night-time gathering space
   - park activations to encourage community use and ownership
   - a playground upgrade
   - increased park maintenance.

11. At its meeting on 19 August 2019, the Howick Local Board resolved via a Notice of Motion as follows:

   **Resolution number HW/2019/91**

   **MOVED by Chairperson D Collings, seconded by Member B Wichman:**

   That the Howick Local Board:

   a) request staff urgently progress an investigation into installing a single solar powered sensor light over the playground in Tarnica Park and to report back their findings to the Howick Local Board meeting on 16 September 2019.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

12. Tarnica Park is located in North Park, Botany and provides neighbourhood-scale recreation for the local community with access to a playground and open passive recreation space.

13. There are no lights located in the park or on the connecting pathway to the shopping precinct and street lights on Tarnica Road illuminate the footpath entrance and road only.

14. Lighting is an important component of park infrastructure, allowing people to use and enjoy spaces into the evening hours where appropriate. Sports fields and some hardcourts are lit in evenings over the winter to allow for extended periods of play, along with busy car parks linked to community facilities and key footpath routes that provide commuter connections or evening amenity at destination parks (i.e Panumure Lagoon).

15. Good lighting can help make parks safe, by reducing the level of crime and perceptions of crime. However, the great majority of parks and associated footpaths are not lit because of safety issues linked to encouraging people to go into isolated areas with poor visibility beyond the range of the footpath lighting. There are no council playgrounds that are lit during hours of darkness either to extend play or discourage antisocial behaviour.

16. Park lighting is expensive to install and operate. It requires significant capex investment and ongoing operational funding. It is not practical or desirable to illuminate all our parks in their entirety.

17. There is uncertainty over the effectiveness that a sensor light will have in managing anti-social behaviour at the park and for these reasons a solar-powered sensor light is not recommended. Illuminating the playground with a solar-powered sensor light to deter anti-social behaviour may inadvertently increase park use at unwanted times, create noise and disturbance for residents or simply result in moving the anti-social behaviour to another location within the park.

18. Encouraging increased community use, participation and ownership of parks is a proven strategy to reduce anti-social behaviour. While it is important to activate the parks network and provide for the recreational needs of the local community it is considered unlikely that increasing day-time visitation to the park will fully eliminate night-time anti-social behaviour.
This is best achieved through a combination of day time activation along with footpath lighting and police patrols.

19. Generally, park footpath lighting is provided on road-to-road commuter routes which connect residential areas to shopping centres and transport links including bus stops, train and railway stations.

20. Tarnica Park provides a direct route and reduced walking distance from North Park to bus stops and shopping precincts at Botany Town Centre compared with the circuitous road corridor.

21. Illuminating the footpath will encourage North Park residents to increase public transport usage, particularly in winter when it is darker for longer. It may also encourage greater visitation to Botany Town Centre on foot resulting in increased park activation and passive surveillance which raises the overall security of the park.

22. Consultation with Auckland Transport will determine whether the park pathway provides sufficient benefit as a commuter corridor to enable footpath lighting to be delivered through the Transport Capital Fund.

23. It is recommended that the board provides $10,000 LDI opex from the Community Response Fund to Community Facilities to progress an investigation and design led process covering options plus costs for the lighting of the Tarnica Park footpath in order to raise use levels of the site in the evening and connect North Park residents to public transport and shopping precincts.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

24. The playground is not identified on the Community Facilities adopted three-year work programme and maintenance including clearance of litter, broken glass and graffiti is managed by existing maintenance contracts.

25. Tarnica Park pathway lighting project does not form part of the approved Community Facilities 2019/2020 work programme. Community Facilities has confirmed there is capacity within their approved work programme to conduct investigation and design for footpath lighting at Tarnica Park.

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

Local impacts and local board views

26. The community has raised expectations that the board will respond to requests to reduce anti-social behaviour at the park.

27. Illuminating the footpath at Tarnica Park is a step towards addressing antisocial behaviour at the site and delivering the following Local Board Plan 2017 outcomes:

- Outcome 1: We are proud of our area and participate in our community to make Howick a great place to live, work and play
- Outcome 2: We want to ensure future growth is well planned with good quality design and transport connections that enable people to move easily around our area.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

28. Parks and heritage are of fundamental importance to mana whenua, their culture and traditions. Providing a wider range of services at Tarnica Park will benefit Māori and the wider community by increasing safety and encouraging community use of the park.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

29. Allocating $10,000 LDI opex from the Community Response Fund for park lighting investigation and design will provide the board with costs to illuminate the footpath and deliver on Local Board Plan outcomes. Noting, the Community Response Fund for 2019/2020 currently has $33,200 available to be allocated.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

30. There is a high risk that installing a single solar powered light over the playground at Tarnica Park fails to address night-time antisocial activity.

31. Addressing antisocial behaviour requires a combination of:
- improving park assets through renewals
- footpath lighting
- partnering with the police.

32. The footpath lighting project provides additional benefit for the board and community in terms of improving the footpath network and providing safe commuter corridors over extended periods.

33. Allocation of $10,000 LDI opex for Tarnica Park investigation and design is a step towards increasing community use of the park by addressing safety concerns and providing for a wider range of users.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

34. Community Facilities will workshop Tarnica Park footpath lighting costs and options in Quarter three of the current financial year.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Steve Owens - Parks and Places Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Mace Ward - General Manager, Parks, Sports and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adoption of the Mangemangeroa Valley Reserves Development Plan, Restoration Plan and Geotechnical Study

File No.: CP2019/13180

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To seek adoption of the:
   - Mangemangeroa Valley Reserves Development Plan (Development Plan - Attachment A)

2. To note the Mangemangeroa Valley Reserves Geotechnical Instability Risk Assessment (Geotechnical Study - Attachment C).

3. To allocate $4000 Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) opex from the Community Response Fund for Community Facilities to conduct site preparation work to support restoration planting at the reserves in FY 2019/2020.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

4. The Mangemangeroa Valley Reserves and Valley Walkway provides a scenic bush and coastal walking experience through six contiguous local parks spanning more than five kilometres (Attachment D). The reserves and walkway are a popular visitor attraction and are actively maintained and cared for by the Friends of Mangemangeroa Society Incorporated (FoM).

5. In FY 2015/2016 the local board provided $130,000 LDI opex to the Mangemangeroa Environmental Education Facility Trust (MEEFT) to determine the viability of developing an environmental education facility and visitor centre at the reserve.

6. The local board funded $55,000 Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) opex in FY 2017/2018 (HW/2017/211) to prepare a Development Plan and update the 2006 Restoration Plan for the Mangemangeroa Valley Reserves and Valley Walkway. The board also provided $20,000 LDI opex in FY 2018/2019 (HW/2018/200) to conduct geotechnical studies for the park and walkway to reduce the impact of landslips.

7. It is recommended that the local board adopts the Development Plan, the 2019 Restoration Plan and notes the Geotechnical Assessment in order to help guide the long-term holistic development of the reserves. This will include the development of an environmental education facility. The documents will assist in coordinating asset maintenance, renewals and volunteer activity across the reserves.

8. It is also recommended that the board allocates $4000 Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) opex for Community Facilities to provide site preparation work to support restoration planting by the FoM.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Howick Local Board:

a) adopt the Mangemangeroa Valley Reserves Development Plan and the Mangemangeroa Valley Reserves Restoration Plan 2019.
b) allocate $4000 Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) opex from the Community Response Fund to Community Facilities to provide site preparation works to support the Friends of Mangemangeroa 2019/2020 tree restoration planting programme.

c) note the Mangemangeroa Valley Reserves Geotechnical Instability Risk Assessment.

**Horopaki Context**

9. Mangemangeroa Reserve is a coastal park that provides access to the Mangemangeroa Valley Walkway spanning more than five kilometres and travelling through six local parks. The reserve and walkway is a popular visitor attraction.

10. In FY 2015/2016 the local board provided $130,000 LDI opex to MEEFT to conduct feasibility studies to determine the viability of developing an environmental education facility at the reserve.

11. The purpose of the proposed education facility is to provide visitors with an understanding of the history, occupation and flora and fauna of the area. Preferred options and feasibility study findings were workshopped with the board in March 2018.

12. A series of landslips from storm events occurred between 2016 and 2018 resulting in the closure of sections of the Mangemangeroa Valley Walkway. The board recognised the importance of maintaining access along the walkway and provided $55,000 LDI opex in FY 2017/2018 (HW/2017/211) to prepare a Development Plan plus update the 2006 Restoration Plan and $20,000 LDI opex in FY 2019/2019 (HW/2018/200) to conduct geotechnical studies for the park and walkway to reduce the impact of landslips.

13. The Development Plan, the 2019 Restoration Plan and Geotechnical Assessment will help guide the long-term holistic development of the reserves which may include the environmental education facility development.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

14. The Development Plan and Restoration Plan 2019 were prepared in collaboration with the Howick Local Board, and local stakeholder/volunteer groups such as the FoM.

15. The Development Plan aims to:
   - articulate the vision for the reserves
   - outline the reserves ecological context and significance
   - provide guidance on asset renewals.

16. The Development Plan aligns with existing plans and proposed developments, including:
   - Mangemangeroa Reserve Restoration Plan 2019
   - Mangemangeroa Valley Reserves Management Plan 2007
   - MEEFT projects.

17. The Development Plan is an operational document that steers maintenance and renewal of existing assets including pathways, bush tracks and signage through design guidance recommendations.

18. The Restoration Plan is an update to the 2006 Mangemangeroa Reserve Restoration Plan and provides current restoration practices and techniques that fulfil the management philosophy and goals outlined in the Mangemangeroa Reserve Management Plan 2007.
19. A Geotechnical Instability Risk Assessment was prepared to identify instability across the six reserves that comprise the Mangemangeroa Reserve and Walkway sites and provide recommendations for:

- managing/mitigating slope instability
- typical maintenance approach appropriate to the existing walkways
- recommendations for further geotechnical assessment/investigations appropriate for new structures or walkways in the area.

20. The geotechnical study defines Mangemangeroa Reserve and Walkway by zones A, B & C (see Attachment C, Figure 1):

- Zone A - Comprises the narrow coastal reserve north of the Whitford Road Bridge and south of Mangemangeroa Reserve. The existing walking track follows the toe of the slope through bush and sections of boardwalk within the tidal mudflats.
- Zone B - Constitutes the Mangemangeroa Reserve, bordered by Somerville Road to the west. The majority of the existing walking track is constructed on grade and traverses downslope near the barn shed, running along the lower eastern margin of the reserve. A proposed walking track follows the ridgeline, adjacent to Sommerville Road, and connects with the existing walking track at the northern extent of the reserve.
- Zone C - Consists of Chisbury Terrace Reserve, Pohutukawa Avenue Esplanade Reserve and ends at the Sandspit at the north-eastern extent. The existing walking track follows a narrow corridor along the toe of the slope through bush and boardwalk sections along the tidal mudflats.

21. Zones A and C are located on a narrow strip of land at the toe of the slope with a moderate to high risk of landslip inundation resulting from landslips originating within private land above. There is limited scope for track relocation through this area because of the narrow corridor. There is the option to relocate the track by building a timber boardwalk within the tidal mudflats.

22. Alternative hard engineering approaches including retaining walls, in-ground palisade walls or debris deflection walls to mitigate landslip inundation may be appropriate in high risk areas, however, these options are expensive and need to be considered against a do nothing or soft engineering option with ongoing track maintenance.

23. Soft engineering options include upslope planting and installation of erosion control matting along exposed slopes and head scarps to mitigate slope instability.

24. Zone B comprises Mangemangeroa Reserve which has a much larger scope for track relocation because of the size of the reserve area. Tracks should be constructed to avoid crossing gully features where possible. Site specific geotechnical studies are required for pathway development to inform appropriate routes and engineering interventions.

25. Recommendations for future track maintenance and areas that require further geotechnical assessment are set out below:

- culverts along the length of the track should be regularly checked and maintained to prevent blockages resulting in overflows and scouring of the track surface
- geotechnical investigations should be conducted to support track relocations and renewals, development of new pathways, structures and boardwalks in the coastal margin
- a coastal assessment should be considered to evaluate the effects of the walking track in low lying areas regarding rates of coastal erosion and sea level rise.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views

26. The Development Plan has been jointly developed by Parks, Sports and Recreation and Community Facilities.

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

Local impacts and local board views

27. The local board provided feedback on the preparation of the Development Plan at workshops in December 2017 and September 2018.

28. Adoption of these plans is a step towards delivering Outcome 5 in the Howick Local Board Plan 2017: Parks and open spaces allow for a wide variety of recreational activities.

29. The FoM have signed the Mangemangeroa Valley Reserves Partnership Agreement with Auckland Council which defines the society’s role in the promotion and coordination of volunteer activities in the valley reserves.

30. The Development Plan and Restoration Plan 2019 were developed in collaboration with the FoM who provided feedback on the documents at workshops, via email and at their 2017 and 2018 Annual General Meeting.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

31. The Restoration Plan and Development Plan seeks to preserve and protect taonga at Mangemangeroa Reserve and Walkway through enhancement of flora and fauna, providing increased habitat and native tree planting. The plans also aspire to educate park visitors on Māori culture and traditions through the application of Te Aranga Māori Design Principles which communicates a cultural narrative through installation of interpretative signage, art installations and way-finding.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

32. Allocation of $4000 LDI opex from the Community Response Fund to support FoM 2019/2020 tree planting programme at the reserves will help realise the aspirations of the 2019 Restoration Plan and one of FoM’s key objectives. Noting, the Community Response Fund for 2019/2020 currently has $33,200 available to be allocated.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

33. The local board seeks to protect and enhance the Mangemangeroa Valley Reserves to facilitate increased visitation and provide environmental protection. Allocation of $4000 LDI opex to support restoration planting at the reserves is a step towards delivering this aspiration.

34. The attached documents were prepared in collaboration with the local board and the FoM. There is an expectation from stakeholders that the board will adopt the documents and provide funding to support the tree planting programme at the reserves.

35. Should the board not adopt the report and allocate funding to support volunteer planting at the reserves the maintenance and renewal of assets will continue without coordination and stakeholder expectations will not be met.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps
36. The adopted Development Plan and Restoration Plan 2019 will be used to guide asset renewals and restoration planting projects.
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1 Introduction

1.1 General

Auckland Council (AC) have engaged Tonkin & Taylor Ltd (T+T) to provide a preliminary slope instability hazard and risk assessment of the Mangemangeroa Valley Reserves. The site covers the extent of the walkway and surrounding reserve land from the Whitford Road Bridge (southern extent) to the Sandspit (northern extent).

A number of landslips that occurred in 2017 caused inundation of the existing walking track in several locations. There is also evidence of historical slope instability within the reserve area.

1.2 Scope of Works

The scope of works is set out in our offer of service dated 26 June 2018 and the Conditions of Contract for Consultancy Services (CCCS) dated 29 June 2018, which is summarised below:

1. Desktop review of existing information provided by Auckland Council, geological maps and historical aerial photograph interpretation.
2. Field mapping of historic and recent landslips in the reserve area and other geomorphological features by a Senior Engineering Geologist.
3. Qualitative hazard and risk assessment, in accordance with AGS March 2007, of slope instability across the entire site and providing recommendations for:
   - Managing/mitigating slope instability risk
   - Typical maintenance approach appropriate to the existing walkways
   - Recommendations for further geotechnical assessment/investigations appropriate for new structures or walkways in the area
4. Preparation of draft geotechnical report for Council review summarising desktop review, field mapping and the risk assessment. Then reissuing final version of report following Council review.

2 Site Description

2.1 Location and Access

The Mangemangeroa Reserve is located on Somerville Road in Howick. Figure 1 in Appendix A shows the extent of the site and the approximate location of the existing and proposed walkway tracks. The walkway passes through a number of the Mangemangeroa Valley Reserves including the following six reserves:

- Hayley Lane Reserve
- Point View Esplanade Reserve
- Mangemangeroa Reserve
- Chisbury Terrace Reserve
- Pohutukawa Avenue Esplanade Reserve
- The Sandspit

---

2.2 Regional Geology

The site is underlain by East Coast Bays Formation (ECBF) of the Waitemata Group comprising interbedded siltstone and sandstone. There are no active faults mapped within the vicinity of the site. However, the Somerville fault, which is an inactive fault, follows the approximate alignment of the Mangemangeroa Creek that borders the site. The southeast facing slope the walkway has been constructed along has been interpreted as being part of the Somerville Fault scarp.

The Mangemangeroa Reserve is also inferred to be within the northern extent of the southeastern landslide zone, which extends from Alfriston (southern extent) to Howick (northern extent).

2.3 Site Zonation

For ease of interpretation, the extent of the study area has been differentiated into three zones, which are described below and are illustrated on Figures 1 - 4 in Appendix A.

2.3.1 Zone A

Comprises the narrow coastal reserve north of the Whitford Road Bridge and south of Mangemangeroa Reserve. The existing walking track follows the toe of the slope through bush and diverges onto sections of boardwalk within the tidal mudflats. The slopes above are privately owned residential sections along Whitford Road.

2.3.2 Zone B

Zone B constitutes the Mangemangeroa Reserve, bordered by Somerville Road to the west. The majority of the existing walking track is constructed on grade and traverses downslope of the barn shed, running along the lower eastern margin of the Reserve within the vegetated area. A proposed walking track follows the crest of the northeast-southwest trending ridgeline, running adjacent to Somerville Road, and connects with the existing walking track at the northern extent of the reserve.

2.3.3 Zone C

Consists of the Chisbury Terrace Reserve, Pohutukawa Avenue Esplanade Reserve and ends at the Sandspit at the north eastern extent. The existing walking track through this area follows the narrow corridor along the toe of the slope though bush, with some boardwalk sections along the tidal mudflats. The upper slopes through this area are privately owned residential sections with access from Estuary Views, Chisbury Terrace and Pohutukawa Avenue.

---


3 Slope Stability Assessment

3.1 Aerial Photography Interpretation

Aerial photographs from 1955, 1972, and recent lidAR information sourced from Auckland Council GeoMaps, has been used to assist with assessing the geomorphology and historical slope instability affecting the site.

Evidence of historical slope instability was noted at various points along the entire length of the site. Historical and existing landslip headscarps are presented on Figures 2, 3 and 4 in Appendix A. Hummocky ground downslope of the headscarps typically indicates shallow instability, i.e. within the soil strength mantle. Shallow instability was also noted to be generally confined within gullies where surface and groundwater is concentrated.

Historical headscarps are evident by a concave shape break in slope, which can range in size from 10 m to 250 m wide. Mid slope benches and irregular debris lobes downslope of the headscarp indicate historical instability associated with potential large scale or deep seated block slides. These historical and deep seated landslides involve failure within the weak sandstone ECBF bedrock and are likely to be controlled by rock mass defects including bedding plane, fault and rock joint defects.

The 1955 and 1972 photographs show the surrounding areas were previously utilised for farming. It appears from the recent Auckland Council aerrals that further planting has been undertaken in the gullies of Mangemangeroa Reserve (Zone B). The steeper (25-40°) lower slopes through the extent of the site are heavily vegetated.

3.2 Field Mapping and Site Observations

The field mapping was carried out on 9 July 2018 and 12 July 2018 by a T+T intermediate and senior engineering geologists. Geomorphological features related to slope instability including recent landslips, ground tension cracks, areas of wet ground/seepage, historical headscarps and ECBF rock defects were noted during the field mapping exercise and are shown on Figures 2, 3 and 4 in Appendix A. Geomorphological features noted from the aerial photography interpretation were also confirmed from observations on site.

ECBF rock outcrops were observed in areas along the foreshore and within the headscarp areas of the recent landslips. The bedding was gently inclined (5-11°) and dipping in a southeast direction out of the slope. Jointing in the rockmass was steeply to very steeply inclined (54-84°) and orthogonal to bedding.

The recent 2017 landslips typically occurred in the lower, vegetated, steeper slopes. The landslips have occurred as a result of heavy rainfall. They are translational and shallow in nature and have failed along the soil/rock interface. The soil / rock interface is also generally concordant with the bedding discontinuities in the underlying bedrock, which is gently inclined to the southeast.

The shallow landslip headscarps have formed near the crest of the lower more steeply inclined slope. The landslip debris, which has inundated the walking track downslope, comprises large trees, other vegetation and soil (refer to Photo 3-1). A large number of these landslips have occurred in Zone C along Chisbury Terrace Reserve.

Two landslips within the Pohutukawa Avenue Esplanade Reserve (Zone C) have caused evacuation and displacement of the track due to the landslip forming further downslope (see Photo 3-2). It appears that, in addition to heavy rainfall, landslips have been triggered by coastal erosion of the slope toe, which has daylighted the residual soil / bedrock interface. Tension cracks were observed upslope of this area indicated incipient landslip movement extending upslope.
Tension cracks are also evident downslope (southeast) of the barn shed in Mangemangeroa Reserve (Figure 2, Zone B). As shown in Photo 3-3, this area has recently been planted, which has possibly been in response to the recent observed instability. The landslip that has occurred further downslope of this area has not affected the adjacent walking track and has instead followed the gully to the south.

Large scale historical landslides were apparent in the unvegetated upper slopes of the Mangemangeroa Reserve. Photo 3-4 shows the extent of a historical headscarp in the upper slopes with evidence of debris lobes downslope represented as intermittent benches.

Track maintenance was being undertaken during our site walkover. Areas where the track had been inundated with debris was being cleared with a small excavator. Hardfill was being placed by hand to reinstate areas of the track following debris clearance or where surface water had scoured out the track surface. Signage was also noticed at the barn carpark and at the eastern end of the Pohutukawa Avenue Esplanade Reserve warning the public of landslips along the walking tracks.

![Image of walking track maintenance](image-url)

Photo 3-1: Inundated section of walking track along Chisbury Terrace Reserve (Zone C).
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Photo 3-2: Evacuated section of walking track along Pohutukawa Avenue Esplanade Reserve (Zone C).

Photo 3-3: Area downslope of barn in Mangemangeroa Reserve (Zone B) where recent planting has been undertaken, looking northeast.
3.3 Slope Instability Hazards

We have identified two main slope instability hazards as follows:

1. Shallow landslips involving failure of residual soil and colluvium at the soil / rock interface, triggered by heavy rainfall causing ground saturation, and

2. Reactivation or mobilisation deep seated landslides triggered by a low frequency rainfall or seismic event. Controlled by adversely orientated rock mass defects including bedding planes, rock joints and faults.

An indicative geological cross section through Mangemangeroa Reserve, extending from the barn shed upslope to Mangemangeroa Creek downslope, has been produced to illustrate the shallow and deep seated landslide failure models and is shown below in Figure 3-1.

The shallow landslips are translational landslips that have occurred along the soil/rock interface. They have happened as a result of high frequency rainfall events. This landslide hazard can be further differentiated into areas of landslide evacuation or landslide inundation. Landslide evacuation is the evacuated land area immediately below the headscarp of the landslide and are typically located near the crest of the slope or further downslope if the toe of the slope is being actively eroded along the foreshore. Landslide inundation occurs downslope due to an accumulation of debris sourced from upslope where the land has evacuated.

There is evidence of large historical landslides having occurred along the extent of the site. The mechanism of failure is likely to be controlled by rock mass discontinuities including gently inclined bedding forming the basal slide surface and geological faults or rock joints forming the sub vertical release surfaces. The historical deep seated landslides appear to be dormant given that there is no evidence of recent deep seated movement resulting in active tension cracks or hummocky ground. Future deep seated landslide hazard could be triggered by a low frequency rainfall or seismic event mobilising a landslide mass on an existing bedding plane surface that may be daylighted in the slope toe area.
4 Qualitative Risk Assessment

4.1 Methodology

A qualitative risk assessment has been undertaken considering the existing slope instability hazards discussed in Section 3.3 above and the risk to the existing walking track, proposed walking track and future developments within the site. The qualitative risk assessment is based on the Australian Geomechanics Society Practice Note Guidelines for Landslide Risk Management (2007) and the risk matrices presented on pages 91 and 92 of that document are included for reference in Appendix B.

We have not been retained by Auckland Council to assess the risk to the persons, i.e. the public using the track.

4.2 Results

For the risk assessment the slope instability hazards have been summarised into three hazard types set out below and discussed previously in Section 3.3:

- Landslip inundation
- Landslip evacuation
- Reactivation or mobilisation of a large scale landside

We have assessed the risk associated with these hazards as a product of likelihood and consequence as set out in the risk assessment matrices. Areas of low, moderate to high and high existing slope instability risk have been identified within the site. The criteria to determine the existing slope instability risk is summarised below:

- High risk – Areas of existing landslip evacuation or the ‘possible or likely’ likelihood of landslip evacuation near the crest of steep slopes and within the head of gullies.
- Moderate to high risk – Areas of existing shallow landslip inundation or the ‘possible or likely’ likelihood of landslip inundation along the lower slopes. Areas of observed seepage are also considered.
Low risk – Areas along the coastal margin where debris runout from a landslip is unlikely. Upper, flatter slopes of the Mangemangeroa Reserve (Zone B) where shallow landslips are unlikely and there is a ‘rare’ likelihood of reactivation or mobilisation of a large scale landslides.

The spatial distribution of the existing slope instability risk is presented on Figures 2, 3 and 4 in Appendix A. Table 1 attached in Appendix B presents a summary of the qualitative risk assessment, mitigation options and probable future modified risk ratings. The modified risk ratings are the projected risk ratings following the application of adequate mitigation and/or remediation measures as recommended below as part of reinstating or protecting the walking track following current or future landslip events.

4.3 Discussion

The risk mitigation options for each of the assessed slope instability hazards generally comprise:

☐ Soft engineering (i.e. planting and geotextile matting)
☐ Hard engineering (i.e. palisade or retaining wall, debris catch barrier and subsoil drainage)
☐ Relocate track

It should be noted that some track maintenance will be required regardless to some degree for any mitigation option that is implemented. Risk mitigation options for the existing track in each of the zones is described in further detail in the sections below.

4.3.1 Zone A and C Risk Mitigation

Zones A and C have similarities in regards to the existing slope instability risk (moderate to high) and the site characteristics. Both zones are a narrow strip of land at the toe of the slope containing land with a moderate to high risk of landslide inundation resulting from landslips originating within private land above.

There is limited scope for track relocation through this area because of the narrow corridor. There is the possibility to relocate to a timber boardwalk within the tidal mudflats. Further assessment would be required to determine the distance the boardwalk would require to be from the toe of the slope to avoid potential debris runout.

Construction of hard engineered retaining walls, in-ground palisade walls or debris deflection walls to mitigate landslide inundation may be appropriate in high risk areas, however, these options are expensive and would need to be considered against a do nothing or soft engineering option with ongoing track landslip disruption and track maintenance. Soft engineering options include upslope planting and installation of erosion control matting along exposed slopes and headscars to mitigate slope instability. The current approach for track maintenance, which was observed during our site walkover, also appears to be appropriate. It involved clearance of debris along inundated sections of the track with small machinery and reinstating the track surface with hardfill by hand methods.

We consider that areas of the track along Pohutukawa Avenue Esplanade Reserve that have been evacuated will require some sort of retention structure or earth works to reinstate the existing track.

4.3.2 Zone B Risk Mitigation

Magemangeroa Reserve (Zone B) has a much larger scope for track relocation because of the size of the reserve area. A proposed walkway alignment is shown on Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix A and extends from the barn shed along the crest of the slope of Mangemangeroa Reserve heading northeast then moves to the southeast to connect with the existing pathway. We recommend the...
proposed alignment traverses existing ridgelines and avoids crossing any gully features where possible.

Planting and installation of slope protection and erosion control matting, are recommended for moderate to high risk areas upslope of the existing track. In particular, this option is recommended for the area where ground cracks were observed downslope of the barn. It appears a lot of planting programmes have already been carried out in this area within existing gullies (i.e. moderate to high risk areas).

No mitigation options have been proposed for historical large scale reactivation because of the existing low assessed risk.

5 Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

At the request of AC, T+T have carried out a preliminary slope instability hazard and risk assessment of the Mangemangeroa Valley Reserves. A number of landslips that occurred in 2017 caused inundation of the existing walking track in several locations along the length the site, which extends from the Whitford Road Bridge (southern extent) to the Sandspit (northern extent). There is also evidence of historical slope instability within the reserve area.

A slope stability assessment was undertaken that included aerial photography interpretation and geological field mapping. The results of our slope stability assessment indicated two slope instability hazards, which comprised shallow landslips or deep seated landslides. The shallow landslips involved failure of residual soil and colluvium at the soil/rock interface, triggered by heavy rainfall causing ground saturation. The deep seated landslides are the reactivation or initiation of new landslides triggered by a low frequency rainfall or seismic event; controlled by adversely orientated rock mass defects including bedding planes, rock joints and faults. A qualitative risk assessment was carried out, in accordance with AGS 2007, considering the existing slope instability hazards and the risk to the existing walking track, proposed walking track and future developments within the site. Landslip inundation, landslide evacuation and reactivation of a historic landslide were considered the three hazard types and are associated with high, moderate to high and low existing slope instability risk respectively. Areas along the coastal margin where debris runout from a landslide is unlikely and the upper, flatter slopes of the Mangemangeroa Reserve (Zone B) are considered to be low risk areas.

Zones A and C comprise a narrow strip of land at the toe of the slope containing land with a moderate to high risk of landslide inundation resulting from landslips originating within private land above. There is limited scope for track relocation through this area but there is the possibility to relocate to a timber boardwalk within the tidal mudflats. Construction of hard engineered structures to mitigate landslide inundation may be appropriate in high risk areas, however, these options are expensive and would need to be considered against a do nothing or soft engineering option with ongoing track landslide disruption and track maintenance. Some sort of retention structure to reinstate the existing track will be required for areas of evacuation along Pohutukawa Avenue Esplanade Reserve.

Zone B (Mangemangeroa Reserve) is not confined to the coastal margin and has a much larger scope for track relocation because of the size of the reserve area. We recommend that the proposed walking track alignment, which extends from the barn shed along the crest of the slope of Mangemangeroa Reserve traverses existing ridgelines and avoids crossing any gully features where possible (i.e. moderate to high risk areas). Soft engineering options (i.e. planting and installation of slope protection/erosion control matting) are recommended for moderate to high risk areas upslope of the existing track. Due to the low assessed risk of historical large scale reactivation within Zone B, no mitigation options have been presented.

Tenkin & Taylor Ltd
Mangemangeroa Valley Reserves - Geotechnical Instability Risk Assessment
Auckland Council
July 2019
Job No. 1002404.000.v1.0
5.2 Recommendations

We recommend AC adopt the geotechnical risk zonation plans produced as part of this report for future planning for track construction, track maintenance and new structures within the Mangemangeroa Valley Reserves. AC should consider options to avoid, remedy or mitigate existing and future landslide hazard through including track relocation (avoid), soft engineering and vegetation (mitigate) and hard engineered (mitigate / remediate) solutions.

Recommendations for future track maintenance and areas that require further geotechnical assessment are set out below:

- In addition to the current track maintenance that is being undertaken, we also recommend that culverts along the length of the track are regularly checked and maintained to prevent the likelihood of any blockages from occurring, leading to surface overflows and scouring of the track surface.

- Any proposed developments within all the reserve areas, including along the upper slopes (i.e. low risk areas) of the Mangemangeroa Reserve (Zone B), will require site specific geotechnical investigation to support any detailed design of tracks and structures. Appropriate setbacks from existing headscarsps need to be considered. Borehole drilling that extends into the underlying rock may be required to determine the presence of any deep seated instability, i.e. identifying shear surfaces within the weak ECBF rock. Installation of surface survey monitoring pins or borehole inclinometers is also an option to assess any potential deep seated movement.

- Geotechnical investigations and assessment will be required for any retention structures that are to be implemented along evacuated areas within Pohutukawa Avenue Esplanade Reserve. Slope stability modelling and further assessment should be carried out if sections of the existing walking track are relocated to a timber boardwalk in the tidal mudflats. In particular, the extent of potential debris runout will need to be assessed to determine the distance the boardwalk will require to be from the toe of the slope.

- A coastal assessment should be considered to evaluate the effects of the walking track in low lying areas regarding rates of coastal erosion and sea level rise.
6 Applicability

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of our client Auckland Council, with respect to the particular brief given to us and it may not be relied upon in other contexts or for any other purpose, or by any person other than our client, without our prior written agreement.

Tonkin & Taylor Ltd

Report prepared by: Authorised for Tonkin & Taylor Ltd by:

Philip Mathewson Tim Coote
Engineering Geologist Project Director
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**Table 1: Qualitative Slope Instability Risk Assessment and Risk Mitigation Options (AGS, 2007)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slope Instability Hazard</th>
<th>Likelihood of Occurrence</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Existing Risk Level</th>
<th>Risk Mitigation Option</th>
<th>Modified Risk Level</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landslide Inundation</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Little – Limited damage to part of the walkway structure</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
<td>1. Construct debris catch barrier upslope of track</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Expensive option. Still requires some maintenance to remove debris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Upslope planting and installation of slope protection geotextile to mitigate instability</td>
<td>Low to moderate</td>
<td>May not reduce risk significantly. Debris removal and maintenance may still be required. Time dependant for vegetation to mature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Relocate section of track to avoid debris runout</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Move track to timber boardwalk within the mudflats. Costly but low maintenance option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide Evacuation</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Limited – Moderate damage to part of the walkway structure</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1. Ground improvement work to improve existing slope stability (i.e. pallissade or retaining walls, subsoil drainage)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Expensive option. To be considered in areas of existing high risk including existing landslide areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Planting and installation of slope protection geotextile to mitigate instability</td>
<td>Low to moderate</td>
<td>May not reduce risk significantly. Time dependant for vegetation to mature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Relocate section of track to avoid further evacuation</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Limited scope for relocation in many areas due to narrow Auckland Council owner corridor along coastal margin. May still be susceptible to evacuation and inundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Scale Reactivation</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Major – Extensive damage to most of the walkway structure</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Qualitative Measures of Likelihood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative Value</th>
<th>Notional Boundary</th>
<th>Implied Indicative Landslide Recurrence Interval</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10⁻¹</td>
<td>5x10⁻²</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>The event is expected to occur over the design life.</td>
<td>ALMOST CERTAIN</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10⁻²</td>
<td>5x10⁻³</td>
<td>100 years</td>
<td>The event will probably occur under adverse conditions over the design life.</td>
<td>LIKELY</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10⁻³</td>
<td>5x10⁻⁴</td>
<td>1000 years</td>
<td>The event could occur under adverse conditions over the design life.</td>
<td>POSSIBLE</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10⁻⁴</td>
<td>5x10⁻⁵</td>
<td>10,000 years</td>
<td>The event might occur under very adverse circumstances over the design life.</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10⁻⁵</td>
<td>5x10⁻⁶</td>
<td>100,000 years</td>
<td>The event is conceivable but only under exceptional circumstances over the design life.</td>
<td>RARE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10⁻⁶</td>
<td>5x10⁻⁷</td>
<td>1,000,000 years</td>
<td>The event is inconceivable or fanciful over the design life.</td>
<td>BARELY CREDIBLE</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1) The table should be used from left to right; use Approximate Annual Probability or Description to assign Descriptor, not vice versa.

### Qualitative Measures of Consequences to Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative Value</th>
<th>Notional Boundary</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Structure(s) completely destroyed and/or large scale damage requiring major engineering works for stabilisation. Could cause at least one adjacent property major consequence damage.</td>
<td>CATASTROPIC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Extensive damage to most of structure, and/or extending beyond site boundaries requiring significant stabilisation works. Could cause at least one adjacent property medium consequence damage.</td>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Moderate damage to some of structure, and/or significant part of site requiring large stabilisation works. Could cause at least one adjacent property minor consequence damage.</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Limited damage to part of structure, and/or part of site requiring some reinstatement stabilisation works.</td>
<td>MINOR</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Little damage. (Note for high probability event (Almost Certain), this category may be subdivided at a notional boundary of 0.1%). See Risk Matrix.</td>
<td>INSIGNIFICANT</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (2) The Approximate Cost of Damage is expressed as a percentage of market value, being the cost of the improved value of the unaffected property which includes the land plus the unaffected structures.
(3) The Approximate Cost is to be an estimate of the direct cost of the damage, such as the cost of reinstatement of the damaged portion of the property (land plus structures), stabilisation works required to render the site to tolerable risk level for the landslide which has occurred and professional design fees, and consequential costs such as legal fees, temporary accommodation. It does not include additional stabilisation works to address other landslides which may affect the property.
(4) The table should be used from left to right; use Approximate Cost of Damage or Description to assign Descriptor, not vice versa.
PRACTICE NOTE GUIDELINES FOR LANDSLIDE RISK MANAGEMENT 2007

APPENDIX C: QUALITATIVE TERMINOLOGY FOR USE IN ASSESSING RISK TO PROPERTY (CONTINUED)

QUALITATIVE RISK ANALYSIS MATRIX – LEVEL OF RISK TO PROPERTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIKELIHOOD</th>
<th>CONSEQUENCES TO PROPERTY (With Indicative Approximate Cost of Damage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicative Value of Approximate Annual Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - ALMOST CERTAIN</td>
<td>10^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - LIKELY</td>
<td>10^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - POSSIBLE</td>
<td>10^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - UNLIKELY</td>
<td>10^4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - RARE</td>
<td>10^5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - BARELY CREDIBLE</td>
<td>10^6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(5) For Cell A5, may be subdivided such that a consequence of less than 0.1% is Low Risk
(6) When considering a risk assessment it must be clearly stated whether it is for existing conditions or with risk control measures which may not be implemented at the current time.

RISK LEVEL IMPLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Example Implications (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VH</td>
<td>VERY HIGH RISK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>HIGH RISK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>MODERATE RISK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>LOW RISK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL</td>
<td>VERY LOW RISK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (?) The implications for a particular situation are to be determined by all parties to the risk assessment and may depend on the nature of the property at risk; these are only given as a general guide.
Flat Bush Community Facilities Locations
File No.: CP2019/17062

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve Barry Curtis Park as the location for the aquatic and leisure centre.
2. To approve Block K in Ormiston Town Centre as the location for the library and community hub.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
3. Two community facilities are planned for the Flat Bush area, a library and community hub and aquatic and leisure centre. They are priorities for the Howick Local Board and the Flat Bush community. To progress planning and delivery of the facilities, a decision is required on their locations.
4. The recommended locations are for the:
   • aquatic and leisure centre to move to Barry Curtis Park
   • library and community hub to remain on Block K in Ormiston Town Centre.
5. This follows a review by Otium Planning Group Pty Ltd (Otium). They completed a site assessment on three sites owned by council in the Flat Bush area (see Attachment A for the Ormiston Town Centre Masterplan and Stage Block Plan):
   • Ormiston Town Centre – Block K
   • Ormiston Town Centre – Block B2
   • Barry Curtis Park.
6. The first stage of the site assessment discounted Block B2 for the aquatic and leisure centre as it is not large enough for a multi-sport facility, including aquatic centre, indoor recreation and car parking. It does not offer any opportunity or flexibility for future needs or service growth. This differs from the 2015 location assessment which recommended Block B2 as the preferred location.
7. The site assessment confirmed that Block K is suitable for a stand-alone library and community hub but is not large enough to also include an integrated aquatic and leisure centre.
8. Barry Curtis Park is suitable for both a stand-alone aquatic and leisure centre and an integrated facility that brings the library, community space, aquatic and leisure centre under one roof.
9. The review considered two options using a quadruple bottom line (QBL) assessment.
   • Option 1 – Stand-alone facilities on two sites (library and community hub on Block K in Ormiston Town Centre and aquatic and leisure centre on Barry Curtis Park)
   • Option 2 – An integrated facility on Barry Curtis Park including the library, community space, aquatic and leisure centre.
10. The QBL assessment gives a holistic assessment of options and considered four outcome areas: social, cultural, environmental and economic. There were similar outcomes across many of the attributes but Option 1, stand-alone community facilities on two sites, performs better across social and cultural outcomes. Option 2 performs better in economic outcomes.
11. Funding for the community facilities is included in the Long-term Plan 2018–2028 (LTP) and cost estimates indicate the facilities can be delivered within the combined budgets.

12. Risks include negative community perception regarding the change of location of the aquatic and leisure centre and delays to the project while the location review was undertaken. There are also general construction risks such as site-specific conditions, cost escalations and timeframes. The risks can be mitigated through communication, planning and design.

13. Next steps for the library and community hub are procurement of the design team and concept planning together with consideration for the early engagement of a contractor to better facilitate value for money outcomes. Next steps for the aquatic and leisure centre are community engagement on service requirements and updating the Barry Curtis Park masterplan to include the aquatic and leisure centre.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Howick Local Board:

a) rescind resolution HW/2015/166 that the Howick Local Board:
   i) approves the location of the Flat Bush aquatic/leisure centre site as Ormiston Road between Pencaitland Drive and Park Edge Road in Ormiston Town Centre.

b) approve Barry Curtis Park as the location for the Flat Bush aquatic and leisure centre.

c) endorse the sale of Block B2 as shown on the Ormiston Town Centre stage block plan dated 25 September 2012 (Attachment A) as it is now not required for the Flat Bush aquatic and leisure centre.

d) approve Block K in Ormiston Town Centre as shown on the Ormiston Town Centre stage block plan dated 25 September 2012 (Attachment A) as the location for the Flat Bush library and community hub.

Horopaki

Context

14. The Flat Bush library and community hub and aquatic and leisure centre are priorities for the Howick Local Board and the Flat Bush community. They form the board’s One Local Initiative advocacy item. They are also priorities in the Community Facilities Network Action Plan to support the significant residential growth in the area. The expected population of Flat Bush by 2046 is 55,096.

15. The Ormiston Town Centre Masterplan (2012; see Attachment A) outlines the planned location of the library and aquatic centre in Ormiston Town Centre. Earlier planning for Barry Curtis Park, prior to 2012 included the aquatic centre in the park.

16. Howick Local Board resolved in 2015 (HW/2015/166) to approve the location of the aquatic and leisure centre in Ormiston Town Centre. This was based on an assessment that considered criteria including site suitability for development, proximity to the Ormiston Town Centre, amenities including public transport and parking, servicing, security and safety and proximity to schools. The assessment concluded that the advantages of the Ormiston Town Centre location outweighed the advantages of Barry Curtis Park.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

17. The Community Facilities Network Plan (2015) guides investment in community facilities. It has an objective of focussing investment on developing fit-for-purpose, integrated and connected community facilities. Integrated facilities are one building with multiple spaces flexibly designed to accommodate and deliver a range of complementary activities. They provide activities and services that respond in a more holistic manner to meeting community needs, are convenient to access and more effectively delivered. The benefits of integrated facilities include:

- convenient, one stop shop for community activities
- cross promotion, and exposure to, a broad range of activities, programmes and events
- maximising use through sharing flexible and multi-purpose spaces
- better return on investment through shared infrastructure, avoiding duplication of spaces and management, staffing and maintenance.

18. There are three sites in council ownership that are considered in the location assessment (see Attachment A for the Ormiston Town Centre Masterplan and Stage Block Plan).

- Ormiston Town Centre – Block K
- Ormiston Town Centre – Block B2
- Barry Curtis Park.

19. Otium were contracted to:

- compare two stand-alone community facilities with a co-located integrated community hub
- conduct a site assessment and QBL analysis of the advantages and implications of different site options.

20. The summary Otium report is included as Attachment B.

21. The first phase of the site assessment (see table one below) looked at the suitability of the above sites for facility development, using the below criteria:

- size of site meets development requirements
- public and active transport access
- visibility of site
- land suitability (e.g. flat, stable soil conditions).

22. The scoring scale is ten points meets all criterion and zero points does not meet any criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site criteria</th>
<th>Block K Stand-alone library and community hub</th>
<th>Block K Integrated</th>
<th>Block B2 Stand-alone aquatic</th>
<th>Block B2 Integrated</th>
<th>Barry Curtis Park Stand-alone aquatic</th>
<th>Barry Curtis Park Integrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site size meets development requirements</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public and active transport access</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High visibility of site</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land suitability</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. The assessment was supported by high level component schedules and spatial planning. It concluded that Barry Curtis Park is the preferred location for the aquatic and leisure centre. It offers opportunities to create a strong sport and recreation hub and has sufficient space for current requirements as well as future flexibility.

24. Ormiston Town Centre - Block B2 is not large enough for a multi-sport facility, including aquatic centre, indoor recreation and car parking. It does not offer any opportunity or flexibility for future needs or service growth. Block B2 has been discounted from further consideration.

25. The 2015 report listed advantages of the Barry Curtis Park location around the size of the site and the link to other sport and recreation activities. The disadvantages listed include the isolation at night, distance from the town centre and less direct pedestrian, public transport and private vehicle routes. These disadvantages can be mitigated through design and strengthening pedestrian and public transport routes to and through Barry Curtis Park.

26. Ormiston Town Centre - Block K is suitable for a stand-alone library and community hub but is not large enough to also include the aquatic and leisure centre. Barry Curtis Park is suitable for both a stand-alone aquatic and leisure centre and an integrated facility that brings the library, community space, aquatic and leisure under one roof.

**Options analysis of stand-alone facilities on two sites against one integrated facility**

27. Two development options were further assessed against a quadruple bottom line (Attachment B).
   - Option 1 – Stand-alone facilities on two sites (library and community hub in Ormiston Town Centre and aquatic and leisure centre on Barry Curtis Park)
   - Option 2 – An integrated facility on Barry Curtis Park including the library, community space, aquatic and leisure centre.

28. The QBL assessment is a decision support tool and provides a mix of information to understand the various impacts of alternative options. It assesses four outcome areas:
   - social – non-monetary impacts on human health and subjective wellbeing
   - cultural – non-monetary impacts on people’s sense of place and cultural identity
   - environmental – non-monetary impacts on air, soil, water, biodiversity and the natural environment in general
   - economic – monetary impacts including construction, land, operating and maintenance costs.

29. Table two assesses the two options against the QBL outcome areas. The scoring scale is:
   - negative impacts of increasing size: -, --, ---
   - no impact: 0
   - positive impacts of increasing size: +, ++, +++.
**Table 2: Quadruple bottom line assessment of development options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Option 1: Stand-alone community facilities on two sites</th>
<th>Option 2: Integrated community hub on Barry Curtis Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Improved accessibility to community facilities</td>
<td>+++ Catchments similar between the two options Block K more accessible by public transport</td>
<td>+++ Barry Curtis Park is less convenient for public transport but co-located with other sports facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved quality of experience for users</td>
<td>++ Block K directly accessible to regular or impulse visitors; other attractors in town centre e.g. shops, cinema and restaurants</td>
<td>++ Convenience of having all community facilities in one place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health and social benefits arising from increased participation</td>
<td>+++ No differences expected</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive use benefits</td>
<td>+++ No differences expected</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reputational risk for Auckland Council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--- Expectation that both facilities would be in the town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
<td>Sense of place</td>
<td>+++ Block K is central to the heart of the town centre Aquatic centre has a strong connection to health and wellbeing drivers of Barry Curtis Park</td>
<td>+ Park setting is not ideal for library and community hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of cultural identity</td>
<td>++ Opportunity to include terminus of the cultural axis on Block K</td>
<td>+ Design of building should reflect cultural identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td>Loss of open space due to facility development</td>
<td>- Both options include loss of open space in Barry Curtis Park</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td>Cost to construct</td>
<td>--- Two stand-alone facilities are more</td>
<td>- Cost saving of one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
new or improved facilities | expensive than one integrated facility | facility vs two
--- | --- | ---
Economic cost of using land for community facilities | --- | Two sites required | One site required; other sites released for alternative uses
Other whole-of-life costs e.g. operation and maintenance costs | 0 | + | Expected operational and maintenance efficiencies
Revenues from facility operation | 0 | + | Higher returns expected with increased throughput

30. The QBL assessment provides a holistic assessment of options. There were similar outcomes across many of the attributes.

31. Option 1 which locates the library and community hub on Block K in the Ormiston Town Centre and the aquatic and leisure centre in Barry Curtis Park is the recommended option. It offers greater social and cultural outcomes as it supports the hub as the heart of the town centre. It also supports the opportunity to incorporate the terminus of the cultural axis which is significant to mana whenua. The aquatic and leisure centre at Barry Curtis Park creates a recreation hub and has a strong connection to the health and wellbeing drivers of Barry Curtis Park.

32. Option 1 is more expensive than Option 2 as it involves constructing, maintaining and operating two buildings rather than one. Option 1 can be delivered within existing LTP funding.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
33. The review of locations has included key information and input from areas across council including Community Facilities, Libraries, Community Places and Parks, Sport and Recreation. All contributing areas support the library and community hub on Block K and moving the aquatic and leisure centre to Barry Curtis Park.

34. Panuku Development Auckland support the library and community hub on Block K in the Ormiston Town Centre and the aquatic and leisure centre moving to Barry Curtis Park.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
35. The location of the library and community hub in Ormiston Town Centre is in line with previous communication and community expectations.

36. Moving the aquatic and leisure centre to Barry Curtis Park means it will be further from local schools and may mean that students do not walk to the aquatic and leisure centre for school activities. However, creating a recreation hub at Barry Curtis Park supports a healthy and active community and the convenience of having a wide range of recreation opportunities in one place.

37. A workshop was held with the local board on 1 August 2019 and the proposed locations were supported by elected members.
38. Todd Property Group, developers of Ormiston Town Centre, support the library and community hub remaining on Block K. Their development, currently under construction, is designed to connect with the hub as part of the heart of the town centre.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

*Māori impact statement*

39. The Independent Māori Statutory Board Schedule of Issues of Significance to Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau identifies the need for libraries, sport and recreation, parks and community facilities to be responsive to Māori community needs. The community facilities in Flat Bush should contribute to Māori outcomes, both through the services they provide and their design and contribution to sense of place.

40. There has been hui in the past with mana whenua about the library and community hub design, but these have been on hold. An ongoing working relationship will be re-established once the location is confirmed.

41. Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki have emphasised the importance of the cultural axis that runs through Barry Curtis Park and its role in connecting the park to Ormiston Town Centre. There is an opportunity for the cultural axis to terminate on the western side of Block K and this will be further explored with mana whenua.

42. Community consultation and engagement on the service requirements for the aquatic and leisure centre is planned for late 2019. This will include mana whenua and residents within the community who identify as Māori.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

*Financial implications*

43. Funding for the community facilities is included in the Long-term Plan 2018-2028. There is $35 million for the library and community hub in 2021–2023 and $48 million for the aquatic and leisure centre in 2023–2025. The funding has increased since the Long-term Plan 2015–2025 to recognise cost escalations and later delivery timeframes.

44. Building two stand-alone facilities will incur significantly more cost than one integrated facility. It is also more expensive to operate and maintain two buildings rather than one.

45. Cost estimates confirm that the two facilities can be delivered within the Long-term Plan 2018–2028 budgets.

46. Block B2 is not a service property so the proceeds of sale will return to council.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

*Risks and mitigations*

47. Table three below outlines risks and mitigations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Risks, impacts and mitigations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative community perception of aquatic and leisure centre location decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative community perception due to delays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site specific conditions are not favourable e.g. geotechnical constraints, contamination</th>
<th>Cost and time required to remediate may impact overall project budget and timelines</th>
<th>Preliminary site investigations and geotechnical information suggests sites are suitable for development. Further detailed investigation will be required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost escalations</td>
<td>Available funding is not sufficient to complete project</td>
<td>Management through design and project delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and construction timeframes do not align to LTP phasing</td>
<td>Funding is not available when needed</td>
<td>Complete project planning. Ensure adequate resources allocated to project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of or irregular communication and engagement with local board</td>
<td>Lack of clarity and loss of trust</td>
<td>Establish clear lines of communication. Develop and implement an agreed communication and engagement strategy. Ensure all project status information is accurate and up-to-date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Ngā koringa ā-muri

### Next steps

#### Library and community hub

48. Procurement of the design team for the library and community hub has commenced. The design team will complete concept designs for the facility and these will be workshopped with the board in early 2020.

49. Project Delivery in Community Facilities are planning delivery of the project to align with project phasing in the LTP.

#### Aquatic and leisure centre

50. Community engagement is needed to confirm the service requirements for the aquatic and leisure centre. This will take place in late 2019. The goals of the engagement are to:
   - inform the community about the project and opportunities to be involved
   - understand ideas, preferences and needs of the community.

   There will be multiple opportunities for the community to be involved including online and face-to-face methods. Staff will consider how the engagement process can bring the community together and provide opportunities for all sectors of the community to participate.

51. Advice will be provided to the local board on the aquatic and leisure network requirements, including the boards aspiration for a 50 metre pool and impacts of local, destination and regional provision in Flat Bush as defined in the Community Facilities Network Plan (2015).

52. The masterplan for Barry Curtis Park will need to be updated to include the aquatic and leisure centre. This process will confirm the best location within the park and will require public consultation. It is anticipated that this consultation can run concurrently with the community engagement for service requirements.

53. Design work is expected to begin in 2021 with delivery of the facility during 2025 to align with project phasing in the LTP.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ormiston Town Centre Masterplan and Stage Block Plan</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Flat Bush Community Facilities Location Review - Summary</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>John Dragicevich - Manager Strategic Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justine Haves - Manager Service and Asset Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa Tocker - Head of Service Strategy and Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment A: Ormiston Town Centre Masterplan and Stage Block Plan
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1. THE REVIEW

Auckland Council has allocated funding to develop a Library and Community Hub and Aquatic and Leisure Centre for the Flat Bush community:
- Library and Community Hub. This project has an allocated budget of $35M in the Long-Term Plan.
- Aquatic and Leisure Centre. This project has an allocated budget of $46M in the Long-Term Plan.

As part of Council’s service planning, different models for the provision for ownership, design, location and operation of community facilities are being explored to meet the needs of a growing and diverse Auckland population and to ensure affordability over time.

The objectives for community facilities for the future are:
- Integrated and coordinated planning across all types of community facilities to ensure future decisions are based on clear evidence and assessment of all options.
- Make the best use of our existing network of community facilities where these continue to meet community needs.
- Focus investment on developing fit for purpose, integrated and connected community facilities.
- Explore opportunities to leverage and support partnerships with other providers.

Optum Planning Group were engaged to investigate two project questions:
- Firstly, to investigate and then compare the impacts of standalone community facilities against a co-located integrated community hub.
- Secondly, to conduct a site assessment and quadruple bottom line analysis of location options that help inform Auckland Council and the Howick Local Board of the advantages and implications of each option.

To answer these questions, a four step process was followed as illustrated here. A detailed report describing the study objectives, process, findings and conclusions has been completed.

[Diagram of the four step process with labels for each step: Step 01 Initial Research and Investigation, Step 02 Spatial Planning, Step 03 Comparative Analysis of Options, Step 04 Report]
2. PLANNING HISTORY

The review acknowledges a number of different considerations and that there is a long history of planning for the Library and Community Hub and Aquatic and Leisure Centre.
3. WHAT HAVE WE LEARNT?

The growing population of Flat Bush will reach 55,000 residents in 2046. This population will require the provision of a local** level of Library and Community Hub and Aquatic and Leisure Centre services. The design of the community facilities will need to be welcoming, flexible and provide services that are affordable, accessible and programmable for all ages, genders, abilities and cultures.

Community facility trends are changing and shaping Council's community services. There is a shift towards an integrated service model that:

- Delivers design, cost and facility management efficiencies; and
- Provides a one stop shop for a diverse mix of participation opportunities that attract a broad audience.

Of particular importance to Auckland and Flat Bush is providing programmes for their unique demographic characteristics with a high proportion of young people and families and a very high (60%) proportion of new migrants from Asian backgrounds.

The vision and spaces for a Library and Community Hub have moved from an arts and performance venue to a local** Library and Community Hub for community participation in arts, music and dance, celebrations and events.

* Local as defined in Auckland Council’s Community Facilities Network Plan.

There is support for the Library and Community Hub to be located in the Town Centre, however there are opportunities for an Active Recreation Hub in Berry Curtis Park created by relocating the Aquatic and Leisure Centre.

BENCHMARK CASE STUDIES OF INTEGRATED AQUATIC AND HEALTH, CULTURAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE MODELS SHOW:

- Provides a one stop shop for community activities, leisure, knowledge and learning, arts and entertainment.
- Passive exposure of co-location of community facilities where visitors go from the Community Hub to Aquatic Centre and vice versa.
- Offers a broader range of partnerships across sectors and activities to attract all interests together.
- Provides for shared infrastructure such as entry, foyer, amenities, staff areas, café and social spaces. Further, avoiding duplication of these common elements and maximising the use of multipurpose spaces.

**Operational savings including management, staffing and maintenance savings.
4. FACILITY OPTIONS

The Community Facilities Network Plan together with community and stakeholder engagement has been used to help inform the options for delivery of community facilities.

**Standalone Library and Community Hub**
This would provide a place for:
- Welcoming all members of families from infants through to grandparents.
- Inviting people to gather and socialise and is fun for children and families.
- Reading a book, borrowing materials, studying or doing quiet activities.
- People to access WiFi, digital resources and devices.
- A range of community participation activities, programmes and events including arts and crafts, music and dance lessons, meetings, celebrations / events.

**Standalone Aquatic and Leisure Centre**
This would provide a place for:
- Welcoming all members of families from infants through to grandparents.
- Inviting people to gather and socialise.
- Teaching children and adults how to swim and be safe in the water.
- Aquatic programmes for young and old, rehabilitation and therapy.
- Swimming and cooling off.
- A variety of health, fitness and wellness participation opportunities.
- Fun, play and adventure.
- Multi-indoor sports including badminton, volleyball, table tennis and futsal.

**Integrated Community Hub**
An integrated Community Hub would provide a ‘local’ place for the Flat Bush that encourages learning, creativity, healthy and active living.

The hub would provide the same spaces and experiences as standalone facilities, and deliver efficiencies in design of shared spaces.
5. SITE ASSESSMENT

To assess the best site, facility, design components, schedules were prepared and agreed with council officers to provide a spatial understanding of the options for each community facility. This has informed preliminary sketches that help illustrate how the functional layout of each community facility could be accommodated on the proposed sites and their indicative capital cost.

Multiple site criteria were then used to assess each site's suitability and benefits for a standalone Library and Community Hub, standalone Aquatic and Leisure Centre and an Integrated Community Hub. The site criteria have given a spatial effect to the strategic objectives in Auckland Council's Community Facilities Network Plan and determined the site's capabilities of creating a fit for purpose, integrated, accessible and strategically placed facility or facilities.

The impacts and reach of these community facilities are difficult to quantify and are impacted by major motorways and waterways. The facility catchment areas have been assessed as relatively equal between all site options.

The facilities will be designed to meet local requirements and complement the existing facilities network.

Assessment Outcomes

Block K
Block K was assessed as suitable for a standalone Library and Community Hub. There is an opportunity to create a Library and Community Hub in the heart of the Town Centre and linked with retail / hospitality / business services in Town Square Market.

Block B2
Block B2 was assessed as unsuitable for development of a standalone Aquatic and Leisure Centre and an Integrated Community Hub. It is of insufficient size for development and is further restricted by the presence of electricity sub stations. It could not provide for aquatic centre and car parking requirements. There is no opportunity to purchase adjacent blocks because they are already developed as residential properties.

Barry Curtis Park
Barry Curtis Park is suitable for development of a standalone Aquatic and Leisure Centre and integrated Community Hub. There is an opportunity to create a sport and health hub for community within a park with trails that connect to the Town Centre.
6. QUADRUPLE BOTTOM LINE ANALYSIS

**Development Options**
Two development options were therefore identified for Quadruple Bottom Line (QBL).

**DEVELOPMENT OPTION 1**
Develop a Standalone Library and Community Hub on Block K and a Standalone Aquatic and Leisure Centre on Barry Curtis Park.

**DEVELOPMENT OPTION 2**
Develop an Integrated Community Hub on Barry Curtis Park.

**What is QBL?**
A Quadruple Bottom Line Analysis evaluates the impact of alternative policy or investment options across four outcome areas – social, cultural, economic, and environmental. Outcomes in each area can be either positive or negative. In some cases, there may be a mix of positive and negative impacts.

**Analysis Outcomes**
To make a decision on the best option, Auckland Council and the Howick Local Board need to weigh the relative merits of the Quadruple Bottom Line Analysis of each option.

The Quadruple Bottom Line Analysis shows that Option 1 is likely to deliver greater **social** and **cultural** outcomes than Option 2. The key differentiators on these criteria are:

- Option 1 will create a greater sense of place providing a strong synergy with other surrounding uses i.e. retail, cinema and hospitality and is central to the heart of the town centre. This supports a place-making approach to town centres.
- Option 2 may lead to significant reputational risks for Council as it would entail reversing a previous commitment to deliver a new Library and Community Hub in the Flat Bush Town Centre.

Option 2 is likely to deliver greater **economic** benefits than Option 1. The key differentiators are:

- Option 2 is expected to be cheaper to construct, reflecting savings in design from shared buildings.
- Option 2 will deliver lower operational maintenance costs.

**Environmental** impacts are likely to be similar. The development footprint and site location at Barry Curtis Park is the same in both options.
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve the allocation of Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) capital funding for recommended projects in the Howick Local Board area and to incorporate these projects in the 2019–2022 Community Facilities Work Programme.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The LDI capital fund was established to ensure that important and prioritised local improvement projects can be delivered within each local community. LDI funded projects include any project that delivers a council owned asset or a capital grant to a third party to deliver an asset made available for public use.

3. The Howick Local Board’s unallocated LDI capital budget at 31 August 2019 was approximately $3.88 million.

4. The proposed LDI capital works projects recommended for inclusion in the 2019-2022 Community Facilities Work Programme were considered by the local board through a series of workshops held in late 2018 and in 2019.

5. The board approved, in principle, a proposed programme for LDI capital works projects at the business meeting held on 20 May 2019. This programme was approved with the expectation that staff and the board would further review the intended scope of the proposed projects and prioritise those that could be delivered as part of the 2019–2022 Community Facilities Work Programme.

6. The projects recommended for LDI capital funding, as shown in Table 1 in this report and further detailed in Attachment A, have been prioritised for investment based on a combination of local board feedback, staff advice and key stakeholder input.

7. This report recommends that the board approve the allocation of $890,000 of LDI capital funding towards eight projects and include them in the approved 2019–2022 Community Facilities Work Programme.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:

a) approve the allocation of $890,000 of the local board LDI capital funding towards the eight projects detailed in Table 1 and Attachment A, and that these projects are incorporated into the approved 2019–2022 Community Facilities Work Programme.

b) note that budget allocation for these LDI projects are best current estimates and amendments may be required to accommodate final costs as these projects progress from investigation and design to delivery of physical works.
Horopaki

Context

8. The LDI capital fund was established to ensure that important local improvement projects can be delivered within the community. Local board LDI funded projects improve lifestyle and a sense of belonging and pride amongst residents.

9. The local board has the discretion to allocate its LDI budget to any project that delivers a council asset or as a capital grant to a third party to deliver an asset made available for public use.

10. Local boards can approve LDI capital projects up to $1 million. Projects that exceed this amount require approval from the Governing Body.

11. Through a series of workshops held in late 2018 and early 2019 staff workshopped with the local board potential projects for LDI funding consideration.


13. At its meeting on 17 June 2019, the Howick Local Board approved some of the proposed LDI capital works projects that were included in the 2019–2022 Community Facilities Work Programme.

14. It is now recommended that the additional LDI capital projects are included in the Community Facilities three-year work programme. A list of these projects are provided within this report and further detailed in Attachment A.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

15. Investment in the LDI capital works programme will ensure that council facilities and open spaces in the Howick Local Board area remain valuable and well-maintained community assets.

16. In preparing recommendations and the prioritisation of projects for LDI funding consideration has been given to the following:
   - strategic documents (e.g. local board plan)
   - service assessment input from Community Services
   - asset condition assessments
   - input from operational maintenance teams and staff working within Community Facilities
   - budget availability.

17. The recommended projects seeking LDI funding support the achievement of the following 2017 Howick Local Board Plan priorities:
   - Involved and connected communities
   - Our future growth is managed effectively
   - Our people are active and healthy.

Projects recommended for LDI funding are shown in Table 1. The local board has discretion to allocate LDI capital funds, and if approved these projects will be included in the 2019–2022 Community Facilities work programme.
## Table 1: Projects recommended for LDI funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>2019/2020</th>
<th>2020/2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barry Curtis Park - install shelter and covered seating</td>
<td>Design and construct a shelter and provide covered seating at the park. The shelter is designated in the vicinity of the activity centre and the skatepark. FY19/20 - investigation, design and scope FY20/21 - commence physical works</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Curtis Park - upgrade and improve event infrastructure</td>
<td>Design and upgrade event infrastructure at Barry Curtis Park to support additional events. FY19/20 - investigation, design and scope FY20/21 - commence physical works</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockle Bay Reserve - renew play assets and fence</td>
<td>Renew play assets, fence and seating at Cockle Bay Reserve. FY18/19 - investigate options to renew play assets and fencing and scope the physical works to ensure the assets remain fit for purpose and provide the required level of service. FY19/20 - confirm concept design and implement physical works.</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick Recreation Centre - install community notice board</td>
<td>Install a community notice board at the leisure centre.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Elsmore Park - develop dog exercise area</td>
<td>Develop a dog exercise area in Lloyd Elsmore Park.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers Park - renew playground</td>
<td>Develop a concept plan to increase play provision at the park, including consideration for a high degree of accessibility. The design will include options for installation of appropriate play items and supporting infrastructure. Stage one is the development of the concept plan including the investigation and scope for the physical works for local board approval. Stage two includes physical works. This is a multi-year funded project initiated as part of the 2018/19 programme. The ABS Capex renewals budget of $120,000 has been approved as part of the local board Community Facilities Work Programme 2019 -2022. (FY19/20 LDI contribution of $60,000).</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Projects recommended for LDI funding*
## Activity Name | Activity Description | 2019/2020 | 2020/2021
---|---|---|---
Rotary Walkway (Bramley Drive) – establish markings for Dick Quax Memorial Run | Establish markings along the Rotary Walkway, Bramley Drive. | | $10,000
Simon Owen Place – install footpath | Install a new footpath for pedestrian access through Simon Owen Place. The footpath will address access issues by providing alternative entry points to Elm Christian College and will also help to alleviate traffic congestion issues in the area. The project is scheduled to be delivered in FY19/20 including the investigation and design, consenting and physical works. | | $60,000

**LDI Allocation Total** | **$430,000** | **$460,000**

18. Specific projects seeking LDI funding may have budget allocated from two or more budget sources, including budget from the local board ABS Capex renewals budget.

19. The recommendations for LDI funding allocation includes both new and existing projects that have been continued from the previous financial year where those projects may require multiple years for delivery.

20. Budget allocations for the proposed LDI projects are best estimates only. Project costings are subject to change and refinement as projects progress through the design and delivery phases.

21. Careful consideration has been given to the phasing of projects over multiple years to allow for delivery timeframes and to meet budget requirements.

22. The delivery of individual projects will be managed within the overall Community Facilities work programme. Where significant change to project budgets may need to be considered, or if new LDI projects are added to the work programme, the local board will be advised and will decide if allocation of additional LDI budget will be approved.

## Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

### Council group impacts and views

23. The project recommendations for LDI funding have been developed in consultation with Community Facilities, Auckland Transport and Parks, Sports and Recreation as part of the council’s integrated local board work programme approach. This approach aimed to improve the quality of advice for the local board through collaboration and understanding across departments.

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

### Local impacts and local board views

24. The recommendations for LDI capital works have been considered by the local board in a series of workshops from in late 2018 and in 2019. Views expressed by local board members during these workshops have informed the prioritisation of the LDI capital works projects that are to be approved and included in the 2019-2022 Community Facilities Work Programme.

## Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

### Māori impact statement

25. LDI capital works projects are part of the 2019-2022 Community Facilities Work Programme which ensures that all facilities and open space assets continue to be well-maintained assets.
that benefit the local community, including Māori. When developing and delivering work programmes, including projects funded by LDI, consideration is given to how the activities can contribute to Māori well-being, values, culture and traditions.

26. Where any aspects of the proposed LDI capital works projects are anticipated to have a significant impact on sites of importance to mana whenua then appropriate engagement will be undertaken.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

27. The proposed allocation of LDI capital funding is within the available local board budgets. The approved allocation of LDI funding does not have significant financial implications, unless projects experience a significant overspend or underspend.

28. Regular updates on the delivery of LDI capital works projects will be provided to the board as part of the routine reporting of the Community Facilities work programme. These updates will identify progress of all projects and potential amendments to the approved programme including changes to budget allocation and timing.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

29. If the LDI funding is not approved for the recommended capital works projects at the business meeting, there is a risk that the proposed delivery timeframe for recommended projects may not be delivered within the 2019/2020 financial year.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

30. Once approved, delivery of activities for these LDI capital works projects will be included in the 2019–2022 Community Facilities Work Programme and will commence immediately.

31. The work programmes identify if further decisions are required for each activity. These will be brought to the local board when appropriate.

32. Progress and updates on work programmes will be reported to the local board for each quarter of the financial year.
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
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## Item 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impacted Area</th>
<th>Scope of works to be presented to the local board for their review and input prior to the delivery of physical works</th>
<th>Our future growth is managed effectively</th>
<th>CF: Project Delivery</th>
<th>Estimated project completion (June 2020)</th>
<th>LDI Capex</th>
<th>2019/2019 &amp; Prior Budget</th>
<th>2020/2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simon Owen Place - Install footpath</td>
<td>Install a new footpath for pedestrian access through Simon Owen Place. The footpath will address access issues by providing alternative entry points to Elm Christian College and will also help to alleviate traffic congestion issues in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDI Capex Allocation - Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDI Capex Allocation - Estimated Physical Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDI Capex Total Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$435,000</td>
<td>$460,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Howick Local and Multiboard Grants Round One 2019/2020 grant allocations

File No.: CP2019/14764

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To fund, part-fund or decline applications received for Howick Local Grants, Round One 2019/2020, including multiboard grant applications.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. This report presents applications received in Howick Local Grants, Round One 2019/2020 (Attachment B) and Multiboard Grants Round One 2019/2020 (Attachment C).


4. The Howick Local Board has set a total community grants budget of $600,000.00 for the 2019/2020 financial year. There was $55,000 from the 2018/2019 Local Grants Round Three funded from the 2019/2020 community grants budget. This leaves a remaining budget of $545,000.

5. Forty-four applications were received for Local Grants, Round One 2019/2020, including thirteen multiboard applications, requesting a total of $443,576.76.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Howick Local Board:

a) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application received in Howick Local Grants Round One, listed in Table One.

<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>LG2007-104</td>
<td>Te Tuhi Contemporary Art Trust</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of chairs and folding tables to upgrade the studio and social room.</td>
<td>$11,112.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2007-108</td>
<td>Howick Village Business Association</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the artist and builder fees to refurbish and expand the mural on Fencible Drive.</td>
<td>$17,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td>LG2007-114</td>
<td>New Zealand Love Dance Association Incorporated</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the rehearsal studio hire, choreography and trainer fees, costume hire, make up and advertising costs to deliver performances throughout the year.</td>
<td>$8,725.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2007-128</td>
<td>New Zealand Overseas Chinese Culture and Arts Centre Incorporated</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the venue hire, costume hire and training fees to deliver a performance at the “Coca Cola Christmas in the Park”</td>
<td>$4,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2007-130</td>
<td>Libretto Productions Limited trading as Children's Musical Theatre Studio</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the costs to deliver a musical theatre production, &quot;Singin' in the Rain Jr.,&quot; including venue hire, lighting design and equipment hire, sound hire and programme design and printing.</td>
<td>$7,984.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2007-133</td>
<td>Eastern Stars Band Incorporated</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the cost of tutoring and conducting fees, hall hire and transportation to major events for all four bands.</td>
<td>$17,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2007-136</td>
<td>Harlequin Musical Theatre</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the purchase and delivery of a new shipping container for storage and the cost of removing the old container.</td>
<td>$3,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2007-102</td>
<td>Sunnyhills Primary School</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the costs to construct an asphalt bike track.</td>
<td>$9,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2007-107</td>
<td>Auckland Seniors Support And Caring Group Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the venue hire at Pakuranga Community Hall and tutor fees to host weekly community activities.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2007-112</td>
<td>Asthma New Zealand Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of a tablet computer and the wages of one asthma nurse educator.</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2007-117</td>
<td>Highland Park Community Creche Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards rental fees for one year to run a preschool programme.</td>
<td>$15,200.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2007-118</td>
<td>South East Auckland Senior Citizens’ Association Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the venue hire, catering, hall setup and clean-up, entertainment and sound to host a Christmas and a 15-year anniversary celebration.</td>
<td>$3,175.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2007-121</td>
<td>Bhartiya Samaj Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of running an elderly support programme, specifically venue hire, transport and accommodation.</td>
<td>$8,040.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2007-124</td>
<td>Life Education Trust Counties Manukau</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the overall costs to deliver a health and well-being programme to schools in the Howick Local Board area.</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2007-125</td>
<td>The Carol White Family Centre Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the travel and food costs for volunteers and refugee families, supplies for the child care centre and wages for a bilingual assistant.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2007-126</td>
<td>The Scout Association of New Zealand</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the salary of the general manager to oversee scout groups in the Howick Local Board area.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2007-127</td>
<td>Dance Therapy NZ</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards venue hire, marketing, facilitation, equipment, coordination and administration costs for the “STARS” Pakuranga programme.</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2007-132</td>
<td>Howick Baptist Healthcare Limited</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the set up and running costs for the &quot;Virtual Village,&quot; including venue hire, catering, planning and facilitation, evaluation, promotions and presentation equipment.</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2007-134</td>
<td>Manukau East Council of Social Services Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards ongoing operational costs for the council of social services.</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2007-135</td>
<td>Youthline Auckland Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the overall costs to train, manage and supervise the volunteer counsellors.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2007-137</td>
<td>CNSST Foundation</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the teacher facilitation fees and the purchase of two tablets.</td>
<td>$12,432.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Grant Code</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount (NZD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td>LG2007-138</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 Howick Local Board area.</td>
<td>$5,112.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2007-131</td>
<td>Tread Lightly Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Towards the wages of education contractors to deliver the &quot;Tread Lightly Caravan&quot; programme to the Elim Christian College Junior Campus.</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2007-103</td>
<td>Howick Village Business Association</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards the traffic management costs to deliver the Midnight Madness 2019 event.</td>
<td>$4,168.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2007-106</td>
<td>Howick Brass Incorporated</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards the stage, lighting and sound costs to host the &quot;Christmas by Candle Light&quot; event.</td>
<td>$10,404.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2007-113</td>
<td>Lions Club of Howick Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards the overall costs of hosting the Howick Lions Summer Festival 2020.</td>
<td>$26,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2007-129</td>
<td>Howick and Districts Historical Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Historic Heritage</td>
<td>Towards the costs of a conservation plan for the Hawthorn Dene property.</td>
<td>$9,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2007-101</td>
<td>Howick Sailing Club</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of a hull for a new rigid inflatable safety boat.</td>
<td>$17,504.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 18

**Howick Local and Multiboard Grants Round One 2019/2020 grant allocations**

#### Howick Local Board
16 September 2019

<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>LG2007-109</td>
<td>Pakuranga United Rugby Club</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards the costs to host the 2019 World School Sevens rugby tournament, including grandstands and delivery, St Johns, big screen hire, marquees and the family entertainment zone.</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2007-115</td>
<td>Bucklands Beach Association Football Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards the costs to lease the Howick Pakuranga Cricket Club facilities during the 2020 winter season.</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2007-123</td>
<td>Pakuranga Athletic Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards the overall costs to host the Dick Quax Memorial Distance Championships 2019, including grandstand hire, entertainment, safety equipment and supplies.</td>
<td>$10,549.50</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$394,056.22</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application received in Multiboard Local Grants Round One, listed in Table Two.

<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>$4,630.00</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 to attend the theatre production &quot;Greedy Cat.&quot;</td>
<td>$3,103.55</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-113</td>
<td>Pegasus Flying Trust Air Training Corps</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the installation of an electrical connection to the Trust Hangar based in Whenuapai.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</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>$4,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-144</td>
<td>Epilepsy Association of New Zealand Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the educator’s salary, fuel costs and telecommunications to deliver epilepsy support services.</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 two family camps at YMCA Adair, including staff costs, accommodation, outdoor instruction, gear and catering.</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-161</td>
<td>The Parkinson's New Zealand Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the salaries of six Parkinson's community educators for the period of 1 October 2019 to 1 October 2020.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-162</td>
<td>Children's Autism Foundation</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards workshop facilitation fees, mileage costs, project coordination administration and printing to deliver the &quot;In It Together&quot; workshop series.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td>Environmental Education for Resource Sustainability Trust</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of native plants, the purchase of classroom bins and the courier fees for delivering the classroom bins.</td>
<td>$9,260.99</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td>The Korean Society of Auckland Incorporated</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards the event costs for 2020 Korean Day, including venue hire, catering, sound, advertising and performance fees.</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20</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 'Lifeguard Facility Replacement Project.'</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>Counties Manukau Sports Foundation</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards the catering, venue hire and event coordinator fee to host the 2019 &quot;Counties Manukau Sporting Excellence Awards.&quot;</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>Totara Park Mountain Bike Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards the maintenance costs of the Totara Park mountain bike trail, including the digger machine and operator hire, contractor fees, equipment hire and materials.</td>
<td>$6,426.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$49,420.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

9. The Howick Local Board adopted their grants programme for 2019/2020 on 18 March 2019 and will operate one quick response and three local grant rounds for this financial year.

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.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

11. 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 rūpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

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

13. 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

14. Local boards are responsible for the decision-making and allocation of local board community grants. The Howick 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.

15. The local board is requested to note that section 50 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.”

16. A summary of each application received through Howick Local Grants, Round One 2019/2020 (Attachment B) and Multiboard Grants Round One 2019/2020 (Attachment C) is provided.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

17. 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.

18. Ten applicants applying to Howick Local Grants Round One and three applicants applying to Multiboard Grants Round One indicated that their project targets Māori or Māori outcomes.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

19. The allocation of grants to community groups is within the adopted 2018-2028 Long-Term Plan and 2019/2020 local board agreement.

20. The Howick Local Board has set a total community grants budget of $600,000.00 for the 2019/2020 financial year. There was $55,000 from the 2018/2019 Local Grants Round Three funded from the 2019/2020 community grants budget. This leaves a remaining budget of $545,000.

21. Forty-four applications were received for Local Grants, Round One 2019/2020, including thirteen multiboard applications, requesting a total of $443,576.76.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

22. 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

23. Following the Howick Local Board allocation of funding for Local Grants Round One and Multiboard Grants Round One, Commercial and Finance staff will notify the applicants of the local board’s decision and facilitate payment of the grant.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Howick Local Board Grants Programme 2019/2020</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Howick Local Grants Round One 2019/2020 Grant Applications (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Howick Multiboard Grants Round One 2019/2020 Grant Applications (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Makenzie Hirz - Senior Community Grants Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Marion Davies - Grants and Incentives Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shane King - Head of Service Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Howick Local Board - Local Grants Programme 2019/2020

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

Outcomes sought by the Howick Local Board

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

- Involved and connected communities
- Our future growth is managed effectively
- Valuing our cultural diversity
- A treasured environment
- Our people are active and healthy
- A prosperous local economy

Our priorities sought from grant applications

The Howick Local Board welcomes grant applications that align with the following local board plan priorities:

- People are supported to actively contribute to their community
- Better used facilities and open spaces to meet existing and future growth needs
- Share and celebrate our culture, and grow our arts, culture and music
- Our natural and built environment is well-managed
- Sport and recreational opportunities respond to the needs of our growing communities
- Our area is an attractive tourist destination

Higher priorities:

The Howick Local Board will prioritise applications which:

- Demonstrate smokefree programmes
- Demonstrate zero waste activities
- Are projects with a contribution from the applicant (for example financial, volunteer time, donated goods and services) or alternate funding sources
- Are events or activities that are held in the local board area and can demonstrate the benefit to the local community

Lower Priorities:

The Howick Local Board has identified the following as lower priorities:

- Fundraising events or activities, unless the activity or event has a wider community benefit beyond its primary purpose as a fundraiser
- Ongoing operational costs including wages and salaries, with the exception of fees for professional and specialised services
- Catering
• Purchase of gear, assets, and/or equipment with limited future usage
• Gratuity for volunteers e.g. petrol vouchers

Ineligibility

In addition to the eligibility criteria outlined the Community Grants Policy, the Howick Local Board will not fund:

• applicants who have failed to complete or provide a satisfactory accountability form from previous grants

Investment approach

The Howick Local Board has allocated budgets to support the local grants programme as follows:

a) Quick Response Grants
   - Minimum amount per grant: $250
   - Maximum amount per grant: $3,000

b) Local Grants
   - Minimum amount per grant: $3,000

Application dates

Grant rounds for 2019/2020 will be as follows:

**Quick Response 2019/2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant round</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round One</td>
<td>13 April 2020</td>
<td>8 May 2020</td>
<td>15 June 2020</td>
<td>1 July 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Grants 2019/2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant round</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round one</td>
<td>10 June 2019</td>
<td>19 July 2019</td>
<td>16 September 2019</td>
<td>1 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>16 September 2019</td>
<td>18 October 2019</td>
<td>9 December 2019</td>
<td>10 December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round three</td>
<td>10 February 2020</td>
<td>20 March 2020</td>
<td>18 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multi-board Grants 2019/2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant round</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round One</td>
<td>3 June 2019</td>
<td>19 July 2019</td>
<td>16 September 2019</td>
<td>1 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two</td>
<td>20 January 2020</td>
<td>13 March 2020</td>
<td>18 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multi-board Grants

The Howick Local Board welcomes multi-board grant applications. However, the activity or initiative will need to clearly benefit the Howick community.

Accountability measures

The Howick Local Board requires recipients of community grants to satisfactorily fulfil the accountability requirements set by council.
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To note the resolution of the Governing Body and consider giving feedback to the Chief Executive before 30 September 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. At its meeting on 22 August 2019, the Governing Body resolved as follows:

Resolution number GB/2019/82
MOVED by Mayor P Goff, seconded by Cr L Cooper:
That the Governing Body:

a) receive the Freedom Camping Hearings Panel recommendations
b) defer any decision on a Freedom Camping in Vehicles bylaw pending advice from officers on the content of a new Statement of Proposal for a bylaw, and further information on a possible review of the Freedom Camping Act 2011
c) agree to alter part of previous resolution GB/2015/112 passed at the Governing Body meeting on 29 October 2015

from:
“a) confirm the following legacy bylaws, or residual parts, in accordance with section 63(3) of the Local Government (Auckland Transitional Provisions) Act 2010 until 31 October 2020, at which time these bylaws, or residual parts, will be automatically revoked …”

to:
“a) confirm the legacy bylaws in i., or residual parts, in accordance with section 63(3) of the Local Government (Auckland Transitional Provisions) Act 2010, until a new bylaw made under the Freedom Camping Act 2011 comes into force at which time these bylaws or residual parts will be automatically revoked; and confirm the legacy bylaws in subparagraphs ii. to v. or residual parts, in accordance with section 63(3) of the Local Government (Auckland Transitional Provisions) Act 2010 until 31 October 2020, at which time these bylaws, or residual parts, will be automatically revoked…”

d) direct officers to provide the Regulatory Committee (or its equivalent) and Governing Body with advice on the following potential elements of a future Statement of Proposal:

i) proposed prohibitions in the following areas:
   A) all areas the Freedom Camping Hearings Panel recommended should be prohibited
   B) the 61 sites proposed in public submissions for inclusion as prohibited areas, which were not specified in the original Statement of Proposal but are identified in Attachment E of the Hearings Panel Report
   C) all Reserves in residential areas that are Reserves held under the Reserves Act 1977
ii) restricted freedom camping in the seven sites proposed in public submissions for inclusion as restricted freedom camping areas, which were not specified in the original Statement of Proposal but are identified in Attachment E of the Hearings Panel Report

iii) restricted or prohibited freedom camping in two sites proposed in public submissions, which were not specified in the original Statement of Proposal but are identified in Attachment E of the Hearings Panel Report

iv) a General Rule that regulates freedom camping outside restricted and prohibited areas not listed in the proposed bylaw, which includes provision for:

A) a prohibition of all freedom camping in vehicles parked directly outside residential homes (unless the resident has granted permission for the vehicle to be parked outside their home)

B) a prohibition of all freedom camping in vehicles parked directly outside commercial premises, educational facilities, healthcare facilities, playgrounds, and swimming pools

C) a maximum number of nights stay at any specific site

D) the same enforcement approach in relation to homelessness as set out in the original Statement of Proposal, which aims to offer compassionate support for people with social needs.

v) any other specific proposal for possible inclusion in a Statement of Proposal that is communicated to the Chief Executive by a councillor or Local Board before 30 September 2019.

e) note that following decisions on the advice on the matters in recommendation d) above, council officers will be directed to develop a new Statement of Proposal for the Freedom Camping in Vehicles Bylaw for consideration by the Regulatory Committee (or its equivalent) and the Governing Body, following consultation with Local Boards”.

3. The Governing Body considered the following at its meeting on 22 August 2019:

a) Item 9 – Implementing the next steps for the Freedom Camping in Vehicles Bylaw (Hearings Panel Report)

b) Item 10 – Chair’s Report on Freedom Camping in Vehicles Bylaw.

4. The attachments to this report show sites that are already in scope for the next phase of work. Attachment A provides a list of areas included in the previous statement of proposal and Attachment B provides a list of the 70 additional areas raised by submitters during the previous consultation.

5. This is an opportunity to provide further input on proposed sites which have not already been included within the scope of the next phase and which meet statutory requirements for inclusion in the Freedom Camping in Vehicles Bylaw.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Howick Local Board:

a) note the resolution of the Governing Body with regards to the Freedom Camping in Vehicles Bylaw.

b) forward any other specific proposal for possible inclusion in a Statement of Proposal to the Chief Executive before 30 September 2019.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Freedom Camping in Vehicles – Managing freedom camping in Auckland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Statement of Proposal) <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Areas proposed by submitters during public consultation and not</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>included within the statement of proposal (Attachment E of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hearings Panel Report)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Michael Sinclair - Manager Social Policy and Bylaws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Kataraina Maki – General Manager, Community &amp; Social Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Areas by ward not included in the statement of proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-scheduled area</th>
<th>Restriction sought</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Link to summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Albert-Eden</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 293 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferndale Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 281 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gribblehirst Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 312 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 313 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbutt Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 315 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kukuwai Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 321 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Halberg Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 332 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōwairaka Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 333 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Reserve - Mt Albert</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 337 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 340 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterview Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 350 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Road - Mt Eden</td>
<td>Seeking restricted freedom camping</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 353 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Devonport-Takapuna</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castor Bay Beach Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>North Shore</td>
<td>Page 298 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham Beach</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>North Shore</td>
<td>Page 300 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Franklin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āwhitu Peninsula: Cochrane’s Road, Pollok Lookout; Pollock Beach; Big bay Boat Ramp</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Page 296 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Lawrie Fields</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Page 304 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halls Beach Access, Clarks Beach</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Page 314 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaka Sports Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Page 318 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karioitahi Beach</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Page 319 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patumahoe Sports Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Page 335 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukekohe Train Station and Pukekohe Hill</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Page 338 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wattle Bay - Āwhitu Peninsula</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Page 282 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Great Barrier</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment B</td>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restricted Area</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Link to Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-scheduled area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avana Beach, Great Barrier Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windy Canyon, Great Barrier Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tui Glen Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingvale Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arliss Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside Reserve (also known as Maygrove Reserve)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matakatia Bay / Beach / Parade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamakou Road Car park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntly Reserve, Campbells Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longing Road Car Park - Stammore Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothesay Bay Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wairere Beach, The Strand Wairere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockle Bay Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockle Bay Domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millhouse Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Referred from the Governing Body: Freedom Camping in Vehicles Bylaw
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-scheduled area</th>
<th>Restriction sought</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Link to summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiraumea Drive Reserve - Pakuranga</td>
<td>Seeking restricted freedom camping</td>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>Page 346 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergusson Domain</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Page 310 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ōrākei</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cawley Street Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 299 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Maiden Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 305 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfield Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 305 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingle Dell</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 306 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellerslie Domain</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 306 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupe Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 322 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liston Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 323 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maskell Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 328 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michaels Ave Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 329 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacock Street - Glendowie</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 336 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāmaki Yacht Club area</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 343 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Landing - Tāmaki Drive</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 345 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Papakura</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>Page 301 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Beth Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Manurewa-Papakura</td>
<td>Page 326 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rodney</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198 Mangatawhiri Road, Omaha</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Page 277 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasse Reserve - Willjames Avenue</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Page 311 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori Bay Car Park at Muriwai Beach</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Page 325 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakiri Beach frontage</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Page 334 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Harbour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herald Island Wharf Car Park</td>
<td>Seeking restricted freedom camping</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Page 316 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimarie Beach Reserve - Whenuapai</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Page 348 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waiheke</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-scheduled area</td>
<td>Restriction sought</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Link to summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae Reserve (Te Huruhu Bay Reserve) 53 Tahatai road, Waiheke island and Lot 1, Te Huruhu Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitomatā and Gulf</td>
<td>Page 326 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Wilson Reserve and Rocky Bay</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitomatā and Gulf</td>
<td>Page 327 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Toki Road (Te Toki Road Reserve)</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitomatā and Gulf</td>
<td>Page 344 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Ranges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Seaview Road</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>Page 289 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Road Car Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>Page 309 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Pukematekeo Car Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>Page 331 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spraggs Bush Car Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>Page 341 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stedfast Park, Glenesk Road, Lograce Road</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>Page 342 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitomatā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitomatā and Gulf</td>
<td>Page 291 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitomatā and Gulf</td>
<td>Page 297 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>Page 333 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Howick Local Board:

a) receive this report on informal workshop summary views from local boards on the draft findings of the Animal Management Bylaw 2015 review.

b) provide 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 2 - Local board informal views on animal nuisances

<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>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>types of nuisance caused by birds is very subjective</td>
</tr>
<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>
Item 20

- feeding wild pigeons and seagulls is causing a nuisance.
- there are large numbers of stray cats across the region
- cats breed in construction and development spaces
- cats cause a nuisance by defecating in vegetable gardens
- abandoned kittens become feral and cause nuisance
- cats are eating native wildlife.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cats</th>
<th>Pigs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in urban areas temporarily keeping pigs for fattening causes nuisance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rabbits</th>
<th>Roosters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roosters are a nuisance and can be vicious, harmful animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in rural areas people are abandoning roosters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rural areas have a higher tolerance for roosters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Vermin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people complain about vermin and water rats in waterways, low tide or the deep bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>open composting could create issues with vermin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complaints about rats are increasing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Vermin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people complain about vermin and water rats in waterways, low tide or the deep bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>open composting could create issues with vermin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complaints about rats are increasing.</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 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>if your animal is going to leave your property, it should be identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>council should offer a form of assistance to identify your animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every farm animal should be tagged and named</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identifying animals would prevent people from feeding unowned animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identifying animals is useful but impractical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the council should collaborate with the National Animal Identification and Tracing database.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the bylaw should be clear on what the council does and does not do regarding animal management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the council should clarify the process for reporting unowned animals causing nuisance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the bylaw’s animal management processes need to align with the Regional Pest Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the council should offer mediation services for disgruntled neighbours over animal nuisance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>
</table>
| **Bees** | 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. | - 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 beehive 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. | - 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. |
| **Horses** | Local boards are able to set specific controls for horses for local parks and beaches. 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. | - the same access rules for dogs on beaches should be applied to horses  
- 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. | - horse owners should be responsible for removing manure. The bylaw should encourage accountability and consider that picking up manure is not always practical, e.g. on busy roads  
- should be allowed to ride horses on berms  
- horses should not be banned from roads. There are few places to ride. |
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**Table 9 - Local board informal views on controls for cats and other animals**

<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 | 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. |
| Stock  | 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 in urban areas must also be restrained within the boundaries of the premises on which they are kept, and chicken coops must not cause a nuisance and must be regularly cleaned.  
In rural areas the above controls do not apply. Rural residents must ensure their animals do not cause a nuisance to any other person. | |  
• 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.

---

**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  
  o should make sure extremes are restricted, such as having 30+ cats  
- the bylaw should require the de-sexing of cats  
  o the council should work closely with the SPCA in this matter
Item 20

- 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
- rely on the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 guidelines
- 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.
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Item 20

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
  - keeping of 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

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>

Rates of not owning an animal (pg. 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender diverse</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75 years or older</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-74 years</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24 years</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rates of not owning an animal by local board area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local board area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier (2 resp.)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Baia</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangateau</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manukau</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtahuhu</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Paparoa</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtahuhu-Tāmaki</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtangawhiti</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People’s Panel data on animal ownership

Cats (pg. 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat ownership rates by local board area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Ranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Marsden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chickens and roosters (pg. 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chicken and rooster ownership rates by local board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier (2 resp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Ranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere-Orāhuhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Harbour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many Aucklanders are experiencing animal nuisance
Council complaints data 2015-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Examples of complaints</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wandering</td>
<td>Stock on roads and property</td>
<td>117,601 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animals getting into left out rubbish</td>
<td>107,374 (involving dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,227 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Barking and crowing</td>
<td>88,187 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86,657 (involving dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,530 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faeces</td>
<td>Wandering animals leaving poop on property</td>
<td>2,206 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owners not picking up after their animals</td>
<td>1,795 (involving dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>411 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead animals</td>
<td>Dead animals dumped on side of roads</td>
<td>1,266 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dead animals in ponds and storm water fields</td>
<td>671 (involving dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>595 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smell</td>
<td>Bad odours attracting mice and rats</td>
<td>1,244 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decomposing animals</td>
<td>408 (involving dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smelly chicken coops</td>
<td>836 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People’s Panel April 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Examples of nuisance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,350 (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhygienic behaviour</td>
<td>Animal faeces left in parks, walkways or on private property, especially vegetable gardens</td>
<td>1,350 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal wandering</td>
<td>Animals wandering onto neighbouring property</td>
<td>896 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbours harbouring rats in overgrown sections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenty nuisance</td>
<td>Odour from animal excreta</td>
<td>667 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loud animals, especially crowing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to property</td>
<td>Scratched deck furniture</td>
<td>531 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yard digging up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property damage from animal faeces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Animals attacking native wildlife</td>
<td>420 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeding wild animals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressive looking livestock in public areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deceased animals in public areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed behaviour</td>
<td>Pets and people being attacked by aggressive animals</td>
<td>370 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter</td>
<td>Finding the practice of killing animals offensive</td>
<td>59 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Witnessing slaughter or leftover remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top nuisances (People’s Panel)

Overall nuisance rates (pg. 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nuisance rates by local board area</th>
<th>Ōea-o-Papakura</th>
<th>Ōrākau and Rays</th>
<th>Manurewa</th>
<th>Howick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier (2 resp.)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākau</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāinga</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which animals have caused a nuisance in the past year? (pg. 19)

- Cats
- Mice/ rabbits
- Other
- Birds
- Chickens/ roosters
- Bees
- Ducks
- Rabbits

Hot topics

- 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)
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.”
Attachment A

Item 20

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)

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.

Horse riding in a public place

Horses in a Public Place Control – General conditions
(1) In a public place the owner of a horse—
(a) must remove or safely dispose of any horse manure that is deposited in a public place;
(b) must show due consideration for other public place users at all times;
(c) must, when on a beach, ride or lead their horse in a manner that does not intimidate, cause a danger or nuisance to other beach users; and
(d) must not ride or lead their horse on coastal dunes except when accessing the beach, an adjoining property or road in a manner that does not cause, nor is likely to cause, damage to any part of that dune, and that utilises the most direct route possible.

Horses in a Public Place Control – Conditions for specified beaches
(2) The following conditions apply to the presence of horses on Agies Beach, Hatfields Beach, Martins Bay Beach, Omana Beach, Orewa Beach and Snells Beach—
(a) horses must only be ridden or lead along the beach between the times of mid and low tide, and must be ridden or lead along the beach below the high tide mark;
(b) between 1 December and 15 February (including weekends), horses are only allowed before 10:00am and after 7:00pm; and
(c) horses are prohibited at Easter weekend (Friday to Monday inclusive) and Labour weekend (Saturday to Monday inclusive).

(3) The following conditions apply to the presence of horses on Kariotahi Beach as shown in Schedule 1—
(a) during high use periods, horses are restricted to a walk within the 1km ZONE, at all other times horses are restricted to a walk within the Safe Zone;
(b) within the 1km ZONE, horses must remain within 10 metres of the water’s edge whenever possible;
(c) horse manure must be removed from the 1km ZONE; and
(d) the unloading of horses is only permitted in the Horse Unloading Area.
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>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>Ponies</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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keeping of Stock Control – Prevention of wandering stock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keeping of stock control - Containment of chickens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(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:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) an enclosed chicken coop with an attached run, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) an enclosed chicken coop and adequate fencing of the premises.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keeping of stock control - Location of chicken coops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) The owner of any chicken must not allow their chicken coop to cause a nuisance to any other person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keeping of stock control - Chicken coop cleanliness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Views on existing controls

- **Bees (pg. 53)** – restrict to rural, require urban licence, restrict number of hives in urban, excrement unenforceable
  - People’s Panel – Bee controls
  - About right: 65%
  - No view/don’t know: 24%
  - Less control: 7%
  - More control: 4%

- **Horses (pg. 56)** – ban from beaches, stricter manure accountability, regulation on roads
  - People’s Panel – Horse controls
  - About right: 64%
  - No view/don’t know: 27%
  - More control: 6%
  - Less control: 3%

- **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
  - People’s Panel – Stock controls
  - About right: 63%
  - No view/don’t know: 25%
  - More control: 9%
  - Less control: 3%
Views on new controls

People’s Panel

Should there be controls on other animals?

- 39% I don’t know
- 35% No
- 26% Yes

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>Birds</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigeons</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbits</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrets</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rats</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</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 Omahi 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?
Howick Local Board Feedback on the discussion document on the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity

File No.: CP2019/16983

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide feedback from the Howick Local Board on the proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Ministry of Housing and Urban Development and the Ministry for Environment have released a discussion document on a proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.

3. This will replace the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (2016) and will build on existing requirements for local authorities to provide greater development capacity for supply of housing to meet demand. The proposed National Policy Statement also broadens the focus of the 2016 version to include other matters that contribute to well-functioning urban environments.

4. On 30 August 2019 all local boards were notified that Auckland Council intended to make a submission on the proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.

5. Local Boards have an opportunity to provide formal feedback to be considered in the final Auckland Council submission.

6. The Planning Committee will give direction on the proposed Auckland Council submission at a workshop scheduled for 19 September 2019. Local board chairs are also invited to this workshop.

7. Due to timeframes, a draft submission will not be sent to local boards prior to lodgment.

8. It is recommended that the board now considers the discussion document on a proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity and provides feedback.

9. Feedback will then be provided to the team leading the development of the Auckland Council submission and incorporated accordingly.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:

a) provide feedback on the discussion document on the proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.
### Ngā kaihaina
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Te take mō te pūrongo  
Purpose of the report  
1. To seek approval for the proposed mitigation work on tracks in local parks to protect healthy kauri and prevent kauri dieback spread within the Howick Local Board area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua  
Executive summary  
2. There are 307 local parks throughout the Auckland region that contain kauri. Protection of healthy kauri is the primary objective of council’s kauri dieback management approach, as is preventing the spread of kauri dieback through – among other things - the isolation of any diseased specimens.

3. To protect healthy kauri and reduce the impact of kauri dieback disease, staff have analysed all local parks and reserves in the Auckland region and developed recommended mitigation measures for each park.

4. An interim report was presented to the Howick Local Board on 18 March 2019 (HW/2019/30). This report obtained the local board’s endorsement of the proposed high-level kauri protection measures prior to the development of a detailed programme of works.

5. This report focuses on the specific programme of works for each park, including the associated costs and timeframes.

6. There are currently 47 local parks across Auckland subject to partial or full track closures. These closures were implemented between April and July 2019, as a temporary measure while mitigation options were developed. Temporary closures will continue until the mitigation works have been completed and tracks have been upgraded to be kauri-safe. In the Howick Local Board area, one track in Point View Reserve was closed temporarily.

7. Three local parks in the local board area were initially assessed and prioritised. Two of these were deemed to be low risk as they are not easily accessible and/or had no formed tracks. Detailed investigation was carried out in Point View Reserve to determine the appropriate mitigation measures.

8. A workshop was held with the Howick Local Board on 5 September 2019 to discuss the proposed detailed mitigation programme.

9. Recommended mitigation measures include re-alignment or re-routing of tracks, installation of new track surface, steps, boardwalks and installation of hygiene stations. Where appropriate, indefinite track closure is also considered as a mitigation option. Public education and engagement are always a part the proposed mitigation measures.

10. Mitigation measures proposed for Point View Reserve are detailed in Attachment A. Location maps are provided in Attachment B.

11. Further detailed design and procurement is planned for September and October. The identified mitigation works are planned to be undertaken from November 2019 to March 2020, subject to any required consent and other approvals.

12. Track mitigation works will be carried out in accordance with the kauri-safe standards and specifications provided by the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) for Kauri Dieback Management.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Howick Local Board:

a) approve the following proposed mitigation work detailed in the following table to protect healthy kauri and reduce the impact of kauri dieback disease in the Howick Local Board area, to be funded by the Natural Environment Targeted Rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Point View Reserve    | • upgrade track sections passing through Kauri Hygiene areas to kauri safe standard  
                           | • upgrade remaining track section to a formed, dry track standard where needed. | $81,000        |

b) note that budget allocation for all projects in the kauri dieback mitigation work programme are best current estimates, and amendments may be required to the kauri dieback mitigation work programme to accommodate final costs as the year progresses.

c) approve the inclusion of the proposed mitigation works in the 2019-2022 Community Facilities Work Programme.

d) delegate to the chairperson authority to approve minor amendments to the Kauri Dieback Mitigation Work Programme, following receipt of written advice from staff.

Horopaki
Context

13. There are 307 local parks throughout the Auckland region that contain kauri. The funding available from the natural environment targeted rate will not be able to provide for the protection of all kauri in the region.

14. To manage investment across the region, a risk-based prioritisation approach has been applied. Local parks have been analysed in terms of kauri ecosystem value, recreational value and kauri health status, noting that the council’s primary objective is the protection of healthy kauri.

15. This report outlines the proposed mitigation works for parks that have been prioritised, including the associated implementation costs and estimated timeframes.

16. An interim report (Resolution number HW/2019/30) regarding proposed kauri dieback mitigation in local parks was presented to the Howick Local Board on the 18 March 2019. The local board resolved the following:

   That the Howick Local Board:

   a) endorse the following high-level kauri protection measures for local parks and reserves:

      i. undertake detailed investigation to determine appropriate mitigation measures and consider temporary closure until mitigation works are completed to protect symptom free high value kauri ecosystems in Category B park Point View Reserve.
ii. note that Category C park Howick Domain and Category D park Boyd Reserve are considered to be low value kauri ecosystems, thus making them a lower priority for mitigation investment at this stage.

b) note that a detailed kauri dieback mitigation programme with costs and timelines will be developed and submitted to a local board business meeting in mid-2019 for approval.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

17. The interim report provided to the Howick Local Board on 18 March 2019 (HW/2019/30) included the results of the prioritisation of local parks and sought endorsement of the recommended high-level kauri protection actions prior to the development of the detailed programmed of works.

18. There are currently 47 local parks across Auckland subject to partial of full track closures. These closures were implemented between April and July 2019, as a temporary measure while mitigation options were developed. In Howick, one track in Point View Reserve was closed temporarily.

19. Three local parks in Howick were initially assessed and prioritised. Two of these were deemed to be low risk as they are not easily accessible and/or had no formed tracks adjoining kauri. A detailed investigation was carried out in Point View Reserve to determine appropriate mitigation measures (Attachment A and Attachment B).

20. Each track was assessed and prioritised on the following basis:

- the value of the kauri ecosystem, which was classified as high, medium or low. A kauri ecosystem value was assigned by council ecologists based on the work undertaken by Singers et al (2017): Indigenous terrestrial and wetland ecosystems of Auckland
- the health status of the kauri, which was noted as infected, possibly infected or symptom free. This information was sourced from the council’s active surveillance programme, which includes soil sampling
- the recreational value of the park, which was identified as high, medium or low. The analysis considered key recreational activities such as recreational trails, active transport, visitor destinations, volunteer activity and sports and recreation use, whether there were alternative tracks available and potential future growth. Reviews of reserve management plans (if applicable) and any other relevant strategic documents were undertaken.

21. The priority for natural environment targeted rate funding is on formal tracks with high value kauri areas and high recreational use. Mitigation of unformed or informal tracks is generally not a high priority. Those tracks are normally recommended for indefinite closure.

22. Consultation has been undertaken with the local board, key park stakeholders and Mana Whenua.

23. The kauri dieback disease mitigation programme below identifies some of the key milestones. Timeframes are estimates only, and are subject to resourcing, weather conditions (for construction) and the actual scope of the works that are required to be undertaken.
24. The mitigation options for Point View Reserve in Howick are described in detail in Attachment A. Location maps are provided in Attachment B.

The recommended mitigation works are summarised as follows:

a. **Point View Reserve**: Upgrade section of track passing near kauri to kauri-safe standards and upgrade remaining track sections to a formed, dry track standard. The estimated cost is $81,000. The estimated timeframe for completion of the works is June 2020, subject to contractor availability and weather conditions.

b. **Low Risk Tracks / Reserves**: An assessment of both Boyd Reserve and Howick Domain concluded that mitigation is not required as the kauri are difficult to access, with no formed tracks leading to or passing the kauri. The risk to kauri has therefore been assessed as low.

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

25. The recommendations in this report have been developed through collaboration between council’s Environmental Services, Parks, Sports and Recreation and Community Facilities.

26. Representatives from these key departments are working as part of a dedicated and ongoing project team, to ensure that all aspects of the kauri dieback mitigation programme are undertaken in an integrated manner.

27. Auckland Council Biosecurity specialists and kauri dieback team members have visited all parks in the Auckland regions that have kauri in close proximity to tracks to assess possible mitigation options.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

28. On 18 March 2019, an interim report was presented to the Howick Local Board where multiple high-level kauri protection measures for local parks and reserves were endorsed.

29. Closing tracks in parks or reserves will have an impact on recreational activities available in the local board area. These impacts were taken into consideration when determining suitable kauri dieback mitigation measures.

30. A workshop is to be held on 5 September 2019 with the Howick Local Board to discuss the proposed detailed mitigation programme.

31. Key stakeholder groups that use the tracks have been informed regarding the proposed mitigation works and will continue to be kept informed on the timing for the planned track works.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

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

33. Tāmaki Makaurau Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Kaimahi representatives have stressed the importance of the kauri species and expressed a desire to work more closely with the council and the Department of Conservation. Staff will work with mana whenua on the approach to kauri dieback on a site by site basis, where appropriate.

34. Mana Whenua were invited to the initial scoping of the reserves however did not attend. A workshop with mana whenua was held on 28th August 2019 where the proposed mitigation works were discussed in detail. Any update regarding feedback received will be provided at the meeting.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

35. In May 2018, the Governing Body approved a natural environment targeted rate to support environmental initiatives, including addressing kauri dieback. The rate will raise $311 million over the duration of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 (resolution GB/2018/91).

36. The natural environment targeted rate provides funding for kauri dieback control, including new infrastructure such as track upgrades to kauri-safe standard.

37. Where track works are already programmed in the renewals budget, additional works required to protect kauri, such as removing muddy sections of track where kauri are at risk, will be funded by the natural environment targeted rate.

38. Due to the required new standards and hygiene operating procedures the costs for building tracks to kauri-safe standard are expected to be higher than previous track projects.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

39. The main risk is the spread of kauri dieback disease, where tracks are located within three times the drip line radius of kauri.

40. Closing tracks in parks and reserves, whether temporary (until upgrade works are completed) or indefinitely (where upgrade works are not recommended), will have an impact
on the recreational activities available in the local board area. This may result in additional recreational pressure on other parks and reserves.

41. To mitigate this risk, information will be provided to the public about alternative recreational activities. As part of the kauri dieback community engagement and education programme, the public is provided with information about the reasons for the track closures, the objectives of the kauri dieback mitigation programme and hygiene around kauri.

42. There is also a risk of non-compliance, where mitigation measures are disregarded by the public, particularly with respect to track closures (where tracks continue to be used despite closure notices) and hygiene stations (where hygiene stations are not used, or not used correctly).

43. Risk mitigation includes the provision of appropriate information and effective implementation of track closures, including signage and physical barriers.

44. In undertaking the mitigation works, strict adherence to the standards and hygiene operating requirements will be required and enforced to reduce the risk of the spread of kauri dieback disease by contractors, volunteers and council staff.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

45. Following the local board’s decision on the recommendations provided in this report, further design, consenting (if required) and procurement will be undertaken. Contractors will then be engaged to undertake park/track mitigation works in late 2019 and/or early 2020.

46. A priority system will be in place to determine the order of works, considering the impact on the community, volume of track users, alternative routes and safety.

47. The local board and the local community will be kept updated and informed on the timing for the planned works.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Proposed mitigation works for local parks in Howick</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Location maps</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
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<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Mace Ward - General Manager Parks, Sports and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
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**ATTACHMENT A: Description of proposed mitigation works for local parks in Howick Local Board**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Point View Reserve (Refer to location map in ATTACHMENT B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>111 Point View Drive, East Tamaki Heights, Auckland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Background**

Point View Reserve (37.3 hectares) is classified as a natural heritage site comprising a network of tracks. Entrances are located at Caldwells Road, Gracechurch Drive and Kenley Heights. The reserve is mainly used by recreational walkers, runners and dog walkers, consequently this destination is highly used all year round. It is anticipated that the recreational use of the reserve will continue to increase in line with the development of surrounding suburbs.

The majority of the reserve is covered in native bush, particularly on the slopes of gullies around a series of small connected streams. There are multiple overland flow paths (streams) traversing the site that appear to join up with Mangemangeroa Creek. Many of the reserve’s tracks are positioned next to these streams and consist of multiple small low boardwalks and bridges.

There are a number of healthy kauri scattered around the fringe of the forest and several kauri growing next to tracks (see Figure 1). Approximately 15% of the track’s length is within its Kauri Hygiene Area. The Kauri Forest tracks include tracks A-B, B-C and B-D. The remainder of the tracks are not within any Kauri Hygiene Areas.

**FIGURE 1: NETWORK OF TRACKS WITHIN POINT VIEW RESERVE**

| Current Status | One track to the north of the reserve, with access from the upper carpark at Caldwells Road has been closed temporarily until the appropriate mitigation measures have been determined and works completed. |
| Assessment Criteria | Kauri forest ecological value - Low |
| | Recreational value - Medium |
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Kauri Dieback Disease - Local Park Track Mitigation in the Howick Local Board area

- Availability of alternative tracks – Yes, there are alternative walking tracks in the local vicinity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed mitigation options</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Proposed Recommendation</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigate track sections within the Kauri Hygiene Areas to kauri-safe standard with geocellular stabilising material, Bark Aggregate Mix (BAM) and box steps. Upgrade remaining track sections to formed, dry track standard (where needed) by topping up and recompacting sections lacking aggregate and reforming the side drains.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Analysis and Recommendation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Proposed Recommendation</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Keep tracks closed indefinitely</td>
<td>Kauri could potentially be exposed to kauri dieback if people do not adhere to the closure.</td>
<td>This option is not recommended because it does not protect the kauri present in the reserve. The reserve has a high recreational use that is expected to increase in line with the development of surrounding suburbs. Therefore, the retention of recreational space is important.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>Mitigate track sections within the Kauri Hygiene Areas to kauri safe standard Upgrade remaining track sections to formed, dry track standard where needed</td>
<td>Kauri are protected due to track upgrades to kauri-safe standard and exposure to kauri dieback is significantly reduced.</td>
<td>This is the recommended option because it provides maximum kauri protection at a cost commensurate with the recreational use of this reserve.</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTACHMENT A: Description of proposed mitigation works for local parks in Howick Local Board
ATTACHMENT B: Howick Local Board - Local Parks location map
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To update Howick Local Board with highlights of ATEED’s activities within the local board area and the region for the six months from 1 January to 30 June 2019.
2. This report should be read in conjunction with ATEED’s Quarter three report to Auckland Council (available at [www.aucklandnz.com](http://www.aucklandnz.com)) and the forthcoming Quarter four report to the Auckland Council CCO Finance and Performance Committee (available 17 September 2019). 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.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
3. This report provides the Howick Local Board with relevant information on the following ATEED activities:
   - locally driven initiatives: Young Enterprise Scheme, Howick tourism development and the Howick Business Improvement Districts top-up grant
   - supporting local business growth
   - filming activity
   - youth employment pathways
   - youth connections
   - offshore talent attraction
   - destination management and marketing
   - delivered, funded and facilitated events.
4. Further detail on these activities is listed under analysis and advice.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:
a) receive the ATEED update to the Howick Local Board for 1 January to 30 June 2019.

Horopaki
Context
5. ATEED has two areas of focus:
   1. **Economic Development** – including business support, business attraction and investment, local economic development, trade and industry development, skills employment and talent and innovation and entrepreneurship.
   2. **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 CCOs 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, 3303 businesses had been through an ATEED intervention or programme. Of these, 120 businesses were in the Howick Local Board area – 34 businesses went through Destination-related programmes and 86 businesses went through Economic Development-related programmes.

Economic Development
Locally Driven Initiatives

12. Young Enterprise Scheme: The Auckland Chamber of Commerce has delivered the Lion Foundation Young Enterprise Scheme (YES) since January 2018. ATEED maintains a strategic role. The Chamber invoiced for funds during Quarter three and payment was subsequently made. During the period, there were 58 schools participating in the Auckland YES programme, representing 1376 students completing the programme. Edgewater College, Macleans College, Ormiston Senior College, Pakuranga College, Sancta Maria College and St Kentigern College are the six schools from the Howick Local Board area participating in the YES programme.

13. Howick tourism development: During Quarter three, followers on the East Auckland Facebook page grew to 1795, and the newly created Instagram page reached 154 followers. A number of promotional activities were carried out during Quarter three, including radio spots promoting East Auckland Tourism, promotion at the Classic Car Show in March, and a tourist map (created in collaboration with Auckland Transport) at the Half Moon Bay ferry terminal. An advertisement for the area features in the Official Visitor Map for South and East Auckland 2019. During Quarter four, East Auckland Tourism held three board meetings. A social media workshop was also held during the quarter, with 14 attendees, including eight board members. A networking breakfast event was held on 27 June 2019. At the end of Quarter four, East Auckland Tourism had 32 paid members.

14. Howick Business Improvement Districts top-up grant: The grant was processed in Quarter one and as a result, there has been no further action required.

Supporting local business growth

15. This area is serviced by the Business and Enterprise team in the south hub, located at Te Haa o Manukau. 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 offer support to provide quality jobs.

---

1 This activity is subject to local boards prioritising local economic development, and subsequently allocating funding to local economic development through their local board agreements.
2 FY 2018/19 result for ATEED’s SOI KPI2
16. 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, Research and Development (R&D), business growth and management.

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

18. Where businesses qualify (meet the programme criteria and/or align to ATEED’s purpose as defined in the Statement of Intent) 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]
   - RBPN business capability vouchers (NZTE), where the business owner may be issued co-funding up to $5000 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.

19. During this reporting period, ATEED Business and Innovation Advisors met with 19 businesses in the Howick Local Board area, two for innovation advice and services and 17 for business growth and capability advice and services (one was a returning client). From these engagements:
   - Eleven RBPN vouchers were issued to assist with business capability training
   - Eight connections were made to Callaghan Innovation services and programmes
   - Five referrals were made to Business Mentors New Zealand
   - Three connections were made to ATEED staff and programmes
   - Nearly 40 connections were made to other businesses or programmes.

Other support for new businesses

20. During the period, ATEED also ran workshops and events aimed at establishing or growing a new business and building capability. Eleven people from the Howick Local Board area attended an event below:
   - Starting off Right workshop – one
   - Business clinic – eight
   - Innovation clinic – two.

Filming activity within the Howick Local Board area

21. 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.

22. 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, eight permits were issued in the Howick Local Board area. The Howick Local Board area’s share of film permit revenue was $2852.17 for the period (total for all boards combined was $51,191.30).

23. On average, 37 crew work 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.
24. Some of the key film productions that were issued permits to film in the Howick Local Board area were:
   - Power Rangers
   - Take Home Pay (feature Film).

25. 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.

Youth employment pathways

26. The ‘Go with Tourism’ campaign was successfully launched on 5 April 2019, attracting 170 employers and more than 700 youth by the financial 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. ATEED delivered the Future Ready Summit on 26 June 2019 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.

Local Jobs and Skills Hubs

27. 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 2019, 377 people had been placed into employment via the ATEED-facilitated CBD hub, 1914 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.

Offshore talent attraction

28. 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.

Destination

Regional destination management and marketing activity

29. The ‘Elemental AKL’ winter festival website went live on 29 April 2019. The festival ran from 1 to 31 July 2019 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 2019, with 120 restaurants participating in plating up unique festival dishes using ingredients sourced from the Auckland region and inspired by the elements.

30. The ‘Short Break’ campaign, aimed at leisure travelers on Australia’s eastern seaboard, ran during Quarter three and Quarter four. 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
campagne. 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 1.1 million followers. Lifestyle.com.au has a reach of 1.2 million 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 2019, the 2019 Pasifika festival, which was due to run on 23 and 24 March 2019, 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 the police must prioritise resourcing to ensure the safety of communities across the city.

33. During the period, residents of the Howick 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](http://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. Local Board views were sought for some of the initiatives described in this report.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

37. The proposed decision to receive the six-monthly update 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 this report has no financial implications.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

39. The proposed decision to receive the six-monthly update 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 update to the Howick Local Board in February 2020 and will cover the period 1 July to 31 December 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Samantha-Jane Miranga, Operational Strategy Advisor (ATEED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Quanita Khan, Manager Operational Strategy and Planning (ATEED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reimbursement to Howick Radio Trust of expenses incurred upgrading premises

File No.: CP2019/16290

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To amend the boards previous resolution to reimburse the Howick Radio Trust of expenses incurred upgrading their premise at 115 Picton Street Howick.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. At the boards August meeting the board resolved to approve the reimbursement of $5,826.87 to the Howick Radio Charitable Trust from LDI Capex (HW/2091/98).
3. Following the August meeting staff were advised that it was not appropriate to fund this reimbursement from LDI Capex and it should be funded from LDI Opex.
4. It is now recommended that resolution HW/2019/98 be rescinded and a new resolution passed confirming the reimbursement be funded from LDI Opex available in the Community Response Fund. Noting, the Community Response Fund for the 2019/2020 financial year currently has $33,200 available to be allocated.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:

a) rescind resolution HW/2019/98.
b) approve the reimbursement of $5,826.87 to the Howick Radio Charitable Trust from LDI Opex available in the 2019/2020 Community Response Fund.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Stephen Hunt - Senior Local Board Advisor - Howick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New ground lease to Contemporary Art Foundation known as Te Tuhi Centre for the Arts at 13R Reeves Road, Pakuranga Heights

File No.: CP2019/16226

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To grant a new ground lease to the Contemporary Art Foundation known as Te Tuhi Centre for the Arts at 13R Reeves Road, Pakuranga Heights.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The Contemporary Art Foundation (trust) have a ground lease for the land occupied by the tenant-owned building known as Te Tuhi Centre for the Arts located at 13R Reeves Road, Pakuranga Heights.

3. The operative ground lease commenced on 13 November 2000 and will reach final expiry on 12 November 2020. There are no further renewals available.

4. The trust has submitted a comprehensive application for a new ground lease to continue offering art-based services and activities from the premises.

5. Staff have assessed the application and are satisfied that the requirements under the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 have been met.

6. The trust has become a well-established community arts organisation, providing art education programmes and exhibitions to the community for over 40 years.

7. This report recommends that the Howick Local Board grant a new ground lease agreement to Contemporary Art Foundation.

8. The recommendations within this report align with the Howick Local Board Plan 2017 Outcome 3: Valuing our cultural diversity and Outcome 6: A prosperous local economy.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Howick Local Board:

a) grant a new ground lease to Contemporary Art Foundation for the land occupied by the footprint of the tenant-owned building on the land legally described as Lot 22 DP 52255 (Attachment A), subject to the following terms and conditions:

   i) term – 10 years commencing 16 September 2019 with one 10 year right of renewal with a final expiry date of 15 September 2039

   ii) rent – $1.00 plus GST per annum if requested

   iii) the current ground lease to Contemporary Art Foundation being surrendered when the new ground lease is executed

   iv) approve the Community Outcomes Plan to be appended as a schedule to the ground lease agreement

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

Context

9. This report considers a new ground lease agreement to Contemporary Art Foundation.
10. A new ground lease for Contemporary Art Foundation was discussed at a workshop with the Howick Local Board on 28 February 2019. No objections were raised at this time.
11. The Howick Local Board is the allocated authority relating to local, recreation, sport and community facilities, including leasing matters.

Land and building

12. The trust have a ground lease for the tenant-owned building known as the Te Tuhi Centre for the Arts located at 13R Reeves Road, Pakuranga Heights. The land is legally described as Lot 22 DP 52255 held in fee simple by Auckland Council as a classified local purpose (site for community buildings) reserve and subject to the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977. The lease area is approximately 2,800 square metres (see Attachment A).
13. The building comprises of several large open floor spaces, break-out rooms, dedicated gallery and studio sections, classrooms, a kitchen, a workshop, an office space, storage and toilet facilities. The building is in good condition and fit for purpose.
14. The trust have a comprehensive long-term maintenance plan in place.

Contemporary Art Foundation

15. The Contemporary Art Foundation; formerly known as the Pakuranga Arts and Cultural Trust was established in the 1960s and registered as a Charitable Trust on 15 February 2001.
16. The trust’s vision is:
   - to be the contemporary art organisation in New Zealand that is nationally and internationally renowned for its art, engagement and participation practices
   - to be a catalyst for new ways of engaging with communities, supporting and developing cultural practices and innovative thinking
   - to further its contemporary art, education and residency programmes throughout Auckland and beyond
   - to be an integral role in the arts and culture sector in Auckland and New Zealand, making Auckland a culturally rich and creative city.
17. The trust delivers its’ strategy through Te Tuhi Centre for the Arts or “The Mark”, a contemporary art space and is a leader in supporting experimental practices. The Te Tuhi Centre for the Arts programmes are robust and internationally recognised for addressing social, political and environmental issues.
18. The Te Tuhi Centre of the Arts offers a wide range of art-based education services, activities and exhibitions, including live performances.
19. In addition, Te Tuhi Centre for the Arts offers participation and engagement programmes integrated with its exhibitions and public events providing formative art experiences for schools and the local community.
20. Between 2017 and 2018, it was estimated that Te Tuhi Centre for the Arts featured:
   - 175,562 visitors
   - 5,546 school students
   - 15 exhibitions
21. The activity of the trust together with the building supports the local board plan in that it serves the community’s needs for access to quality facilities that make Howick an attractive tourist destination and continues to grow the arts, culture and music.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

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

23. In accordance with the guidelines, the recommended lease term for a tenant-owned building is 10 years, with one right of renewal for a further 10 years.

24. However, local boards have discretion to grant an alternative term to community groups, provided that it aligns to one of the terms contained in the Auckland Council’s Community Occupancy Guidelines of 2012.

25. The Contemporary Art Foundation satisfies the required criteria specified in the following ways:
   - it is a registered incorporated charitable trust
   - it has complied with the terms of the operative lease agreement
   - it has a history of delivering its services to the local community
   - the arts centre is managed appropriately, as evidenced by the extent of use and wide range of service offerings
   - the trust has all necessary insurance cover, including building and public liability insurance in place
   - the financial accounts provided indicate that its funds are sufficient to meet its liabilities.

26. Staff recommend that a new ground lease agreement be granted for 10 years, with one right of renewal for a further 10 years.

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

27. In compiling the recommendations contained in this report, Staff obtained feedback from Service Strategy and Integration, Arts and Culture and Council Controlled Organisation Governance and External Partnerships.

28. Feedback is positive and support for a new ground lease agreement has been expressed to maintain their current operations in the long-term.

29. Staff also obtained feedback from Auckland Transport in regard to the Eastern Busways Project, previously known as Auckland Manukau Eastern Transport Initiative and commonly referred to as AMETI.

30. Although the surrounding areas on Reeves Road and William Roberts Road will undergo development, Auckland Transport have confirmed there is no impact on the lease area of the trust.
31. The trust have contemplated the impact of the project against their current operations and identified parking and access to the facility as an issue, especially during the initial construction phase.

32. Staff and Auckland Transport held engagement sessions with the trust to discuss the impact of the project.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

33. This item is on the Community Facilities Work Programme for the 2019/2020 financial year.

34. At its workshop on the 28 February 2019 the local board expressed support for the Contemporary Art Foundation.

35. As there is no proposed change in activity on the land, staff do not foresee that there will be a significant local impact by granting the new ground lease agreement.

36. 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**

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

38. Support for Māori initiatives and outcomes are detailed in Whiria Te Muka Tangata, Auckland Council’s Māori Responsiveness Framework. An aim of community leasing is to increase Māori wellbeing through targeted support for Māori community development projects. Additionally, it seeks to improve access to facilities and participation for Māori living in the Howick Local Board area.

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

40. Iwi engagement was undertaken between 5 March 2019 and 2 April 2019 with the iwi groups identified as having an interest in land in the Howick Local Board area.

41. No objections to the proposed ground lease agreement were received.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

42. There are no direct costs to council associated with granting a new ground lease.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

43. Should the ground lease not be granted, the trust’s ability to provide its services to the community will be severely compromised, which in turn will have a negative impact on local board outcomes.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

44. Subject to the local board granting a new community lease, council staff will work with the Contemporary Art Foundation to formalise the deed of lease documents.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
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Ngā kaihaina
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Attachment A - Locality and Lease Area

Contemporary Art Foundation
13R Reeves Road, Pakuranga Heights
Lease area delineated in red
## COMMUNITY OUTCOMES PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Group</th>
<th>Contemporary Art Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name and Location of Land/Facility</strong></td>
<td>13R Reeves Road, Pakuranga Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Board Area</strong></td>
<td>Howick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreed Annual Report Due Date</strong></td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board Outcome and Toi Whitiki</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1: Involved and connected communities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The activities and programmes offered by the art gallery aligns to the funding agreement and the Contemporary Art Foundation Statement of Intent</td>
<td>The performance measures to be in line with Contemporary Art Foundation funding agreement and Statement of Intent targets. Annual reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective: People are supported to actively contribute to their community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support community-led initiatives that build potential for social innovation and enterprise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to investigate developing a youth facility and/or more programmes for youth within existing facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective: All communities have a sense of belonging and feel valued.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to develop the Pride of Place projects – signage, public art and significant events to promote local pride.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW1: All Aucklanders can access and participate in arts and culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW3: A network of vibrant arts and culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New ground lease to Contemporary Art Foundation known as Te Tuhi Centre for the Arts at 13R Reeves Road, Pakuranga Heights
**Maori**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 3: Valuing our cultural diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective: Share and celebrate our cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective: Grow our arts, culture and music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW 5: Auckland celebrates a unique cultural identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage and foster Māori values, Te Rōo Māori and Māori world view and considerations through art, culture and music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present a minimum of 2 exhibitions, events or performances per annum that includes Māori artists and/or Māori world view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance measures to be in line with Contemporary Art Foundation funding agreement and Statement of Intent targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 4: A treasured environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective: reduce waste through recovery, reuse and recycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW 2: Auckland values and invests in arts and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create awareness of environmental issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of waste to landfill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display signage and information around the premise to encourage recycling and zero waste.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Annual reports |
Approval of the Howick Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report
File No.: CP2019/16164

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve the Howick Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Howick Local Board provided funding in the 2018/2019 financial year to undertake the ‘Knowing phase’ of the Urban Ngahere (Forest) program.
3. The ‘Knowing phase’ involved a detailed analysis of the urban tree cover; using a variety of data sources from the council, Stats NZ and other local government sources. The analysis has looked at the urban tree cover extent from a 2013 aerial analysis study, 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 was approximately 16 per cent of the overall land area in 2013. The total tree cover is low when compared to the averages across the region and one per cent above 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 area with a canopy coverage of less than 15 per cent.
5. To continue increase canopy cover in the long term a concerted effort will be required to plant new specimen trees every year in the Howick Local Board area.
6. In the 2019/2020 financial year the local board has provided funding to undertake the ‘Growing phase’ of the Ngahere program. This will begin the work to increase the tree cover in areas where it is most needed and aim to develop partnerships to help grow native plants locally.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendations
That the Howick Local Board:

a) approve the Howick Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) 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 Howick Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report as required before public release.

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 (Forest) Strategy recommends implementation and analysis at the local level. Local boards were offered the opportunity to invest operational funding in area specific Urban Ngahere programmes’ of work.

10. The local board Urban Ngahere programme has three phases: ‘Knowing’, ‘Growing’ and ‘Protecting’. The ‘Knowing’ phase involves establishing an accurate current state analysis report with recommendations for future actions. The ‘Growing’ phase involves a number of activities including annual tree plantings’ ongoing to address areas of low tree cover. The Howick Local Board has allocated funding to begin the ‘Growing’ phase in the 2019/2020 financial year.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

11. The analysis report highlights the low overall tree canopy coverage at 16 per cent for the Howick Local Board area.

12. The report provides a number of other statistics:

- there is a disparate spread of tree cover: 22 per cent of rural zoned land has over half of the total tree cover of the Howick Local Board area
- rural zoned land has 34 per cent canopy cover, and residential zoned land has a low of 11 per cent canopy cover
- 26 per cent of parks and open space have tree canopy cover
- six per cent of local roads have tree canopy cover, which is very low
- 17 per cent of urban tree cover is on private land.

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

14. 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 overall tree numbers in the local board area which will help to increase the areas overall tree canopy coverage in the long term.

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

15. Parks, Sport and Recreation (PSR) has collaborated with Community Facilities to help 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.

16. PSR will help inform the Community Facilities renewals program to ensure an ongoing program of tree renewal occurs to replace poor and ailing stock and to replant where dead, dying, or diseased trees are removed.

17. PSR and Community Facilities will collaboratively manage local board funding 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

18. The Howick Local Board has provided direction and support for the project at workshops in July and August 2018 to complete the ‘Knowing’ phase. The board provided in-principle support to adopt the report at its 13 August 2019 workshop.

19. The local board has also provided funding for the next stage of the Ngahere program in the 2019/2020 financial year.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

20. 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.

21. 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

22. The local board has provided further funding in the 2019/2020 financial year to undertake scoping of sites for new tree plantings. Further detail on this program will be presented to the board at the beginning of 2020.

23. 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. The planting program should take place over a number of years to help increase tree canopy cover in local parks and reserves.

24. The ‘Growing phase’ should include funding to help develop a collaborative program with local schools and community groups to develop a locally based program to grow native trees, and shrubs for planting in the local area.

25. 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

26. Failure to provide further funding for the Ngahere programme will result in no long-term planting plan and no specific new tree planting programme taking place in neighbourhood parks and along the road berms. Current renewal planting will be the only mechanism for improving the current tree asset.

27. 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

28. A canopy cover change chapter will be added as an update addendum once 2016 data is ready later this year. The updated chapter will be presented to the local board in early 2020.
29. Community Services and Community Facilities will work collaboratively to develop an outline of the ‘Growing’ program to set out new tree planting plans for the next five years. The long term growing plan for the planting program will be adopted via a report in Quarter Four of the 2019/2020 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>Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
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Investigating recreation needs in Howick and implications for Howick Leisure Centre

File No.: CP2019/16265

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To include investigating recreation needs in Howick and implications for Howick Leisure Centre in the 2019/2020 Service Strategy and Integration local board work programme.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. A detailed building assessment report on the Howick Leisure Centre (HLC) identified that significant investment is required (beyond the current renewals budget) for continued delivery of recreation services into the future.
3. At a workshop on 27 June 2019, staff proposed the following course of action.
   - short-term: to carry out critical work to enable HLC to remain operational while longer term options are identified (to be managed by Community Facilities)
   - long-term: investigate recreation needs in Howick and develop long-term investment options for HLC (to be managed by Service Strategy and Integration).
4. Approving the recommendation in this report will confirm resourcing for investigating recreation needs during the 2019/2020 financial year.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:
 a) approve the inclusion investigating recreation needs in Howick and implications for Howick Leisure Centre in the 2019/2020 Service Strategy and Integrations local board work programme.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.
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Howick Sport and Recreation Initiatives

File No.: CP2019/16612

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To add ‘Sport and Recreation Initiatives’ back into the Community Services 2019/2020 annual work programme.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Howick Local Board is allocated $105,000 of Asset Based Services (ABS) funding annually for investment in sport and recreation initiatives.
3. Due to an administrative error this line item was not included in the Community Services (Parks, Sports and Recreation) annual work programme, which was approved in June 2019 (HW/2019/95).
4. In the 2018/2019 financial year, the $105,000 budget was allocated as follows:
   • $44,000 to Sport Auckland to deliver sport initiatives such as ActiveAsian
   • $12,000 for the Howick Sports Awards, and
   • the balance for the refresh of the Howick Sport and Recreation Facilities Plan.
5. In the 2019/2020 financial year staff recommend an extra $6,000 for Sport Auckland to increase the ActiveAsian programming, increasing the allocation to $50,000. Staff also recommend an extra $3,000 for the Howick Sports Awards, increasing the allocation to $15,000.
6. Options for the balance of the funding ($40,000) will be workshopped with the incoming board in the new term.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:
a) approve the addition of ‘Sport and Recreation Initiatives’ and the associated $105,000 of Asset Based Services (ABS) funding to the 2019/2020 Community Services annual work programme.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.
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Classify 21 Drumconnell Drive as a local purpose (esplanade) reserve

File No.: CP2019/16167

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To classify 21 Drumconnell Drive, Flat Bush as a local purpose (esplanade) reserve.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. 21 Drumconnell Drive, Flat Bush is owned in fee simple by Auckland Council as an unclassified local purpose (esplanade) reserve subject to the Reserves Act 1977. As the administering local authority for 21 Drumconnell Drive, Auckland Council must classify the reserve according to the Reserves Act. The Howick Local Board is the landowner for the purposes of classifying the reserve following the Governing Body’s resolution number GB/2017/117.

3. 21 Drumconnell Drive was vested in Auckland Council as a local purpose (esplanade) reserve contribution from a private subdivision in 2018 under the Resource Management Act 1991. Since acquiring the reserve, there have not been any attempts to classify it as a local purpose (esplanade) reserve.

4. Staff have investigated the reserve’s status as a local purpose (esplanade) and consulted local iwi on the proposal to classify it, to which no objections were received. As such, staff recommend that the Howick Local Board resolve to classify 21 Drumconnell Drive, Flat Bush as a local purpose (esplanade) reserve.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:

a) approve, pursuant to Section 16 (2A) of the Reserves Act 1977, the classification of 21 Drumconnell Drive, Flat Bush, being Lot 200 DP 514248, comprising of 5915 square metres (more or less) and contained in Record of Title 830744 as a local purpose (esplanade) reserve.

Horopaki
Context
The reserve
5. 21 Drumconnell Drive, Flat Bush (the reserve) is legally described as Lot 200 Deposited Plan 514248, comprises of 5915 square metres (more or less) and is contained in Record of Title 830744 (see Attachment A for an aerial view of the reserve). In 2018, the reserve was vested in Auckland Council from a private subdivision subject to the Resource Management Act 1991 as a local purpose (esplanade) reserve contribution.

6. The reserve is now owned in fee simple by Auckland Council as an unclassified local purpose (esplanade) reserve subject to the Reserves Act 1977 (the Act). The reserve has not been classified and this must be completed pursuant to Section 16 (2A) of the Act.
7. Classification is a process required under the Act to formalise the purpose for which a reserve is held and provide a legislative framework to authorities on how to administer such land.

**Existing features**

8. The reserve is situated along the north-eastern boundary of Drumconnell Drive and is bordered by private land available for development. Approximately 500 metres to the east of the reserve is Murphys Bush Reserve. The contours of the reserve give way slightly to its northern boundary, which slopes down towards a natural bank for a stream. The prior landowner of the reserve is required to undertake activities such as regenerative riparian planting as a condition of its consent to develop the surrounding area.

9. The north section of the reserve is subject to an existing aboveground power pylon as well as overhead power cables connecting to another pylon on adjacent land. These cables and pylons are owned by Transpower New Zealand Limited (Transpower). The reserve is currently subject to development earthworks but prior to such works consisted of farmland for many decades. Following the completion of all consented works, the reserve will be reinstated to a better condition than its earlier state which will also be to the satisfaction of council’s parks staff.

**Cultural Heritage Index sites**

10. There are no cultural heritage index sites reported on the reserve. If any are found, the classification of local purpose (esplanade) reserve would require council to protect and uphold the quality of such objects.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

**Local purpose (esplanade) reserve classification**

11. Local purpose (esplanade) reserve is the most appropriate classification purpose for this reserve as the land was vested in council to be a local purpose (esplanade) reserve for reasons including the natural existence of a stream bank.

12. There is not currently any public use of the reserve as it is a newly created reserve and subject to ongoing development works. However, following the completion of the works and the required landscaping being approved, it is anticipated that the public will visit the reserve for leisure and access to the stream. A recreational purpose is not deemed to be the most appropriate for the reserve as the parcel of land has an average width of 20 metres and contains a stream; therefore, a local purpose (esplanade) reserve is considered to be the most suitable classification category for the site.

**Current and proposed interests**

13. Transpower has existing, extensive rights to access and maintain the pylons and power cables on or over the reserve. These rights are granted as statutory powers under the Electricity Act 1992. As the power infrastructure was situated on the reserve before it was created and vested in council and that the infrastructure forms part of an electricity corridor, it is considered that the public will not be affected any more so than they ordinarily would have been by Transpower’s established statutory powers to access and maintain the existing infrastructure.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

14. Council’s legal staff have been consulted on the proposal to classify the reserve as a local purpose (esplanade) reserve and are supportive as classification is a statutory duty imposed upon council under Section 16 of the Reserves Act and must be completed.
15. Upon the completion of the development and reinstatement of the reserve, Community Facilities will take over maintenance duties unless the developer is required to undertake this duty for a period as a condition of their consent. Eventually, Community Facilities will be responsible for duties in conjunction with Parks Services and Service, Strategy and Integration for any planning on future use of the reserve.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

16. The proposal to classify the reserve is consistent with the Howick Local Board Plan 2017 Outcome 2: Our future growth is managed effectively, as the residential growth in the immediate and wider vicinity of Drumconnell Drive will require open spaces which the public can enjoy. The plan to classify the reserve for the specific purpose of a local purpose (esplanade) reserve ensures that all planning for the reserve, including its design, must be in a manner which is consistent with the classification purpose, which is to protect the natural features on the reserve and keep the public’s access to the esplanade free and unrestricted. This classification proposal is considered to be effective management of the available open space within the growing neighbourhood of Flat Bush.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

17. On 3 July 2019 the following iwi authorities, who have a vested and recognised interest in the area which the reserve is situated, were advised in writing of council’s proposal to classify 21 Drumconnell Drive, Flat Bush:

   a) Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki
   b) Ngāti Maru
   c) Ngā Tamaoho
   d) Ngāti Paoa
   e) Ngāti Tamaterā
   f) Ngāti Te Ata
   g) Ngāti Whanaunga
   h) Te Ahiwaru – Waiohua
   i) Te Ākitai Waiohua
   j) Te Patukirikiri
   k) Waikato – Tainui

18. The iwi authorities were requested to provide council with any feedback on the proposal by 31 July 2019.

19. On 5 July 2019 the Makaurau Marae Maori Trust on behalf of Te Ahiwaru – Waiohua replied in writing to confirm that Te Ahiwaru – Waiohua was not opposed to the classification of the reserve as local purpose (esplanade) and supported the proposal to undertake regenerative recuperation of the natural environment and ecology on the reserve. Te Ahiwaru – Waiohua also acknowledged Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki as the active kaitiaki for the rohe or area in which the reserve is situated.

20. On 5 August 2019 staff wrote to Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki to confirm that iwi had received council’s notice on 3 July 2019 and whether iwi had any specific feedback on the proposal. To date, staff have not received a response, so consider that Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki and all other iwi notified of the proposal are not opposed to the classification of the reserve.
Financial implications

21. There are no financial implications created by the classification of the reserve except for the costs to publish notice of the classification, if approved, in the New Zealand Gazette. The fee for the notice is set by the word count in the notice and unlikely to exceed $100.00. The costs incurred by publication in the New Zealand Gazette will be borne by Community Facilities.

22. Any other costs associated with the creation and vesting of the reserve and formalisation of power rights, including reasonable legal costs, have already been borne or will be borne by the developer or Transpower, as appropriate per either party’s requirements.

Risks and mitigations

23. All reserves must be classified as mandated by Section 16 of the Act. Council is fulfilling its statutory duty by classifying the reserve accordingly. This reserve has been prioritised for classification due to Transpower’s request to legitimise its interest in the infrastructure, as well as align with Transpower’s pre-existing statutory rights under the Electricity Act 1992.

Next steps

24. If the board resolves to classify the reserve subject to section 23 of the Act, the reserve will be classified as a local purpose (esplanade) reserve. The classification status will then enable easement interests to be issued to Transpower in accordance with its pre-existing statutory rights. The classification status will also instruct council as to how to appropriately manage, plan and design the reserve in a manner that is consistent with the classified purpose.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Attachment A - Aerial view of reserve</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Bianka Lee - Land Use Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Classify 21 Drumconnell Drive as a local purpose (esplanade) reserve
Temporary arrangements for urgent decisions and staff delegations during the election period

File No.: CP2019/16353

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval for temporary arrangements during the election period for:
   • urgent decisions
   • decisions made by staff under delegated authority from the local board that require consultation with local board members under delegation protocols.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Between the last local board business meeting of the current electoral term, and the first business meeting of the new term, decisions may be needed on urgent matters or business as usual matters that cannot wait until the incoming local board’s first business meeting in the new electoral term.
3. Current elected members remain in office until the new members’ term of office commences, which is the day after the declaration of election results. The declaration will be publicly notified on 21 October 2019, with the term of office of current members ending and the term of office of new members commencing on 22 October 2019. The new members cannot act as members of the local board until they have made their statutory declaration at the inaugural local board meeting.
4. As for each of the previous terms, temporary arrangements are needed for urgent decisions of the local board, and decisions made by staff under existing delegated authority.
5. All local boards have made a general delegation to the Chief Executive, subject to a requirement to comply with delegation protocols approved by the local board, which require, amongst other matters, staff to consult with local board portfolio leads on certain matters. Where there is no nominated portfolio lead, staff consult with the chair. After the election, there will be no local board portfolio leads or chairs to consult until new arrangements are made in the new term.
6. As a temporary measure, approval is sought from the local board to allow staff to continue to process business as usual decisions that cannot wait until the local board’s first meeting, without consulting with the nominated portfolio lead or local board chair. Staff will consult with the local board chair following the inaugural meeting until new arrangements are made at the first meeting in the term.
7. Appointments made by the local board to external bodies will cease on the date of the election. New appointments will need to be made by the local board in the new term.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:

a) approve the utilisation of the board’s existing urgent decision-making process between the final local board meeting and the commencement of the term of office of new local board members.
b) note that from the commencement of the term of office of new local board members until the inaugural meeting of the incoming local board, urgent decision-making will be undertaken by the Chief Executive under existing delegations.

c) approve that staff, as a temporary measure, can make business as usual decisions under their existing delegated authority without requiring compliance with the requirement in the current delegation protocols to consult with the nominated portfolio lead (or chair where there is no portfolio lead in place), from 22 October 2019, noting that staff will consult with the chair following the inaugural meeting until new arrangements are made at the first meeting in the new term.

d) note that existing appointments by the local board to external bodies will cease at the election and new appointments will need to be made by the local board in the new term.

**Horopaki Context**

8. Current elected members remain in office until the new members’ term of office commences, which is the day after the declaration of election results (Sections 115 and 116, Local Electoral Act 2001). The declaration will be publicly notified on 21 October 2019, with the term of office of current members ending and the term of office of new members commencing on 22 October 2019.

9. The new members cannot act as members of the local board until they have made their statutory declaration at the inaugural local board meeting (Clause 14, Schedule 7, Local Government Act 2002).

10. Following the last local board meeting of the current electoral term, decisions may be needed on urgent matters or routine business as usual that cannot wait until the incoming local board’s first meeting in the new electoral term.

11. As with each of the previous electoral terms, temporary arrangements need to be made for:

- urgent decisions
- decisions made by staff under delegated authority from the local board that require consultation with local board members under delegation protocols.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu Analysis and advice**

**Urgent decisions**

12. Between the last meeting and the declaration of results on 21 October, current members are still in office, and can make urgent decisions if delegated to do so. If the board does not have an existing urgent decision-making process already in place, it is recommended that the board delegate to the chair and deputy chair the power to make urgent decisions on behalf of the local board during this period.

13. The urgent decision-making process enables the board to make decisions where it is not practical to call the full board together. The Local Government Act 2002 provides for local boards to delegate to committees, sub-committees, members of the local board or Auckland Council staff, any of its responsibilities, duties and powers, with some specific exceptions. This legislation enables the urgent decision-making process.

14. All requests for an urgent decision will be supported by a memo stating the nature of the issue, reason for urgency and what decisions or resolutions are required.

15. Board members that have delegated responsibilities, for example, delegations to provide feedback on notified resource consents, notified plan changes and notices of requirement,
may continue to exercise those delegations until their term of office ends on 22 October (or earlier if the delegation was specified to end earlier).

16. Between the declaration of results and the inaugural meeting, the current members are no longer in office, the new members cannot act until they give their statutory declaration, and new chairs and deputies will not be in place. During this period, urgent decisions will be made by the Chief Executive under his existing delegated authority (which includes a financial cap).

### Decisions made by staff under delegated authority

17. All local boards have made a delegation to the Chief Executive. The delegation is subject to a requirement to comply with delegation protocols approved by the local board. These delegation protocols require, amongst other things, staff to consult with nominated portfolio leads on certain issues. Where there is no nominated portfolio lead, staff consult with the local board chair.

18. The most common area requiring consultation is landowner consents relating to local parks. The portfolio lead can refer the matter to the local board for a decision.

19. Parks staff receive a large number of landowner consent requests each month that relate to local parks across Auckland. The majority of these need to be processed within 20 working days (or less), either in order to meet the applicant’s timeframes and provide good customer service, or to meet statutory timeframes associated with resource consents. Only a small number of landowner requests are referred by the portfolio lead to the local board for a decision.

20. Prior to the election, staff can continue to consult with portfolio leads as required by the delegation protocols (or chair where there is no portfolio lead). However, after the election, there will be no portfolio leads or chairs in place to consult with until new arrangements are made in the new term.

21. During this time, staff will need to continue to process routine business as usual matters, including routine requests from third parties for landowner approval such as commercial operator permits, temporary access requests and affected party approvals.

22. As a temporary measure, it is recommended that the local board allow staff to continue to process business as usual decisions that cannot wait until the local board’s first meeting. This is irrespective of the requirements of the current delegation protocols to consult with the nominated portfolio lead on landowner consents. Staff will consult with the local board chair following the inaugural meeting until new arrangements are made at the first meeting in the term.

### Appointment to external bodies

23. Appointments made by the local board to external bodies will cease at the election, so local board members will not be able to attend meetings of their organisations as an Auckland Council representative from 22 October 2019, until new appointments are made in the new term. Staff will advise the affected external bodies accordingly.

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

#### Council group impacts and views

24. The arrangements proposed in this report enable the council to process routine local matters during the election period. They apply only to local boards. The reduced political decision-making will be communicated to the wider council group.

25. The governing body has made its own arrangements to cover the election period, including delegating the power to make urgent decisions between the last governing body meeting of the term and the day the current term ends, to any two of the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and a chairperson of a committee of the whole. From the commencement of the term of office of
the new members until the governing body's inaugural meeting, the Chief Executive will carry out decision-making under his current delegations.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

26. This is a report to all local boards that proposes arrangements to enable the council to process routine local matters during the election period. This will enable the council to meet timeframes and provide good customer service.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

27. A decision of this procedural nature is not considered to have specific implications for Māori, and the arrangements proposed in this report do not affect the Māori community differently to the rest of the community.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

28. The decisions sought in this report are procedural and there are no significant financial implications.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

29. There is a risk that unforeseen decisions will arise during this period, such as a decision that is politically significant or a decision that exceeds the Chief Executive’s financial delegations.

30. This risk has been mitigated by scheduling meetings as late as possible in the current term, and communicating to reporting staff that significant decisions should not be made during October 2019.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

31. The decision of the local board will be communicated to senior staff so that they are aware of the arrangements for the month of October 2019.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

There are no attachments for this report.

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Anna Bray - Policy and Planning Manager - Local Boards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason – General Manager, Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance Forward Work Calendar

File No.: CP2019/16186

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To present the Howick Local Board with its updated governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
1. The governance forward work calendar for the Howick Local Board is in Attachment A. The calendar is updated monthly, reported to business meetings and distributed to council staff.

2. The governance forward work calendars were introduced in 2016 as part of Auckland Council's quality advice programme and aim to support local boards' governance role by:
   - ensuring advice on meeting agendas is driven by local board priorities;
   - clarifying what advice is expected and when; and
   - clarifying the rationale for reports.

3. The calendar also aims to provide guidance for staff supporting local boards and greater transparency for the public.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:

a) note the Howick Local Board Governance Forward Work Calendar.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Calendar</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Vanessa Phillips - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop / Business Meeting / Review</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>Oct/Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>Nov/Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative business meeting</td>
<td>Nov/Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>2020 TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workshop Records

File No.: CP2019/16187

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. This report attaches the workshop records taken for the period stated below.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. Under Standing Order 12.1 workshop records shall record the names of members attending and a statement summarising the nature of the information received, and nature of matters discussed. No resolutions are passed, or decisions reached but are solely for the provision of information and discussion. This report attaches the workshop records for the period stated below.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Howick Local Board:

a) note the workshop records for workshops held on 1, 6, 8, 13, 15, 22 and 27 August 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Workshop record 1 August 2019</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Workshop record 6 August 2019</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Workshop record 8 August 2019</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Workshop record 13 August 2019</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Workshop record 15 August 2019</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Workshop record 22 August 2019</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Workshop record 27 August 2019</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Vanessa Phillips - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Howick Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Howick Local Board held at the Howick Local Board meeting room, Pakuranga Library Complex on Thursday 1 August 2019, commencing at 3:30pm.

PRESENT
Members: David Collings, Garry Boles, Bob Wichman, Peter Young, Katrina Bungard, Jim Donald, Adele White, John Spiller and Mike Turinsky

Apologies:

Also present: Nina Siers (Relationship Manager), Stephen Hunt (Senior Advisor), Vanessa Phillips (Democracy Advisor) and Phoebe Peguaro (Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item / Presenters</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat Bush community facilities</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board were updated on the recommended location for the Flat Bush community centre and pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dragicevich, Manager Strategic Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine Haves, Head of Service and Asset Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Forum at Business Meetings</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board discussed a way forward with the public forum at business meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina Siers, Relationship Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction setting</td>
<td>Local Initiatives and specific directions</td>
<td>Direction was requested from the board on upcoming work programme and other items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Hunt, Senior Local Board Advisor - Howick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asma Bashir, Strategic Broker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 5pm
Howick Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Howick Local Board held at the Howick Local Board meeting room, Pakuranga Library Complex on Tuesday 6 August 2019, commencing at 3pm.

PRESENT
Members: David Collings, Garry Boles, Bob Wichman, Jim Donald, Adele White, John Spiller and Mike Turinsky

Apologies: Katrina Bungard and Peter Young

Also present: Stephen Hunt (Senior Advisor), Vanessa Phillips (Democracy Advisor) and Phoebe Peguero (Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item / Presenters</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT / AMETI Update</td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific</td>
<td>The board were provided with an update on the AMETI project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Stallworthy, Elected Member</td>
<td>directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Collier, Project Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarnica Park Debrief</td>
<td>Community engagement</td>
<td>The board debriefed on the community meeting with the residents of Tarnica Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asma Bashir, Strategic Broker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick Youth Council</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board were provided with an update from the Howick Youth Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asma Bashir, Strategic Broker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 5:05pm
Howick Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Howick Local Board held at the Howick Local Board meeting room, Pakuranga Library Complex on Thursday 8 August 2019, commencing at 3pm.

PRESENT
Members: David Collings, Garry Boles, Bob Wichman, Peter Young, Katrina Bungard, Jim Donald, Adele White, John Spiller and Mike Turinsky

Apologies:

Also present: Nina Siers (Relationship Manager), Stephen Hunt (Senior Advisor), Vanessa Phillips (Democracy Advisor) and Lucy Stallworthy (Engagement Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item / Presenters</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Forum at Business Meetings Nina Siers, Relationship Manager</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board discussed way forward with public forum at business meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Plan Stephen Hunt, Senior Local Board Advisor - Howick</td>
<td>Setting, direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>An early conversation was held with the board discussing the upcoming development of the Local Board Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to the board Lucy Stallworthy, Engagement Advisor</td>
<td>Community engagement</td>
<td>The board held an open discussion with members of the community on local issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 6:05pm
Howick Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Howick Local Board held at the Howick Local Board meeting room, Pakuranga Library Complex on Tuesday 13 August 2019, commencing at 4pm.

PRESENT
Members: David Collings, Garry Boles, Bob Wichman, Peter Young, Katrina Bungard, Jim Donald, Adele White and Mike Turinsky

Apologies: John Spiller

Also present: Stephen Hunt (Senior Advisor), Vanessa Phillips (Democracy Advisor) and Phoebe Peguero (Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item / Presenters</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activations Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>An update was provided to the board on the activations programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Caccioppoli, Activation Team Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Gear, PSR Portfolio Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report</td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific directions</td>
<td>The board were presented with the draft Urban Ngahere analysis report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howell Davies, Senior Advisor - Urban Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Gear, PSR Portfolio Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Sport &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific directions</td>
<td>The board were updated on the Parks, Sport &amp; Recreation work programme in particular:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Owens, Parks &amp; Places Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Play Network Analysis scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Gear, PSR Portfolio Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Community Cultural Gardens feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick Bowling Club Cover Greens</td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific directions</td>
<td>The board were provided advice on the strategic alignment, merits and potential funding sources in relation to the proposal from the Howick Bowling Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa Holland, Sport &amp; Recreation Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Gear, PSR Portfolio Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 6:15pm
Howick Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Howick Local Board held at the Howick Local Board meeting room, Pakuranga Library Complex on Thursday 15 August 2019, commencing at 3pm.

PRESENT
Members: David Collings, Garry Boles, Bob Wichman, Peter Young, Katrina Bungard, Jim Donald, Adele White, John Spiller and Mike Turinsky

Apologies:

Also present: Stephen Hunt (Senior Advisor) and Vanessa Phillips (Democracy Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item / Presenters</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The board discussed the Auckland Transport report ahead of the business meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Stallworthy, Elected Member Relationship Manager – Auckland Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to the board debrief</td>
<td>Community engagement</td>
<td>To board were provided with a debrief of the recent talk to the board session and clarified follow up actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Phillips, Democracy Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year End and Quarter 4 Performance Report and Annual Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The board discussed the Year End and Quarter 4 Performance Report and Annual Report ahead of the business meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Hunt, Senior Local Board Advisor – Howick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jestine Joseph, Finance Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 4:28pm
Howick Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Howick Local Board held at the Howick Local Board meeting room, Pakuranga Library Complex on Thursday 22 August 2019, commencing at 3pm.

PRESENT
Members: David Collings, Garry Boles, Bob Wichman, Peter Young, Katrina Bungard, Jim Donald, Adele White, John Spiller and Mike Turinsky

Apologies:

Also present: Stephen Hunt (Senior Advisor), Vanessa Phillips (Democracy Advisor) and Phoebe Peguero (Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop item / Presenters</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction setting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Direction was requested from the board on upcoming work programme and other items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoebe Peguero, Local Board Advisor - Howick</td>
<td>Local Initiatives and specific directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and Multiboard Grants, Round One</td>
<td>Local Initiatives and specific directions</td>
<td>The board discussed the Local and Multiboard Grants, Round one prior to a report to the September meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makenzie Hirz, Senior Grants Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 6:15pm
Howick Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Howick Local Board held at the Howick Local Board meeting room, Pakuranga Library Complex on Tuesday 27 August 2019, commencing at 3pm.

PRESENT
Members: David Collings, Garry Boles, Bob Wichman, Peter Young, Jim Donald, Adele White, John Spiller and Mike Turinsky

Apologies: Katrina Bungard

Also present: Stephen Hunt (Senior Advisor), Vanessa Phillips (Democracy Advisor) and Phoebe Peguero (Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item / Presenters</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACE – Rotary Sculpture</td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific directions</td>
<td>The board were updated with the preferred options from the Expression of Interest for the Rotary sculpture and discussed the next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichola Waugh, Arts &amp; Culture Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Cunningham, Manager Arts &amp; Culture Advisory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE – Arts out East</td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific directions</td>
<td>The board were provided with an update on the progress of Arts out East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Cunningham, Manager Arts &amp; Culture Advisory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater East Tamaki Business Association</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The Greater East Tamaki Business Association reported back to the board on the previous year and provided a brief on the plans for the year ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Tongatule, General Manager Greater East Auckland Business Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musick Point</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Clarification was provided to the board on the settlement with Ngai Tai Ki Tamaki at Musick Point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hutton, Manager Treaty Settlements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese New Year</td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific directions</td>
<td>The board were briefed for the 2020 event and provided with direction on the date and location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaya Irvine, Senior Event Organiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammy Johnston, Event Organiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 5:45pm