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1 Welcome

2 Apologies

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

3 Declaration of Interest

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

4 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) confirm the minutes of its ordinary meeting, held on Wednesday, 21 August 2019, as a true and correct.

5 Leave of Absence

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

6 Acknowledgements

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

7 Petitions

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

8 Deputations

Standing Order 7.7 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu 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.

8.1 Deputation - New Zealand Police

Ngā tūhunanga / Recommendation/s

That Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) thank Steve Smith from the New Zealand Police for his presentation and attendance.

9 Public Forum

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

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. Jason Myks, Coaching and Talent Development Manager from CLM Community Sport, Counties Manukau would like to give feedback on the toilet upgrades at Manukau Rovers Rugby Club.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) thanks Jason Myks, Coaching and Talent Development Manager from CLM Community Sport, Counties Manukau for his presentation and attendance.

9.2 Public Forum - John Roache - Otahuhu Rugby Club

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. John Roache would like to introduce himself and update the board on the Otahuhu Rugby Club and the community Christmas event.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) thank John Roache for his presentation and attendance.

9.3 Public Forum - Mere Rangihuna - Condor 7s

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. Mere Rangihuna Tournament Manager for Condor 7s would like to introduce herself and speak to the board on the tournament to be held at Kings College.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) thank Mere Rangihuna for her presentation and attendance.

9.4 Public Forum - AIGA Energy - Good in the Hood 2019

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. Marshal Walia from AIGA Energy would like to introduce himself and update the board on Good in the Hood 2019.
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:
a) thank Marshal Walia for his presentation and attendance.

9.5 Public Forum - Manukau Beautification Charitable Trust

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Dawn Edwards and Barbara Carney from the Manukau Beautification Charitable Trust would like to present to the board on the work of the trust.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:
a) thank Dawn Edwards and Barbara Carney for their presentation and attendance.

Attachments
A Manukau Beautification Charitable Trust 2018/19 presentation.................. 211

9.6 Public Forum - Auckland Airport He Tangata Grants - 2019 Recipients

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Justis Kamu from Auckland Airport He Tangata Grants would like to update the board on the recipients of the 2019 grants.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:
a) thank Justis Kamu from Auckland Airport He Tangata Grants for his presentation and attendance.

9.7 Public Forum - Papatūānuku Kōkiri Marae

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Valerie Teraitua from the Papatūānuku Kōkiri Marae would like to introduce herself and update the board on the lease application for Papatūānuku Kōkiri Marae.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:
a) thank Valerie Teraitua for her presentation and attendance.
9.8 Public Forum - Jasvin Park Residents Society Favona

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. Prasad Joshi Chairperson and Manish Kumar Secretary of the Jasvin Park Residents Society Favona would like to introduce themselves and raise safety concerns around Boggust Park boundary and their adjoining properties. The critical boundaries are Bukem Place and Toutouwai Lane.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) thank Prasad Joshi and Manish Kumar for their presentation and attendance.

Attachments
A Letter from Jasvin Park Residents Society Favona.............................................. 241

9.9 Public Forum - BestStart Mangere East Child Care Centre - Community Hub

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. Kim Kendrick from BestStart would like to introduce herself and discuss their plan to provide a community hub at BestStart Mangere East child care centre.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) thank Kim Kendrick for her presentation and attendance.

Attachments
A BestStart Mangere East Community Hub Vision...................................................... 243

9.10 Public Forum - Joseph Kalolo

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. Joseph Kalolo would like to introduce himself and the work he is doing through digital transformation in technology and business.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) thank Joseph Kalolo for his presentation and attendance.
10 Extraordinary Business

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

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

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

(b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-

(i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

File No.: CP2019/01958

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. A period of time (10 Minutes) has been set aside for the Manukau Ward Councillors to have an opportunity to update the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board on regional matters.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) receive the verbal reports from Cr Alf Filipaina and Cr Efeso Collins.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Janette McKain - Local Board Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. This item allows the local board members an opportunity to present verbal and written updates on their lead rolls, such as relevant actions, appointments and meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Impact Forum for Kohuora Corrections Facility</td>
<td>Makalita Kolo</td>
<td>Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere Bridge BID</td>
<td>Tauanu’u Nick Bakulich</td>
<td>Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere Town Centre BID</td>
<td>Tafafuna’i Tasi Lauese</td>
<td>Makalita Kolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere East Village BID</td>
<td>Tauanu’u Nick Bakulich</td>
<td>Togiatolu Walter Togiamua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otahuhu Business Association</td>
<td>Christine O’Brien</td>
<td>Makalita Kolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Harbour Business Association BID</td>
<td>Carrol Elliott</td>
<td>Makalita Kolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Airport Community Trust for Aircraft Noise Community Consultative</td>
<td>Tauanu’u Nick Bakulich</td>
<td>Tafafuna’i Tasi Lauese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaki Estuary Environmental Forum</td>
<td>Carrol Elliott</td>
<td>Togiatolu Walter Togiamua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Connections South Local Governance Group (3 members)</td>
<td>Christine O’Brien, Makalita Kolo, Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
<td>Tauanu’u Nick Bakulich (appointed 15 March 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori input into local board decision-making political steering group (1 lead, 1 alternate)</td>
<td>Togiatolu Walter Togiamua</td>
<td>Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Pukaki Tapu O Poutukeka Historic Reserve &amp; Associated Lands Co-Management Committee</td>
<td>Togiatolu Walter Togiamua</td>
<td>Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambury Park Centre</td>
<td>Christine O’Brien</td>
<td>Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere Mountain Education Trust</td>
<td>Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
<td>Togiatolu Walter Togiamua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government New Zealand Zone One Committee</td>
<td>Carrol Elliott (appointed 21 March 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Board Leads**

| Infrastructure and Environmental Services lead | Carrol Elliott | Lemauga Lydia Sosene |
| Arts, Community and Events lead | Tafafuna’i Tasi Lauese | Togiatolu Walter Togiamua/Christine O’Brien |
| Parks, Sport and Recreation lead and Community Facilities | Tauanu’u Nick Bakulich | Togiatolu Walter Togiamua/Tafafuna’i Tasi Lauese |
| Libraries and Information Services lead | Christine O’Brien | Togiatolu Walter Togiamua/Makalita Kolo |
| Local planning and heritage lead – includes responding to resource consent applications on behalf of board | Togiatolu Walter Togiamua (Planning) Carrol Elliott (Heritage) | Lemauga Lydia Sosene |
Item 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport lead</td>
<td>Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
<td>Carrol Elliott/Makalita Kolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development lead</td>
<td>Christine O’Brien</td>
<td>Togiatolu Walter Togiamua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Southern Initiative Joint Steering Group</td>
<td>Lemauga Lydia Sosene</td>
<td>Togiatolu Walter Togiamua (appointed 17 May 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Licence Hearings – Delegation to represent</td>
<td>Tauanu‘u Nick Bakulich (appointed 17 May 2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manukau Harbour Forum</td>
<td>Carrol Elliott (appointed 19 April 2017)</td>
<td>Togiatolu Water Togiamua (appointed 19 April 2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) receive the verbal and written reports from local board members.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

Authors | Janette McKain - Local Board Democracy Advisor
Authorisers |
Chairpersons Report and Announcements
File No.: CP2019/01972

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 for the local board to receive the Chairperson’s written report.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:
a) receive the verbal update and written report of the local board Chair.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Chairpersons Report</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Janette McKain - Local Board Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu and Otara-Papatoetoe Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acknowledgements:

(Additional tabled at the meeting)
- Congratulations to the South Harbour BIDS AGM.
- Congratulations to Mangere Otahuhu Papatoetoe CAB AGM.
- Congratulations to Manukau United annual Prizegiving event.
- Congratulations to Future Streets Project Team who had a recent Community Update workshop and Maori and Pasifika specific community talanoa (discussion).
- Congratulations to DGFG Team for their Creative Slam event.
- Congratulations to Cook Island descent Fashion House Designer Karaiti for her inaugural Fashion Show Mangere Arts Centre event.
- Congratulations to Minister Aupito T.T.S.W Sio and MPP for their Talanoa session with Young people who recently attended the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu Government trip with the strong theme of Climate Change in the Pacific.
- Congratulations Pacific People’s Panel held recently in Mangere East.
- Congratulations for the opening of the Peninsula Point Overbridge and planting day at the Naylors Park Reserve, thank you to the volunteers from Tatau Academy, neighbours and residents, and Council officers and Local Board.
- Acknowledging the work of the Mangere Bridge Residents Community Safety Working Group who has been meeting for the last number of months to co-ordinate an active working relationship with the Local Board, NZ Police, Auckland Transport and Auckland Council.
- Acknowledging passing of local Mangere resident Vanessa Aurelio Pasene.

Ongoing:

- Pre-election period for elected members commenced 12 August 2019 to 12 October 2019
- Otahuhu Town Centre Transformation project media release will be out shortly informing the Community project timelines and an update.
Reflections from 2016 – 2019

Thank you to our Heavenly Father who has guided the Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board to this point, given the very nature of the continuing work of the Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board Plan, Key performance objectives and completed projects, six key outcomes:

- A strong local economy
- Being the heart of Maori and Pasifika culture
- Protecting our natural environment and heritage
- A well connected area
- Facilities to meet diverse needs
- A place where everyone thrives and belongs

A number of successes recorded but not without its challenges along the way. The Governance Framework review highlights one of those challenges of the Auckland Council co-governance model, with the most recent feedback to elected members received recently from the Political Working Party. This will most certainly provide the necessary platform for elected members to continue seeking efficiencies being reviewed particularly the processes, by which local boards participate in, and influence, regional policy, plans and bylaws. Next steps will be in the new political term, with more detailed processes documented and rolled out to staff who lead, the regional plans, policies and bylaws.

Highlights from 2016 – 2019

Refer to the Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board 2016-2019 Achievements Report.
Farewell

Tafafuna'i Tasi Lauese JP

We say farewell to a long standing committed Local Board Member who has served with the Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board, Auckland Council, in the following terms: 2010-2013, 2013-2016, 2018-2019. Prior to that, he was also a Member with the Manukau City Council, Mangere Community Board. Thank you for your commitment and dedication to our Mangere and Otahuhu communities in your ongoing service and many leadership roles.

Carol Elliott JP

We say farewell to our colleague and long standing Member of the Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board, Auckland Council, in the following terms: 2010-2013, 2013-2016, 2016-2019 and also Deputy Chair 2013-2016. Thank you for your commitment and dedication to the Mangere and Otahuhu communities in your ongoing service and leadership roles.

All the very best to the incumbent Members putting their hand up again in the upcoming local body elections, good luck with your continued aspirations. Thank you for your ongoing and unwavering support.

Finally, it would be remiss on behalf of the Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board to thank all staff, Local Board Services in our local board office, for your professionalism of time and service in ensuring proper procedures and due diligence is always carried out daily in our roles. We would be affected if it not were your guidance and participation in keep the Local Board Elected Members Team on track.
In serving as Chair of the Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board, this has been my second term – privileged to lead a strong dedicated team of elected Members, grateful for their personal advice and courageous support. There have been many great times of celebration with our communities, and in the times of sadness or regret, we have pulled together to get through by continuing to work hard.

I thank you, for your aroha and alofa, helping us the Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board deliver to the local Mangere and Otahuhu communities.

God bless, la manuia, No reira,

Lemauga Lydia Sosene

Chair, Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board, Auckland Council

September 2019.
Valedictory reflections: end of term address

File No.: CP2019/17030

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide retiring Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board members the opportunity to comment on their time in local government and share valedictory reflections.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This is an opportunity for retiring Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board members to share valedictory reflections or an end of term address, prior to the 2019 Local Board Elections.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) receive valedictory reflections from Member Carrol Elliott, JP and Member Tafafuna’i Tasi Lauese, QSM, JP.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Janette McKain - Local Board Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu and Otara-Papatoetoe Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Transport September 2019 update Report

File No.: CP2019/16986

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board on transport related matters in their area, including the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. A decision is not required this month and as this report is the final report of this electoral term it provides an opportunity to highlight transport achievements in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area.
3. The report contains information about the following:
   • The wider context involving a summary of the strategic projects delivered in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area in this electoral term.
   • A final update on the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) including projects investigated and project delivered.
   • A summary of Auckland Transport support for board advocacy initiatives.
4. This report provides a summary of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board’s transport success this term especially the delivery of approximately $8 million of new transport works that directly support the local board’s plan including delivering capital projects in Māngere Bridge, Māngere Town Centre, Māngere East and Ōtāhuhu.

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

Horopaki
Context
5. Auckland Transport is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. Auckland Transport reports on a monthly basis 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.
6. Auckland Transport continues to deliver a number of strategic projects in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, discussed below.

Auckland Vision Zero
7. In 2018, 58 people died and 595 were seriously injured using Auckland’s transport network. Vision Zero is a paradigm shift in thinking about transport safety, it mandates that no death or serious injury on our transport network is acceptable.
8. Achieving this shift requires prioritising people’s safety over other benefits. Assuring the safety of all transport users in Auckland is vital to meeting the objectives of the Auckland Plan 2050, the Government Policy Statement and the soon to be released National Road Safety Strategy 2030.

9. Auckland currently has a commitment to a 60% reduction in road crash deaths and serious injuries by 2027 (from a 2017 baseline), reducing annual deaths to 25, and annual serious injuries to 325. Auckland Transport is the lead agency responsible for delivery of these objectives as part of the Vision Zero Strategy.

10. Implementing the strategy will be integral to achieving these objectives. It will require transformational shifts in policy and practice within Auckland Transport and across all of its partnerships and stakeholder relationships.

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

11. In this electoral term, Auckland Council and Auckland Transport started working strategically to create a Rapid Transport Network linking the Airport and Botany. The plan is that 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.

12. From Māngere-Ōtāhuhu’s perspective, key projects are New Zealand Transport Agency’s Rail to the Airport and the Airport to Botany RTN both of which have progressed significantly in this electoral term.

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

![Airport to Botany Rapid Transit Network](image)

13. Planning for the Airport-to-Botany RTN has started and is advancing rapidly. Already the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu area is seeing the benefits with small local walking and cycling improvements and the re-development of Puhinui Station, which will serve as a hub for east-west connectivity.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
Local Board Transport Capital Fund

14. The 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.

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

16. In this electoral term, the local board had $2.6 million of LBTCF to spend. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board successfully utilised all of its available LBTCF.

17. The following projects were authorised using the LBTC:

- **Widening Bader Drive in front of the Māngere Cosmopolitan Club.** The stretch of Bader Drive outside the Cosmopolitan Club is now wider, removing the congestion created by slipping two lanes into one at this point.

- **Building a new roundabout at the intersection of Bader Drive and Idlewild Road.** The Local Board has funded construction of a new single lane roundabout at the intersection of Bader Drive and Idlewild Road. The aim is to allow people to more easily get into and out of Idlewild Road. The design of the roundabout also maximises pedestrian safety crossing the intersection.

![Figure 2: Bader Drive and Idlewild Road Intersection](image)

- **Building a new walking and cycling pathway through Ashgrove Reserve.** The local board has funded construction of a fully lit 3m wide shared path from Ashgrove Road to Mascot Ave with marker posts, lights, re-fencing the reserve’s boundary fences and a speed table at the Ashgrove Road entrance. This project links people living in Ashgrove Road with MāngereTown Centre and extends Future Street’s network of safer routes.
• **Boggust Park walking and cycling path.** The LBTCF is supporting delivery of walking and cycling pathways in Boggust Park. The red line in Fig 4 (below) shows the route. This project meets the board objective of providing safer access and more walking options for local people contributing to the local board’s Greenways Plan and to overall walking and cycling connectivity in the local area by providing a safe off road route between Bukem Place and Otago Place. Both of which are discussed in the Local Board Plan.

**Figure 4: Walking and Cycling Route in Boggust Park**

• **Walking and Cycling Improvements in Mangere East.** Working together, Auckland Council and Auckland Transport are ready to deliver more than $1 million worth of work in this area that will:
  o Provide an off-road, walking and cycling link between Buckland Road and Hain Avenue.
  o Upgraded footpaths on Yates Avenue
Community Safety Fund

18. The Community Safety Fund is an allocation of $20 million distributed across all local board for local road safety projects. The fund is split between local board areas based on the number of death and serious injury crashes in that area. Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board's budget is $1.1 million.

19. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board used this fund to support the upgrade of Ōtāhuhu Town Centre. The Community Safety Fund supports this project by delivering safety work in the area and the board enabled investment re-allocation to deliver more and better upgrades in the town centre.

Mangere Bridge Safer Community

20. Auckland Transport is delivering a new road safety initiative that concentrates road safety funding in certain areas. Last month it was report that Mangere Bridge will receive funding and work will start early next year. The project involves a commitment of approximately $5 million. Details of the project are available on the Auckland Transport website: https://at.govt.nz/driving-parking/road-safety/safer-communities-programme/mangere-bridge/

Future Streets activation activities

21. Future Streets is a key local board advocacy issue and Auckland Transport supported it throughout this term and delivered the following activations in Māngere over the last three years:

- Twenty community events, including Christmas in the Carpark, Ladies Night Ride/Rave, World Car-Free Days, pit-stops and Lady’s Cycle Nights
- Twenty-eight bike training sessions, including Adults Learn to Ride, On road riding, Bike Maintenance, Refugee Cycle Training, and Kids Learn to Ride
- Twelve guided and themed rides around local cycle routes
- Five events and training sessions
- Worked with community to develop and distribute a walking and cycling map.

22. The activations were delivered in partnership with the local community. This programme demonstrates the commitment that Auckland Transport has had to supporting Future Streets. In the future we are aiming grow local capacity and encourage community groups to take greater leadership in driving this programme.

Local board advocacy

23. This section provides a regular report about how Auckland Transport is supporting the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu’s Advocacy Initiatives. The board’s Advocacy Initiatives are recorded in its Local Board Plan. In this month’s report, the board’s Advocacy Initiatives from the 2016-19 term have been recorded in the table below:

- Upgraded footpath from Yates Ave to Massey Homestead.
### Table 3: Advocacy Initiative Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Deliver projects with the governing body and Auckland Transport including:</th>
<th>In this term Auckland Transport has supported this initiative by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A well-connected area, part of a great, affordable public transport network</td>
<td>Improving street connections between the Otāhuhu bus/train station and town centre.</td>
<td>• The Otāhuhu Upgrade is being managed by Auckland Council but delivered by Auckland Transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that makes it easy for all to move around.</td>
<td>Upgrading the street environment around Māngere East shopping area and community facilities.</td>
<td>• Auckland Transport and Council developed a plan for Māngere East and are delivering projects in this area that meet this goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completing the Māngere town centre bus station upgrade.</td>
<td>• The Māngere Town Centre Bus Station is finished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support walking and cycling connections around popular parks like Walter Massey and Māngere Town Centre.</td>
<td>• A pathway through Ashgrove Reserve is confirmed and is funded from the LBTCF to improve off-road walking and cycling opportunities in Māngere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive, accessible and safe cycle ways and walkways.</td>
<td>Champion and support the Otāhuhu Portage route project to open the area for recreation, walking and cycling.</td>
<td>An advocacy issue that Auckland Transport can help support but cannot lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement Norana path walkway and fund priority Local Paths projects.</td>
<td>An advocacy issue that Auckland Transport can help support but cannot lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue supporting Te Ara Mua-Future Streets and identify options to increase use of cycle ways and walkways.</td>
<td>• Auckland Transport’s Community Safety Team is still working in the area-supporting local groups to deliver events and programmes that promote walking and cycling in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partner with Te Wānanga o</td>
<td>• Auckland Transport is delivering a pathway through Ashgrove Reserve linking people with Future Streets area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aotearoa to use digital technology to popularise and increase use of new paths.

Safe, attractive and well-maintained streets for all.

Develop and deliver improvements to Bader Drive, e.g. a roundabout at the Idlewild Road intersection and road widening near Māngere town centre.

Auckland Transport has delivered these projects

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera**
**Council group impacts and views**
24. Any impacts with other Council groups within this report were discussed earlier in the report.

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe**
**Local impacts and local board views**
25. Local board impacts and views are recorded in the body of the report if relevant to a project or issue.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**
**Māori impact statement**
26. In this reporting period, no local board project required iwi engagement.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**
**Financial implications**
27. This report does not have a financial impact.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**
**Risks and mitigations**
28. 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**
29. Auckland Transport will provide an update report to the local board in the new electoral term.

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

**Ngā kaihaina**
**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Ben Stallworthy – Elected Member Relationship Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon – Elected Member Team Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu and Otara-Papatoetoe Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Board Transport Capital Fund Decisions

File No.: CP2019/16987

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. The purpose of this report is to support decision-making about Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board’s Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. Auckland Transport manages the LBTCF on behalf of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board. On an as required basis, Auckland Transport reports on progress, provides advice and supports decision-making.

3. This month a LBTCF decision is required. Auckland Council has a local board sponsored programme of work in Walter Massey Park. The aim being to deliver paths through the park as part of the local board’s ‘greenways’ plan, providing a safe off-road walking and cycling link between Buckland Road and Hain Avenue.

4. The options were workshoped on 4 September 2019 and this report records the options discussed and provides the opportunity for the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board to progress a preferred option through decision-making.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) authorise Auckland Transport to spend the remainder of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board’s Transport Capital Fund (approximately $220,000) combined with funds allocated to the ‘Pedestrian Improvements in Māngere East’ project that is within Walter Massey Park (approximately $125,000) to deliver paths/greenway routes that will provide a safe off-road walking and cycling link between Buckland Road and Hain Avenue.

Horopaki
Context

5. The 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.

6. The following table provides an overall summary of the current LBTCF position.
7. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board has committed LBTCF to deliver four projects so far this term:
   - Widening Bader Drive in front of the Cosmopolitan Club
   - Building a new roundabout at the intersection of Bader Drive and Idlewild Roads
   - Constructing a new, safe, well-lit walking and cycling path through Ashgrove Reserve
   - Building a short section of walking and cycling path through Boggus Park.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

8. Over time, working with Auckland Transport and Auckland Council officers the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board identified a range of reasonably practicable options for it to achieve its transport objectives. The project discussed in this report has a history of being investigated previously but was put 'on hold' while the local board discussed a large Council funded project in Māngere-East.

9. Auckland Transport and Auckland Council officers have continued to work together and support the local board to assess options and identify new projects. During this process, it was identified that Walter Massey Park plans involved creation of a new walking and cycling pathway. The path would be a greenways route.

10. Auckland Transport’s advice is that this project directly delivers on policy direction in the Local Board Plan. The plan states the local board’s desire to improve its parks and reserve mentioning Walter Massey Park specifically in the following key initiatives:

   “Support walking and cycling connections around popular parks like Walter Massey and Māngere Town Centre.”.

   “Fund the development of concept plans for Walter Massey and Māngere Centre parks.”

11. The local board plan also makes the following statement:

   “We (Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board) will advocate for joined-up investment from the council and its council-controlled organisations in Māngere East to create a hub for communities and businesses.”

12. This project meets this objective by providing safer access and more walking options for local people in Māngere East and is a demonstration of Council and its Council Controlled Organisations working together. Furthermore, it contributes to the local board’s Greenways plan and to the overall walking and cycling connectivity in the local area by providing a safe off-road route between Buckland Road and Hain Avenue.

13. The estimate of cost from Auckland Council is a contractor’s quote so is likely to be accurate and Auckland Council has developed the plan with the local board meaning that options have been analysed appropriately and considered by members. Based on this history Auckland Transport recommends authorising construction and transferring money from LBTCF to Auckland Council Community Facilities immediately rather than progressing through the normal LBTCF process.
14. If the local board chooses to support this project then:
   - The remainder of the board’s LBTCF (approximately $220,000) would be transferred to Auckland Council
   - The money allocated to work in the north west corner of Massey Park (approximately $125,000) would also be transferred to Auckland Council.

15. This would provide a total of $345,000 which when added to Auckland Council’s budget provides approximately $800,000 and would allow the team from Community Facilities to deliver a pathway around the southern western sides of the park. Shown in red and orange in Figure 1 (below).

16. Depending on the final design, a further pathway running parallel with the driveway (shown by the blue line) may be built, but this needs approval of the budgets before it can be confirmed. If the local board accepts this recommendation, Auckland Council Community Facilities will report with a final design before construction starts.

Figure 1 – Proposed Pathway through Walter Massey Park

Key
Red – Proposed 3m wide pathway.
Orange – Proposed 1.8m wide pathway
Blue – Pathway under consideration
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
17. The issues discussed in this report were workshopped with the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board on a number of occasions, most recently on 4 September 2019.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
18. Study of the options indicates that there are no significant impacts to land or a body of water, so iwi consultation has not been conducted at this time. Projects that continue will be reviewed again, and if specialist staff advise iwi consultation, this will occur and any iwi concerns, advice, input and suggestions will be considered for incorporation into the project.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
19. The financial implications of the draft recommendations are a commitment of an estimated $345,000 of the LBTCF to support the work in Walter Massey Park proposed by Auckland Council Community Facilities.
20. This is a significant commitment and will use the remainder of the local board’s transport funding. The project has a thorough history of consideration and discussion by the local board and meets objectives of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Plan.
21. With this commitment, the local board will have used all of its available LBTCF.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
22. Construction always involves an element of risk and there are fluctuations in the cost of contractors, materials and even the weather, all of which can increase the cost or time required for construction.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
23. If the recommendation is approved, Auckland Transport will immediately start work to fulfil the request. Auckland Transport will report on progress monthly after the elections.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Ben Stallworthy – Elected Member Relationship Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon – Elected Member Team Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mangere-Ōtāhuhu and Otara-Papatoetoe Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Grant and Multi-Board Round One 2019/2020 grant allocations

File No.: CP2019/15370

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To fund, part-fund or decline applications received for Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Grants Round One and Multi-Board Local Grants Round One 2019/2020.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
3. This report presents applications received in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Grants Round One and Multi-Board Round One 2019/2020 (see Attachment B and C).
4. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board has set a total community grants budget of $202,000 for the 2019/2020 financial year.
5. Thirty-one applications were received for Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Grant Round One 2019/2020, and 13 applications were received for Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Multi-Board Grant Round One requesting a total of $279,639.12.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Grants Round One 2019/2020 listed in Table One.

Table One: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Grant Round One 2019/2020 grant applications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-103</td>
<td>Mountains to Sea Conservation Trust - Experiencing Marine Reserves</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for the De La Salle College kaitiaki programme, including administration, travel, marine gear, health and safety checks.</td>
<td>$3,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-106</td>
<td>Julia Aloalii</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards travel costs to China for university study.</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-109</td>
<td>TOA Pacific Incorporated</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards the “International Day of Older People” celebration costs, including venue hire, lunch, disc jockey, party supplies and bottled water.</td>
<td>$2,258.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-111</td>
<td>Louisa Teinaki Marsters</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards touch rugby costs, including advertising, sports carry bags and touch rugby balls.</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-113</td>
<td>South Auckland Seniors and Youth Association Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs of the seniors Christmas trip to the Hamilton gardens, including bus hire, camera, presents and refreshments.</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-114</td>
<td>Pila Tomu Exercise</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards facilitator costs for the “Pila Tomu” exercise programme at the Mangere Town Centre.</td>
<td>$3,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-116</td>
<td>Mangere Town Centre</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards evening market costs, including entertainment, vouchers, media and promotions.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-117</td>
<td>ares artifex Limited</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards costs to paint a mural on Great South Road, including paint, administration, brushes, printing, transport and artist fees.</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-119</td>
<td>Jah Tana under the umbrella of Maori Women’s Welfare League</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards costs for the “Otauhu Town Revamp” project, including paint, administration, brushes, printing, transport and artist fees.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-120</td>
<td>New Zealand Ethnic Women Incorporated trading as New Zealand Ethnic Women’s Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards sewing class costs, including sewing tutor and co-ordinator fees, venue hire, transport, sewing crafts, materials and supplies.</td>
<td>$18,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-121</td>
<td>Jasreen Sikka</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards costs of the &quot;Turbans Up&quot; event, including venue hire, photographer and facilitator fees.</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-122</td>
<td>Jasreen Sikka</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards costs for the &quot;Global Buddha&quot; event, including venue hire, photographer and facilitator fees.</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-123</td>
<td>James Dunlop Textiles</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for a community garden, including rat bait, rat traps, bait stations, soil, compost, planter beds and plants.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-124</td>
<td>Life Education Trust Counties Manukau</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards a contribution to costs for the life education programme in schools, including educational resources, insurance, salary and professional development.</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-125</td>
<td>Auckland Basketball Services Limited</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards basketball coaching costs for junior basketball in Mangere-Otahuhu.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-126</td>
<td>Pasifika Aotearoa Women's Sports Incorporated</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards sports training and workshop costs, including venue hire, sports equipment, t-shirt's, facilitator fees and prizes.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-127</td>
<td>Mangere Pathfinders Club</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for the pathfinder programme for children, including crayons, felt pens, paper, volleyballs and rugby balls.</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-131</td>
<td>William Howse</td>
<td>Historic Heritage</td>
<td>Towards restoration costs of the Shenstone Cottage, including weatherboards, timber, corrugated roofing, hardware, nails and paint.</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-133</td>
<td>Northern Dance Network Incorporated</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards costs for the &quot;YouDance Youth Festival South&quot; including venue hire, marketing, printing, videographer, photographer and stage manager fees.</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-134</td>
<td>Counties Manukau Sports Foundation</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards costs of the &quot;Hauora Hakinakina - Wellbeing through Sport&quot; programme, including venue hire, bin and toilet hire, trophies, prizes, refreshments, photography, coaches, a Maori Warden donation and St Johns.</td>
<td>$25,830.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-136</td>
<td>The Scout Association of New Zealand</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards a contribution to staff salaries from 14 October 2019 to 14 October 2020.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-137</td>
<td>Mapura Studios Division of Panacea Art Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards wages for a therapist and art facilitator from 15 October 2019 to 9 April 2020.</td>
<td>$4,580.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-138</td>
<td>Onehunga Samoan Seventh-Day Adventist under the umbrella of North New Zealand Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for the “Fit Aiga Family” programme, including venue hire, prizes, exercise coordinator and health and wellbeing facilitator fees.</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-139</td>
<td>Otahuhu Softball Club Incorporated.</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards costs for the upgrade of the “Turface, softball granite” and artificial turf in Sturgess Park.</td>
<td>$65,874.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-141</td>
<td>Youthline Auckland Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards Marae e Noho costs, including venue hire, catering and facilitator fees.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-143</td>
<td>Mani Tapuai under the umbrella of Maori Women’s Welfare League</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards costs for the “Otahuhu Town Revamp” green wall project including paint, administration, brushes, printing, transport and artist fees.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
18 September 2019

Item 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-144</td>
<td>Hannah Sirkia</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards costs for the “Otahuhu Town Revamp” green wall project, including paint, administration, brushes, printing, transport and artist fees.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-146</td>
<td>Shiloh Creative Life Centre Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for the “back to basics” family programme, including food, venue hire, gardening supplies, cooking work books and folders.</td>
<td>$17,676.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-147</td>
<td>Madeleine Gifford</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards artist fees for the “Nectar” exhibition at the Mangere Arts Centre.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-148</td>
<td>Kim Barrable under the umbrella of the Maori women’s welfare league</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards costs of the “Otahuhu Town Revamp” project, including paint, administration, brushes, printing, transport and artist fees.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2009-150</td>
<td>Tom Tai Malo under the umbrella of the Mangere Baptist Church</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards costs of the “Tom Tai Malo” exercise programme, including venue hire, equipment, advertising and fitness instructor fees.</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$233,268.85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

b) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Multi Board Grants Round One 2019/2020 listed in Table One.

Table One: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Multi Board Round One 2019/2020 grant applications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-107</td>
<td>BTC Boxing Community Health and Wellbeing</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Retrospective costs for a refurbished boxing facility and equipment in Mangere.</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Number</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-110</td>
<td>The Korean Society of Auckland Incorporated</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards the annual event costs for the Korean Day event on 14 March 2020.</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-115</td>
<td>Manukau Orchestral Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the wages of mentors and a soloist to rehearse and deliver a concert.</td>
<td>$723.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-118</td>
<td>Chinese New Settlers Services Trust Foundation, formerly known as Chinese New Settlers Services Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards “A Brighter Future for You” project costs including venue hire, tablet and teaching costs.</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-123</td>
<td>Connect the Dots</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards costs of the “Make Moments” art workshops, tutor fee, printing of postcards, art materials.</td>
<td>$2,887.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-133</td>
<td>Auckland Kids Achievement Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards wages for the “Kiwi Can” leaders in schools.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-152</td>
<td>Mika Haka Foundation Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the costs for the “YES Creative Hub”, including rent, public liability insurance, utilities, safety officer’s salary and administration.</td>
<td>$4,897.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-153</td>
<td>The Operating Theatre Trust</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards 2,000 show tickets and transport for school children to attend the theatre production “Greedy Cat” by Joy Cowley.</td>
<td>$3,103.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Grant and Multi-Board Round One 2019/2020 grant allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>MB1920-155</th>
<th>YMCA North</th>
<th>Sport and recreation</th>
<th>Towards a contribution for costs of the “Counties Manukau Intermediate Sports Camps” including catering, accommodation, salaries, volunteer donations, St Johns ambulance, medals, trophies and sports equipment.</th>
<th>$10,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>MB1920-164</td>
<td>Counties Manukau Sports Foundation</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards catering, venue hire, event coordinator, decorations and printing costs to host the “2019 Counties Manukau Sporting Excellence Awards.”</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>MB1920-170</td>
<td>Environmental Education for Resource Sustainability Trust</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Towards costs of the “Paper for Trees” programme in schools, including native plants, classroom bins, administration and office expenses.</td>
<td>$7,125.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>MB1920-173</td>
<td>Body Positive - New Zealand Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the salary of the peer navigator for “Body Positive New Zealand”.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>MB1920-178</td>
<td>Kokotala Limited</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for financial literacy workshops, including venue hire, course material, information technology setup, banners, flyers and signage.</td>
<td>$3,333.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$46,370.27</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 Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board adopted their grants programme for 2019/2020 on 18 April 2019 and will operate three quick response and two local grants 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.

11. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board has set a total community grants budget of $202,000.00 for the 2019/2020 financial year.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

17. A summary of each application received through Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Grants Round One and Multi-Board Local Grants Round One is provided (see Attachment B and C).

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

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

19. Twenty organisations applying to Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Grants Round One 2019/2020 and seven multi-board applications have indicated their project targets Māori or Māori outcomes.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

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

22. This report presents applications received in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Grants Round One and Multi-Board Round One 2019/2020 (see Attachment B and C).

23. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board has set a total community grants budget of $202,000 for the 2019/2020 financial year.

24. Thirty-one applications were received for Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Grant Round One 2019/2020, and 13 applications were received for Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Multi-Board Grant Round One requesting a total of $279,639.12.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

25. 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

26. Following the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board allocating funding for local grants round one, Commercial and Finance staff will notify the applicants of the local board’s decision.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
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Community Grants Programme 2019/2020
Our Community Grants Programme aims to provide contestable community grants to local communities.

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

A strong local economy
• Improve skills training, increase employment opportunities for the local workforce especially Maori and Pacific youth

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu is the heart of Maori and Pasifika arts and culture
• Our diverse communities enjoy arts and cultural facilities that are vibrant, creative hubs for connecting, engaging and learning, and expressing identity
• Increase opportunities for Maori and Pasifika arts and cultural expression

A place where environment and heritage are protected, enhanced and preserved
• Manukau Harbour and its coastline is clean, improved and protected.
• Local heritage is protected, enhanced and recognised.
• Reduce waste by improving waste management practices in the local area.

A well - connected area
• Attractive, accessible and safe cycleways and walkways
• Safe, attractive and well-maintained streets for all.

Facilities to meet diverse needs
• Collaboration and best use of local community assets and resources is encouraged.

A place where communities thrive and belong
• Our seniors are cared for and intergenerational projects are encouraged
• Young people are engaged and have a voice and contribute positively in local matters
• Increase the sense of safety in neighbourhoods and reduce harm from gambling, alcohol and synthetic drugs
• Increase opportunities for active living and community involvement and connectedness (see the Healthy Environment principles below)
Healthy Environment Principles
The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board has endorsed the Healthy Environment principles:

![Healthy Environment Principles Image]

Applicants with the following messages and practices are encouraged to apply:
- smoke free
- zero waste
- alcohol and drug free
- healthy options for food and drink, including water as the first choice.
- active lifestyles

Lower Priorities:
We will also consider applications for other services, projects, events and activities. However, these may be considered a lower priority:
- Commercial entities and promotion of commercial entities
- Ticketed events
- Activities that primarily benefit communities outside the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area
- Activities that primarily benefit a third party (e.g. activity to gain money for an organisation)
- Grants to support the purchase of, or maintenance associated with, motor vehicles
- Wages or operational costs
- Grants to support equipment or items for one-off events
- Initiatives that are eligible and can be funded by central government

The local board will not fund (exclusions):
- Exclusion one: Applications for Liquor licenses
- Exclusion two: Core activities and tasks of business entities
- Exclusion three: Hiring of facilities for religious purposes
- Exclusion four: Applicants who have already had two successful grants applications within the current financial year. However these applicants may be eligible to receive funding if they are;
  - collaborating with other groups
  - contributing significantly to the project

Investment approach
The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board has allocated budgets to support the local grants programme as follows:

Quick Response Grants
- $2000 maximum amount per grant

Local Grants:
- Above $2000 per grant, two contestable rounds per annum
Event Grants
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board will, at their discretion, fund a few community events, projects or initiatives as part of regular calendar of events that align with the priorities of the local grants programme. Recipients are required to put in an application and provide accountability for the funding they have received in that financial year, report on the progress they have made and demonstrate they are meeting any key performance indicators before funds will be released for the following year. e.g., applicants are to provide information on expected number of participants and final numbers who attended. These grants will be allocated through the events work programme and will be administered by the relevant departments:

- Ōtāhuhu Family Fun Day
- Māngere East Cultural Festival
- St. Patrick’s Day
- Māngere Town Centre Arts Festival
- Māngere Bridge Food and Wine Festival
- Counties Manukau Sporting Excellence Awards
- Eye on Nature
- Ōtāhuhu Ethnic Food Festival
- Portage Crossing
- Māngere Bridge Santa Parade
- Otahuhu Christmas Celebration

Application dates
Grant rounds for 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 will be as follows:

Quick Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019/2020 Grant rounds</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>23 September 2019</td>
<td>18 October 2019</td>
<td>11 December 2019</td>
<td>13 December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>13 April 2020</td>
<td>8 May 2020</td>
<td>17 June 2020</td>
<td>1 July 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019/2020 Grant rounds</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>17 June 2019</td>
<td>28 July 2019</td>
<td>18 September 2019</td>
<td>1 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>17 February 2020</td>
<td>28 March 2020</td>
<td>20 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-board funding
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board will also consider funding multi-board grant applications in collaboration with other local boards. Applicants will need to clearly demonstrate how their intended project, event and/or activities will specifically benefit people and communities in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area.
### 2019/2020 Multi-board Grant rounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round one</strong></td>
<td>3 June 2019</td>
<td>19 July 2019</td>
<td>18 September 2019</td>
<td>1 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round two</strong></td>
<td>20 January 2020</td>
<td>13 March 2020</td>
<td>20 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accountability measures

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board requires that all successful applicants to provide:

- success and outcomes of the project against local board outcomes and priorities
- photos and anecdotal narratives as supporting information
- Standard financial accountability, e.g. receipts and comparison of spending against budget.
- Information on community contributions
- Invite to events directly contributed to by the local board grant.
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To grant two new community leases to Māngere East Afterschool Care, Community Education and Study Support Trust at Walter Massey Park, 366 Massey Road, Māngere East and at 372 Massey Road, Māngere East.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. Māngere East Afterschool Care, Community Education and Study Support Trust holds an operative community lease for part of the council-owned building known as Māngere East Community Centre located at Walter Massey Park, 366 Massey Road, Māngere East. The lease commenced on 1 June 2009 and reached final expiry 30 June 2015.

3. Additionally, the Trust holds an operative community lease for part of the council-owned building known as Former Māngere East Library located at Walter Massey Park, 372 Massey Road, Māngere East. The lease commenced on 1 January 2009 and reached final expiry 4 July 2015.

4. The leases are holding over on a month-by-month basis until terminated or new leases are granted.

5. At the expiry of a lease for a council-owned building, it is good practice to review alternative uses for the premises. An expression of interest process can be undertaken to gauge community interest and alternative uses.

6. If the incumbent group is required in the area, the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board has the discretion to forego the expression of interest process.

7. The purpose of the Trust is to provide and promote a range of accessible, low-cost or free community services such as, adult education, parenting courses, afterschool care and school holiday programmes.

8. After assessing the Trust’s new lease applications, staff are satisfied that the requirements under the Auckland Council Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 have been met.

9. Iwi engagement commenced on 8 August 2019 and concludes on 5 September 2019, no objections were raised from any of the iwi groups.

10. This report recommends that the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board grant two new community leases to Māngere East Afterschool Care, Community Education and Study Support Trust in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Auckland Council Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 and the Reserves Act 1977.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) grant, under Section 61(2A)(a) of the Reserves Act 1977, a new community lease to Māngere East Afterschool Care, Community Education and Study Support Trust for part of the council-owned building comprising 245 square meters (more or less) located at Walter Massey Park, 366 Massey Road, Māngere East (outlined in red on Attachment A) on the land described as Lot 6 Deposited Plan 42220 subject to the following terms:

i) term - 5 years commencing 18 September 2019, with one 5 year right of renewal

ii) final expiry - 17 September 2029

iii) rent - $1.00 plus GST per annum if demanded

iv) operational fee - $6125.00 plus GST per annum

v) all other terms and conditions to be in accordance with Auckland Council’s Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 and the Reserves Act 1977

vi) approve the Māngere East Afterschool Care, Community Education and Study Support Trust Community Outcomes Plan for inclusion as the Third Schedule of the lease (attached to this report as Attachment B).

b) grant, under Section 61(2A)(a) of the Reserves Act 1977, a new community lease to Māngere East Afterschool Care, Community Education and Study Support Trust for part of the council-owned building comprising 102 square meters (more or less) located at Walter Massey Park, 372 Massey Road, Māngere East (outlined in red on Attachment C) on the land described as Lot 5 Deposited Plan 42220 subject to the following terms:

i) term - 5 years commencing 18 September 2019, with one 5 year right of renewal

ii) final expiry - 17 September 2029

iii) rent - $1.00 plus GST per annum if demanded

iv) operational fee - $2550.00 plus GST per annum

v) all other terms and conditions to be in accordance with Auckland Council’s Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 and the Reserves Act 1977

vi) approve the Māngere East Afterschool Care, Community Education and Study Support Trust Community Outcomes Plan for inclusion as the Third Schedule of the lease (attached to this report as Attachment B).

Horopaki
Context

11. This report considers the two new community leases to Māngere East Afterschool Care, Community Education and Study Support Trust for part of the council-owned buildings located at Walter Massey Park, 366 Massey Road, Māngere East and at 372 Massey Road, Māngere East.
12. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board is the allocated authority relating to local, recreation, sport and community facilities, including community leasing matters.

Land, Building and Lease

366 Massey Road, Māngere East

13. The Trust holds an operative community lease over part of the council-owned building at Walter Massey Park, Māngere East, described as Lot 6 Deposited Plan 42220, comprising 2178 square metres, held in fee simple by Auckland Council as a classified local purpose (community buildings) reserve and subject to the Reserves Act 1977.

14. The use of the building as a people’s centre are contemplated in the Manukau City Council Sports Parks Management Plan adopted in 2007. The proposed lease does not depart from the approved land use.

15. The building known as the Māngere East Community Centre is owned by Auckland Council. The Trust will be responsible for the interior maintenance of the leased area. Council will undertake the exterior, common areas and structural maintenance of the building.

16. The area proposed to be leased to the Trust consists of approximately 245 square meters and is outlined in red on Attachment A.

17. Under the community occupancy guidelines, groups occupying part of a council-owned building are charged $25.00 per square meter (plus GST) to cover operational costs, including building (not contents) insurance, share of overheads (electricity and water) and council maintenance.

372 Massey Road, Māngere East

18. The Trust holds an operative community lease over part of the council-owned building at Walter Massey Park, Māngere East, described as Lot 5 Deposited Plan 42220, comprising 2051 square metres, held in fee simple by Auckland Council as a classified local purpose (community buildings) reserve and subject to the Reserves Act 1977.

19. The building known as the Former Māngere East Library is owned by Auckland Council. The Trust will be responsible for the interior maintenance of the leased area. All exterior, common areas and structural maintenance will be the responsibility of Council.

20. The area proposed to be leased to the Trust consists of approximately 102 square meters and is outlined in red on Attachment C.

21. Under the community occupancy guidelines groups occupying part of a council-owned building are charged $25.00 per square meter (plus GST) to cover operational costs, as detailed above.

Māngere East Afterschool Care, Community Education and Study Support Trust

22. The Trust registered as an incorporated society on 14 April 1997. The objectives of the Trust are to provide an inclusive and accessible environment where people can come together to connect, learn, interact, contribute and celebrate community wellbeing.

23. The premises are open Monday to Friday from 7:00am to 6:00pm. The activities are run in partnership with other organisations, community groups and community members. Over 2,000 people each week take part in activities at the premises which are supported through funding partnerships and private donations. The grants received enables the Trust to operate a busy premises that is accessible to everyone in the community.

24. The programmes and classes the Trust provides are aimed to enrich people’s lives and respond to the changing needs of the Māngere, Ōtāhuhu and its surrounding communities. The programmes and classes on offer include:

- Before and After School - care for school aged children
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- Parenting Support - a programme which provides support to parents on how to overcome the unique challenges they are facing
- Mellow Bumps - antenatal parenting programme
- Te Reo Māori - language and culture classes for beginners and intermediate speakers
- Samoan Language - develop an individual’s understanding of the Samoan language and cultural practices
- English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) - low beginners and beginners classes offered
- Korowai and Tāniko class - cloak weaving and other traditional Māori crafts for learners of all skill levels
- Cuban/Salsa, Tai Chi and Zumba classes.

25. The Trust also allows other community groups to use the premises during the weekend and offers community buses for hire that are used by sports teams, for school trips and community group excursions.

26. The Trust has submitted comprehensive applications in support of the new community leases.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

27. The Trust’s new lease applications were assessed against the criteria in the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 and the priorities set by the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Plan 2017.

28. When a lease reaches final expiry for a council-owned building an expression of interest process can be undertaken to gauge interest and best use. If the existing group is required in the area and continues to provide services to the community, the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board has the discretion to forego the expression of interest process and grant a new community lease.

29. It is recommended that two new leases be granted to the Trust for a term of five years with one right of renewal for a further term of five years, in accordance with the guidelines.

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

31. Staff have determined that the Māngere East Afterschool Care, Community Education and Study Support Trust meets the requirements under the guidelines to qualify for new community leases as evidenced below, the Trust:
   - is a registered incorporated society
   - has complied with the terms of the operative leases
   - has a history of delivering quality services to the local community
   - is financially viable and audited accounts show proper accounting records have been kept
   - is managed appropriately, as shown by its longevity and extent of the programmes offered.

32. The buildings are owned by Auckland Council and the Trust are responsible for the interior maintenance of the leased areas. A site visit undertaken on 12 July 2019 indicated that the buildings are reasonably maintained.

33. The Trust has a scheduled maintenance programme in place in terms of routine cleaning and the upkeep of the interior of the buildings.
34. A single community outcomes plan has been negotiated with the Trust that identifies the benefits the Trust will provide to the community from both sites. This will be attached as a schedule to each lease document.

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

35. Staff have obtained input from colleagues in Community Empowerment and Operational Management and Maintenance units. No issues or concerns were raised regarding the new leases to Māngere East Afterschool Care, Community Education and Study Support Trust.

36. The proposed new leases have no identified impact on other parts of the council group. The views of council-controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of this report’s advice.

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

37. The assessment of the applications were workshopped with the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board on 22 May 2019. The local board gave informal support for the proposed two new community leases to the Trust.

38. The recommendations in this report fall within local board’s allocated authority to grant leases within local community facilities in line with the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012.

39. The recommendations within this report support the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Plan 2017 outcomes of:

- we are the heart of Māori and Pasifika cultures (Outcome 2)
- facilities to meet diverse needs (Outcome 5).

40. The proposed leases will benefit the local community by enabling initiatives that enrich people’s lives and meet community needs as well as offering evidence-based programmes and services tailored to Māngere, Ōtāhuhu and the surrounding communities.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement**

41. Auckland Council is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi which are articulated in the council’s key strategic planning documents the Auckland Plan, the Long-term Plan, the Unitary Plan and local board plans.

42. An aim of community leasing is to increase targeted support for Māori community development. This proposal seeks to improve access to facilities for all Aucklanders, including Māori living in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area.

43. The Trust provides Te Reo Māori classes at two levels (beginners and intermediate) also Māori focused parenting classes and korowai (Māori cloak) and tāniko (traditional weaving technique) classes. The Trust will promote participation of Māori through local programmes as part of their community outcomes plan commitments.

44. Iwi engagement has been undertaken and involved a formal, written engagement which commenced on 8 August 2019 and concludes on 5 September 2019. Detailed information of Māngere East Afterschool Care, Community Education and Study Support Trust and the sites were provided to Mana Whenua to comment on any spiritual, cultural or environmental impact with respect to the proposals.

45. No objections were raised from any of the iwi groups.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

46. All costs involved in the preparation of lease documents are borne by Auckland Council.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

47. Should the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board resolve not to grant the two new community leases to Māngere East Afterschool Care, Community Education and Study Support Trust, it will inhibit the Trust’s ability to undertake its core activities which in turn will have a negative impact on the desired local board outcomes.

48. As there is no significant departure from the current land use or change in activities there are no identified risks in granting the leases.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

49. Subject to the local board’s approval, staff will work with Māngere East Afterschool Care, Community Education and Study Support Trust to finalise the lease documentations.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
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## COMMUNITY OUTCOMES PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Group</th>
<th>Mangere East Afterschool Care, Community Education and Study Support Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name and Location of Land/Facility</td>
<td>Walter Massey Park, 366 Massey Road and 372 Massey Road, Mangere East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Area</td>
<td>Mangere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed Annual Report Due Date</td>
<td>18 September 2020 and on the same date every year thereafter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Board Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board Outcomes</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 5: Facilities to meet diverse needs</strong></td>
<td>The local community networks, collaborative initiatives and partnerships the Trust initiates, works with or maintains and the resulting benefits for the community i.e.) local schools, other community groups, users of the facility, affiliated bodies.</td>
<td>A minimum of 5 per annum.</td>
<td>Evidence provided by annual report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The number of other community groups or users that make use of the facility.</td>
<td>A minimum of 5 per annum and grow where can.</td>
<td>Evidence provided by annual report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote the facility within the community.</td>
<td>Promote the availability of the Trust and the facility to the community.</td>
<td>Evidence provided by annual report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Maori**                                 |                                                                      |                                                 |                     |
| **Outcome 1: We are the heart of Māori and Pasifika culture** | Establish opportunities to enhance and increase collaborative relationships with Māori. | List the opportunities to collaborate with Māori. | Evidence provided by annual report. |
|                                           | To promote customs of Māori culture.                                | A minimum of 4 programmes per annum.            | Evidence provided by annual report. |

| **Environment**                           |                                                                      |                                                 |                     |
| **Outcome 2: Protecting our natural environment and heritage.** | Effective, frugal use of services and waste minimisation. | Promote recycling by group users when using the facility. | Photo evidence of actions provided. |
Attachment C: Site Plan for Māngere East Afterschool Care, Community Education and Study Support Trust at Walter Massey Park, 372 Massey Road, Māngere East
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Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board for the addition of Nga Tapuwae Community Building project – internal refurbishment and joinery (# 2976) to the FY20 risk adjusted programme, and to reprioritise project funding in financial year 2021/2022 in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board work programme accordingly.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. In June 2019 the local board approved in principle the Nga Tapuwae Community Building – internal refurbishment and joinery (#2976) as part of the 2019 – 2022 Community Facilities work programme, resolution number (MO/2019/94).
3. Budget allocation for the project was not programmed to start until the 2020/2021 financial year, and the project was not proposed as a risk adjusted programme when the work programme was approved, with the understanding that the poor condition of the building could be tolerated until funding became available.
4. Subsequent reassessment of the building condition, including discussion with the current user group, has led to staff proposing that work be progressed sooner than anticipated, and preferably completed this financial year 2019/2020.
5. Staff recommend budget adjustments so that internal refurbishment of the Nga Tapuwae Community Building can take place as soon as possible. Reallocation of $135,000 is recommended by staff, from a park roading and car park renewal project scheduled to take place in financial year 2021/22.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) approve the addition of Nga Tapuwae Community Building – internal refurbishment and joinery (#2976) to the 2019/20 risk adjusted programme.

b) approve the budget reallocation of $135,000 from the 2021/22 Māngere-Ōtāhuhu renew park roading and car parks project (# 2288) to Nga Tapuwae Community Building - internal refurbishment and joinery (# 2976).

Horopaki

Context
6. The Nga Tapuwae Community Centre in Buckland Road, Mangere, is a community hub, holding a special place in the hearts of the local community. Over the last 11 years, the Nga Tapuwae Community Centre has been a key community facility for community-led activities, and a venue for hire for the local community.

7. The Community Facilities three year work programme includes two projects relating to the Nga Tapuwae Community Centre:
8. Project #2350 Nga Tapuwae Community Building - renew structural components is currently being delivered on site.

9. The work programme anticipated that project #2976 Nga Tapuwae Community Building internal refurbishment and joinery would be undertaken in two to three years time.

### Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

#### Analysis and advice

**Scope of interior refurbishment works required**

10. Following recent feedback from the user groups concerning the substandard condition of the facility, staff have reassessed the condition of the interior of the building.

11. Findings indicate that the interior of the building is in a worse condition that previously understood. The facility is cold and damp, which poses a health risk to the building occupants. Key concerns include:
   - widespread evidence of moisture ingress via the timber weatherboard cladding, internal and external gutters and joinery units
   - damaged and decayed timber wall framing and wall cladding in isolated locations
   - inadequate and poor lighting
   - poorly detailed and installed joinery units
   - deteriorated floor finishes
   - infrared heaters are not working.

12. The interior of the building requires considerable refurbishment to bring it up to current standards for safety, health and durability.

13. It is recommended that the internal refurbishment works be carried out at Nga Tapuwae Community Centre at the earliest opportunity, consisting of:
   - replacement of all decayed damaged timber framing and wall cladding
   - replacement of timber doors and joinery units
   - removal and replacement of the existing floor finishes with new carpets and vinyl
   - installation of an efficient heating solution to improve economic efficiency
   - upgrading existing, obsolete lighting systems with energy-efficient lamps and fixtures.

14. Cost estimates for the renewal of internal refurbishment and joinery at Nga Tapuwae Community Centre indicate a likely required budget of $240,000.

### Proposed changes to approved work programme

15. In the recently approved three year work programme, the Nga Tapuwae Community Building - internal refurbishment and joinery (# 2976) project has a budget allocation of $105,000 spread over financial years 2020/2021 and 2021/2022.

16. In order to progress the project this financial year, staff recommend that the local board approves two changes to the approved work programme, as follows:

   - Approve the Nga Tapuwae Community Building - internal refurbishment and joinery (SharePoint ID 2976) project as a risk adjusted programme project. This will allow staff to commence work this financial year.
   - Increase the budget allocation for the project by $135,000, to provide a total project budget of $240,000. To achieve this increased budget staff propose that $135,000 is reallocated to the Nga Tapuwae Community Building - internal refurbishment.
and joinery (# 2976) project from the currently approved project Mangere-Otahuhu - renew park roading and car parks (# 2288).

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

17. The renewal of the Nga Tapuwae Community Centre will ensure that we continue to provide the services Aucklanders require and expect.

18. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Community Facilities work programme is socialised with the wider council family and no impacts have been highlighted to date.

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

19. This proposal aligns with the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Plan 2017 outcome (5) to provide “Facilities to meet diverse needs”.

20. The early delivery of this renewal project will benefit facility users by providing a higher standard of asset, which is fit for purpose and is operating within agreed service levels.

21. All of the matters in this report have been workshoped with the local board on 7 August 2019.

**Tauākī whakaawaewe Māori Māori impact statement**

22. 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 plan.

23. The recommendations in this report benefit all users of council facilities including Māori.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications**

24. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board approved in principle the expenditure of $315,000 for the Nga Tapuwae Community Building – internal refurbishment and joinery (SharePoint ID #2976), resolution number MO/2019/94 from the local board’s renewals budget for 2021–2023 financial year.

25. The funding for this project was not programmed to commence until financial year 2020/2021 (as outlined in the table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>FY19/20</th>
<th>FY20/21</th>
<th>FY21/22</th>
<th>FY22/23+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nga Tapuwae Community Building – internal refurbishment and joinery (SharePoint ID #2976)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Cost estimates for the renewal of internal refurbishment and joinery at Nga Tapuwae Community Centre is expected to be $240,000.

27. The recommendation presented to the local board is to reprioritise funding, ensuring all funding is aligned with a renewal outcome within the local communities.
28. As the building is cold and damp it provides a health and safety risk to the occupants of building.

29. Auckland Council recommends the internal refurbishment works be brought forward for delivery to prevent any further deterioration to the building.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

30. If the recommendation is supported by the local board, the 2019 – 2022 work programme will be updated accordingly.

31. The project funding will be amended to reflect the board’s approval and further works can be delivered by way of contract variation or contract engagement.

32. Accurate commencement and duration of the physical works is not known at this time, but it is anticipated that works would take place during late September, early October.

33. These amendments will be reflected in the next quarterly report.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

There are no attachments for this report.
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Mangere-Otahuhu Sports Field Upgrades

File No.: CP2019/16577

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board to renew and upgrade sports field lighting at Māngere Centre Park and Murphy Park to address the shortage of sports fields with lights in the local board area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area has a projected shortage of sports fields with lights of 158 hours.

3. The local board approved the community facilities three-year work programme which had a number of sports field projects (MO/2019/94).

4. The purpose of this report is to update the board on three projects in the programme and seek approval to proceed with upgrades in FY2019/2020.

5. Moyle Park – Install sand carpet, irrigation and lights (#2455)
   This project is not being actively progressed at this time as council's Healthy Waters department are investigating the potential use of an area of the park as a stormwater detention pond, which would be designed to flood during extreme weather events.

6. This work could resolve existing flooding issues in the area and support the residential redevelopment of Housing New Zealand property.

7. Māngere Centre Park – Renew and upgrade park assets (#2438)
   This project is currently being investigated and two assets have been identified for renewal at the park, the playground and the sport field lights on field #2. This project has been identified as a risk adjusted programme project and staff recommend renewing and upgrading the lights in FY20.

8. Because of the delays identified for Moyle Park, staff propose reallocating $108,000 of the Moyle Park budget for FY20 to Māngere Centre Park to enhance the renewal of the existing lights to meet some of the shortfall in lit capacity in a timelier manner.

9. Māngere-Ōtāhuhu-renew sports fields FY20+ (#2726)
   Staff propose that the sports field lights at Murphy Park are renewed as part of this project. Currently there is $875,000 allocated to this project, with the majority of the funding in FY2020/2021 and FY2021/ FY2022.

10. Staff have received a cost estimate of $200,000 to renew the lights at Murphy Park and are seeking approval to complete the renewal in FY2019/2020 as part of the risk adjusted programme to enable the urgent delivery of the project

11. Additional sport field renewal projects will be recommended to the board in a separate report for project #2726.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) put the Moyle Park project to install sand carpet, irrigation and lights (#2455) on hold until agreement is reached with Healthy Waters with regard to:
   i) Detail of proposed stormwater works, including understanding of potential impacts on Moyle Park and the timing of any physical works
   ii) Compensation payment which could be used in addition to existing budget allocation to deliver more extensive sport field upgrade works within Moyle Park.

b) reallocate $108,000 currently allocated in FY20 from the Moyle Park project of installing sand carpet, irrigation and lights (#2455), to increasing lit sports field capacity at Mangere Centre Park.

c) approve the renewal and upgrade of lights on the number two field at Māngere Centre Park, to be funded from both Māngere Centre Park project to renew and upgrade park assets (#2438) and the reallocation of budget from the Moyle Park project to install sand carpet, irrigation and lights project (#2455)

d) approve the renewal of lights at Murphy Park in FY2019/2020 to be funded from Māngere-Ōtāhuhu-renew sports fields FY20+ project (#2726), and to be included as part of the risk adjusted programme.

Horopaki
Context
12. The 2017 Winter Sports Field Supply and Needs Study by Longdill and Associates predicts that by 2028 there will be a shortfall of 158 hours per week for weekday lit fields in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area.

13. The recently approved Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Community Facilities three-year work programme included a number of growth funded and renewal projects to address some of this shortfall.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
Moyle Park (#2455)

14. An initial concept plan to upgrade the entire playing surface to sand carpet with drainage and irrigation and to install lighting on one field has been completed. The cost estimate of all works is $2,500,000. This cost estimate exceeds the currently allocated budget, and the project will require either additional budget allocation or a reduced scope.
15. The current budget allocation for upgrading the Moyle Park sports field provision is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY22</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$950,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. To date $42,000 has been spent on specialist reports and the preparation of a concept design.

17. The investigation and design work at Moyle Park is not currently being actively progressed as Healthy Waters are investigating whether the park can be used to address flooding issues being experienced along Tararata Creek and for stormwater management purposes for the Housing New Zealand Māngere West Stage 2A redevelopment.

18. Healthy Waters are investigating the possibility of turning some of the park into a dry stormwater detention pond. This would result in the park functioning as a stormwater pond during extreme weather events, while remaining dry and fully serviceable as a sports field at other times.

19. The existing ground level would be lowered by approximately 1m to create the capacity to hold stormwater. The sports fields are rebuilt at the lower ground level with the park continuing to operate as it has done previously.

20. Similar work has recently been successfully completed at Sunnynook Park in the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board area.

21. Community Facilities staff are working with Healthy Waters on their proposals to ensure the best outcomes for the user groups of the park.

22. A significant benefit for allowing the park to be used for stormwater management purposes may be a compensation payment from Healthy Waters and Housing New Zealand which could allow more of the sport park upgrade work currently unbudgeted to be delivered. The main dis-benefit is that sports field upgrades would have to be delayed by at least two years.

**Māngere Centre Park (#2438):**

23. The local board allocated $600,000 as per the table below to renew assets at Māngere Centre Park in the approved three-year work programme. They have identified this project as part of the risk adjusted programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY22</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$600,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. The investigation and design for the renewal of the existing playground space is underway.

25. Council staff propose any remaining renewal budget is allocated towards renewing the existing training lights on the number two field on the park.

26. Currently the lights on field two only light half the field. Staff propose that additional lights are installed to allow for more lit capacity.

27. Due to the delays at Moyle Park, staff propose using the unspent budget from FY19 for the Moyle Park upgrade ($108,000) to complete the upgrade to the lighting at Māngere Centre.
Park. Staff believe the reallocation of this growth funded budget is appropriate as it would still achieve the intended outcome of increasing lit sports field capacity in the Māngere Ōtāhuhu Local Board area.

28. The remaining $800,000 currently allocated to Moyle Park upgrade in FY21 and FY22 would remain for the Moyle Park project when an agreement had been reached with Healthy Waters.

29. In the three-year work programme the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board has allocated $875,000 towards renewing sports field assets. Funding is allocated as per the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY22</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Murphy Park currently has two sports field lighting columns with lights that are under performing.

31. Feedback from the local sports club, the local board and the maintenance contractor all recommend these lights are renewed to today’s current level of service.

32. An initial estimate of $200,000 has been received to renew these lights. Staff recommend proceeding with this renewal in FY2019/2020 as part of the risk adjusted programme.

33. The remaining budget of $675,000 is available for other sports field renewals. Staff will provide recommendations to the local board on which other assets require renewal in a separate report.

34. At a workshop held in August the local board were supportive of renewing the lights at Murphy Park.

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

35. Auckland Council’s Operation and Maintenance team have been consulted with as well as the full facilities contractor that manage these parks.

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

36. The local board has the decision-making authority over recreation facilities and initiatives including the specific location, design, build and fit out of new local recreation and sports facilities within budget parameters agreed with the governing body and the use of local recreation facilities and initiatives including leasing and changes of use.

37. Renewing and upgrading these assets will contribute to achieving Outcome 5: Facilities to meet diverse needs of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Plan.

38. One of the key initiatives of this plan is to ensure existing facilities and parks and open spaces are high-quality, well maintained and accessible to diverse users.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

39. 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 2018-2028 Long-term Plan, the Unitary Plan and Local Board Plans.

40. No specific impacts to mana whenua have been identified as part of these lighting renewals.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

41. The budgets required to complete the two projects are summarized in the tables below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renew and Upgrade Māngere Centre Park Sports Field Lighting</td>
<td>Reallocated budgeted from Moyle Park project #2455</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Māngere Sports Park Renewal project #2438</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$308,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renew Murphy Park Lighting</td>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu-renew sports fields FY20+ (#2726)</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

42. Cost to construct is more than expected at Māngere Centre Park and Murphy Park. Scope may have to be reviewed if cost estimates are more than budget envelopes.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

43. Subject to resolutions of the local board, staff will prepare detailed design, secure necessary consents and undertake physical works for:
   - renewal of existing lights and installation of new lights at Māngere Centre Park
   - renew existing lights at Murphy Park.

44. Staff anticipate that these works can be completed within the 2019/2020 financial year.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Phil Gedge – Sports Parks Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorisers      | Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities  
|                  | Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager Mangere-Ōtāhuhu and Otara-Papatoetoe Local Boards |
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. This report seeks the endorsement of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board to progress further investigation of the optimisation of 12-16 High Street, to consider the divestment of part of the property and reinvestment of sale proceeds into enhancing community service provision.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Community Facilities Network Action Plan (2015) and Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Plan (2017) emphasise the contribution and importance of community facilities within the Local Board area.

3. The site at 12-16 High Street contains two community facilities: the Ōtāhuhu Town Hall/Community Centre and the former Ōtāhuhu Library building. The Ōtāhuhu library facilities were relocated to Tōia in 2015 with a small number of community leases remaining at 12-16 High Street. The long-term future of the site requires resolution.

4. Service property optimisation has been proposed as a potential funding mechanism to deliver improved service outcomes and meet future service requirements by leveraging the development capacity of the land at 12-16 High Street.

5. Clearly defined future service requirements are a key input needed to assess the feasibility of optimisation. The Ōtāhuhu Community Needs Assessment and Options Analysis (2017) (needs assessment) assesses local community service requirements, current service provision and implications for the 12-16 High Street facilities. The needs assessment details a number of findings, including that there is an ongoing need for a community centre in Ōtāhuhu.

6. Based on the needs assessment and the development potential of the site, five scenarios that could facilitate the optimisation of 12-16 High Street were identified.

7. Through a workshop on 4 September 2019, the local board signalled support for staff to progress further investigation of two of these scenarios.

8. The first scenario comprises the sale of the Community Centre land and retention and refurbishment of the former Library site. The proceeds of the sale of the Community Centre land would be reinvested into consolidating and enhancing community service provision in Ōtāhuhu in the former Library building.

9. The second scenario comprises the sale of the former Library land and retention and refurbishment of the Community Centre. The proceeds of the sale of the former Library land would be reinvested into consolidating and enhancing community service provision in Ōtāhuhu in the Community Centre building.
**Ngā tūtohunga**  
**Recommendation/s**

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) endorse the further investigation of the application of the service property optimisation policy at 12-16 High Street, Ōtāhuhu to consider the divestment of either the Ōtāhuhu Town Hall/Community Centre land or the former Ōtāhuhu library land and reinvestment of the sale proceeds into enhancing community service provision.

b) approve allocating $20,000 of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board’s FY2019/20 Locally-Driven Initiative budget (Community Response Fund) to the detailed investigatory works required for 12-16 High Street, Ōtāhuhu.

**Horopaki Context**

**Scope and drivers**

10. The Community Facilities Network Action Plan (2015) identified the following action to be investigated for the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area: "Investigate future options for the library space which will become vacant in 2015 and consider how this will complement the adjacent Otahuhu Community Centre. This will be conducted as part of a wider Otahuhu community needs assessment."

11. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Plan (2017) recognises that our community spaces are part of a first-class network. They are popular gathering places used for a variety of activities led by diverse local communities with many interests. They offer choices for people from different cultures and life-stages to take part in local life. This is reflected in Outcome 5: Facilities to meet diverse needs.

**12-16 High Street**

12. The site at 12-16 High Street contains two adjoining community facilities:

   - the Ōtāhuhu Town Hall Community Centre building (Community Centre), on the western part of the site, and
   - the former Ōtāhuhu Library building on the eastern part of the site.

13. The Community Centre building is currently occupied by Ōtāhuhu Town Hall and Community Centre Incorporated who hold a licence to manage and operate the building.

14. The former Ōtāhuhu Library is a two-storey building. In 2015 the library facilities were relocated to the Tōia Recreation Precinct. The first floor of the former library building is occupied by four community leases – the Ōtāhuhu Historical Society Inc, South Auckland Income Planning Services Inc, Lalotoa Aotearoa Community and Social Services Trust, and Discovery Foundation Inc. The ground floor is occupied on a short-term basis by the Ōtāhuhu-Māngere Youth Group.

**Ōtāhuhu Community Needs Assessment**

15. A community needs assessment undertaken in 2017 sought to understand existing and future service requirements. The needs assessment informs decisions on service provision at 12-16 High Street in Ōtāhuhu, their spatial requirements, and the implications for the current facilities.

16. The Ōtāhuhu Community Needs Assessment and Options Analysis Report was presented to the local board in October 2017. The key findings of the report were:

   a. There is an ongoing need for a community centre in Ōtāhuhu.
   b. Continued (and possibly greater) provision for youth is supported.
c. Provision for arts and culture activities can potentially be accommodated in existing facilities, rather than in a dedicated facility.
d. A number of the council-owned facilities in Ōtāhuhu currently have additional capacity.
e. Non-council owed facilities in Ōtāhuhu are generally at capacity.

Service property optimisation

17. Optimisation has been proposed as a potential funding mechanism to deliver improved service outcomes and meet future service requirements by leveraging the development capacity of the land at 12-16 High Street.

18. Optimisation is a cross-council portfolio development approach led by Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku), targeting underperforming existing service assets. It seeks to improve levels of service to the community, while delivering on strategic outcomes such as housing and urban regeneration without impacting on rates. Any funds generated by optimisation are ring-fenced directly back into the service component of the project itself or into other eligible local board projects.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

19. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board recognise the potential of the 12-16 High Street for optimisation and has supported investigation of the policy to facilitate providing a suitable community facility on the site.

20. Initial investigations were undertaken on mixed-use development of the site encompassing a purpose-built community facility on the ground floor with residential units above. The investigations revealed that this would not be a cost-neutral option and not feasible under the optimisation model.

21. Five scenarios have been identified for 12-16 High Street to respond to the needs assessment findings:
   1. Sell community centre land, retain and refurbish former library
   2. Sell entire site and reinvest at new location
   3. Retain entire site, maintain and renew as required (status quo)
   4. Sell community centre land, retain and refurbish former library, with relocation of services from and subsequent sale of other sites
   5. Sell former library land, retain and refurbish community centre

22. The five scenarios were presented to the local board at a workshop on 4 September 2019.

23. The table below outlines considerations for each of the five scenarios.
24. Staff recommended progression of Scenario 1. At the workshop the local board supported Scenario 1 and Scenario 5 as preferred options to progress.

25. Scenario 1 comprises the sale of the Community Centre land and retention and refurbishment of the former Library building. The proceeds of the sale of the Community Centre land would be reinvested into consolidating and enhancing community service provision in Ōtāhuhu in the former Library building.

26. Within this scenario, it is anticipated that the parcels comprising the Community Centre building and adjoining car park would be divested, but determination would be required on whether any or all of the area of open space between the car park and Atkinson Avenue could be divested.

27. Scenario 5 comprises the sale of the former Library land and retention and refurbishment of the Community Centre. The proceeds of the sale of the former Library land would be reinvested into consolidating and enhancing community service provision in Ōtāhuhu in the Community Centre building.

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

28. A cross council team and Panuku have provided input throughout this project.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

29. A number of workshops have been held with the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board to progress the optimisation of community facilities at 12-16 High Street. These workshops have provided updates and sought direction and input from the local board.

30. At its meeting on 18 October 2017, through Resolution MO/2017/196 the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:
   a) note the findings of the Ōtāhuhu Community Needs Assessment & Options Analysis (2017)
   b) endorse Panuku proceeding with the assessment of feasibility for the optimisation of council assets, based upon the findings of the needs assessment.
   c) request Council officers to pursue Option 3 as noted in the Ōtāhuhu Community Needs Assessment & Options Analysis (2017):
      • Develop a purpose-built community facility (at a site to be determined), with the opportunity to accommodate additional activities and services to deliver an integrated service and improve flexibility for shared use, and investigate opportunities for improved services at other Council-owned sites.

31. Through the workshop on 4 September 2019, the local board signaled its support to progress the feasibility assessment of Scenario 1 and Scenario 5.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

32. A Mana Whenua Framework for Engagement for service property optimisation projects was endorsed by the Panuku Mana Whenua Governance Forum in August 2017. This framework sets out how mana whenua will be engaged throughout an optimisation project, including opportunities for mana whenua to identify cultural and commercial interests.

33. Mana whenua will now be engaged on the two options staff will be investigating. Any feedback received from mana whenua will be included in updates to the local board.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

34. Using optimisation as a funding tool provides the ability to advance the consolidation and enhancement of community service provision without any impact on rates or the LTP.

35. A key element of optimisation is that the proceeds from the sale of community facilities are locally reinvested to advance approved projects and activities on a cost neutral basis. Detailed assessment will inform whether the divestment of one of the two existing community facilities at 12-16 High Street and reinvestment of sale proceeds into enhancing community service provision at the other facility on a cost neutral basis is a viable possibility.

36. To advance this optimisation, detailed assessment needs to be undertaken of the options requested by the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board. To enable this to be progressed, Panuku and Service Strategy and Integration (SS&I) request the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board contribute $20,000 from its Locally Driven Initiative fund towards this.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

37. Identified risks and mitigations associated with the recommendations in this report are outlined in the below table;
### Item 21

#### Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mitigations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market movement could affect capacity for investment</td>
<td>Further investigation to inform decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurbishment/reconfiguration of respective facility may not prove to be feasible under optimisation funding mechanism</td>
<td>Additional funding will need to be sought from elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative community perception of divestment of respective facility</td>
<td>Provide opportunity for community to input into repurposing of facility to be retained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Next steps

38. Panuku and SS&I to undertake detailed assessment to:
   - identify and understand the community service provision and associated spatial requirements.
   - understand the capability and potential costs of refurbishing and reconfiguring the respective facility for both scenarios.
   - determine the area of land that can be divested for each scenario and clarify the sale proceeds that would be available for reinvestment.
   - determine the statutory actions necessary to enable divestment.

39. Outcomes to be presented to the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board in February 2020.

### Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.
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Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval to reallocate budget from the Ōtāhuhu Citizens Advice Bureau to expedite the development of a community safety action plan.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. At the 28 August 2019 local board workshop, staff introduced the proposed community safety action plan approach, to be completed as part of 2019/2020 local board work programme line 1153 – Enabling Safe and Resilient Communities.
3. The 2019/2020 work programme includes $26,000 to support the Ōtāhuhu agency of the CAB, subject to the outcome of the Environment and Community Committee’s decision on a review of Auckland Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) services and funding models.
4. In July 2019, it was confirmed that the cost to operate the Ōtāhuhu agency in 2019/2020 will be funded from within the regional funding granted to Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux Incorporated (ACABx) to maintain CAB services.
5. Staff recommend that the total budget of $26,000 is reallocated to contracting an external provider to develop the community safety action plan, which is currently included in the 2019/2020 work programme to be delivered by council staff.
6. The community safety action plan will explore community leadership and collaboration opportunities to improve the experience of living and working in the local board area, based on the World Health Organisation safety communities approach.
7. The development of the action plan by an external provider will enable wider community engagement, increase specialist input into planning and enable the plan to cover a wider area.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) approve the reallocation of $26,000 from work programme line 102 Citizens Advice Bureau – Ōtāhuhu Agency, to work programme line 1153 Enabling Safe and Resilient Communities.

Horopaki

Context
8. The 2019/2020 work programme includes $26,000 to support the Ōtāhuhu agency of the CAB, subject to the outcome of the Environment and Community Committee’s decision on a review of Auckland CAB services and funding models.
9. In July 2019, it was confirmed that the cost to operate the Ōtāhuhu agency in 2019/2020 will be funded from within the regional funding granted to ACABx to maintain CAB services.
10. The $26,000 allocated by the local board for Ōtāhuhu CAB services is therefore not required and is now available for the local board to reallocate.
11. Community safety in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu is a topical and concerning issue. There have been several high-profile incidents in recent months, both in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu and neighbouring Otara-Papatoetoe and the local board have identified community safety as a top priority.

12. The 2019/2020 work programme includes $77,000 towards Enabling Safe and Resilient Communities (line 1153), which will be issued as grants to support the following activities:
   - $62,000 - Māngere Town Centre Crime Prevention Officer
   - $15,000 - Ōtāhuhu Business Association’s crime prevention initiatives

13. Accountability reporting for the Māngere Town Centre Crime Prevention Officer and Ōtāhuhu Business Association’s crime prevention initiatives in 2018/2019 indicate that the current level of funding is sufficient to achieve the intended outcomes and do not require additional budget.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

14. The Enabling Safe and Resilient Communities work programme line also includes the development of a ‘reimagined approach to community safety’ and associated action plan, with an emphasis on empowering the community to improve the safety of their neighbourhoods. The action plan will provide a strategic overview to inform the work programme for the next three years, with a range of short, medium and longer-term actions.

15. The methodology for developing the action plan, based on the World Health Organisation’s safe communities approach, recognises that there are many facets to the issue of community safety which intertwine. This initiative will complement the work of Police and other agencies on crime prevention and enforcement, and will explore preventative and wellbeing initiatives such as working with young people, placemaking, addressing concerns about alcohol, graffiti, violence, transport, and injury prevention.

16. The action plan will consider:
   - community leadership and collaboration opportunities, empowering community-led initiatives such as volunteer groups
   - empowering the community to advocate on issues that concern them
   - initiatives to improve youth wellbeing and reduce youth offending
   - initiatives grounded in cultural context e.g. Kaupapa Māori
   - reviewing alcohol licensing and enforcement
   - placemaking and crime prevention through environmental design
   - neighbourhood connectedness, use of media, community networks and resilience.

17. At the time the work programme was developed, it was envisaged that the development of the action plan would be undertaken by Community Empowerment Unit staff over the 2019/2020 year. However, the new availability of CAB budget creates an opportunity to fund the development of the action plan by an external provider to enable wider community engagement, increase specialist input into planning and enable the plan to cover a wider area.

18. Staff therefore recommend reallocating the total available budget of $26,000 to the development of the community safety action plan by an external provider.

19. The local board may choose to reallocate the available CAB funds to another initiative. In which case, the development of a community safety action plan will still be progressed by council staff, over a longer time-frame and without the benefit of the additional specialist expertise. Due to resource constraints, the scope would also be limited to two or three hotspot locations, rather than a broader local board-wide approach.
20. In the development of this recommendation, staff consulted with the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu senior local board advisor regarding any other initiatives awaiting funding by the local board. Staff are not aware of any other initiatives awaiting funding at this time, and $154,000 remains unallocated in the local board’s 2019/2020 Community Response Fund.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

21. Staff will support the external provider to engage with relevant departments across council regarding the development of the plan and implementation of its recommendations.

22. Development of the plan will explore possible links to the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu youth plan currently under development and work done by The Southern Initiative and Healthy Families, taking a preventative, wellbeing approach to improving safety outcomes.

23. The community safety concerns evident in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu are also evident in neighbouring Otara-Papatoetoe local board area, and the two areas share some commonalities in demographics and societal challenges. Staff are actively exploring ways to coordinate efforts and leverage impacts across the two local board areas.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

24. Table 1 outlines the findings of the Quality of Life Survey 2018¹, which identified that residents in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board area are less likely than the average for all of Auckland region to feel safe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu residents that feel safe</th>
<th>Average Auckland residents that feel safe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In their city centre during the day</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In their own home after dark</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking alone in their neighbourhood after dark</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. The Quality of Life Survey 2018 also identified that residents of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu are more likely to be concerned about antisocial behaviour in their neighbourhoods, as shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of antisocial or petty crime issue</th>
<th>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</th>
<th>Auckland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism as a problem in my area</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of people I feel unsafe around</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol or drug problems</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. At the 28 August 2019 local board workshop, staff introduced the proposed community safety action plan approach, to be completed as part of 2019/2020 local board work programme line 1153 – Enabling Safe and Resilient Communities.

27. The proposed action plan is aligned to the outcomes identified in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board plan 2017, particularly Outcome 6: “A place where everyone thrives and belongs”. Specifically, these initiatives will support achievements of the local board’s objectives that:
   - Increase the sense of safety in neighbourhoods and reduce harm from gambling, alcohol and synthetic drugs.
   - Increase opportunities for active, healthy living, and community involvement and connectedness.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
28. Sixteen per cent of the local board population identify as Māori, and a further 60 per cent identify as Pasifika.
29. A focus area in the development of the action plan will be engaging with Māori and Pasifika communities to identify community-led community safety responses that reflect the cultural context, including Kaupapa Māori and Fa’a Samoa, and empower community to take ownership of community outcomes.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
30. The 2019/2020 work programme includes $26,000 to support the Ōtāhuhu agency of the CAB, which remains unspent and is available for reallocation.
31. The 2019/2020 work programme includes $77,000 towards Enabling Safe and Resilient Communities (line 1153), which will be issued as grants to support the following activities:
   - $62,000 - Māngere Town Centre Crime Prevention Officer
   - $15,000 - Ōtāhuhu Business Association’s crime prevention initiatives.
32. The reallocation of $26,000 from line 102 would increase line 1153 to a total of $103,000. The additional $26,000 will cover the cost of the development of the community safety action plan by an external provider.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
33. The development of a community safety action plan is specified in the 2019/2020 local board work programme (line 1153) but will be expedited and enhanced by the application of funds to engage an external contractor to work alongside staff resource. This is a low-risk activity, and the approach has been successfully used in the past e.g. Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Safety Action Plan 2015.
34. The proposed action plan is responding to perceived risks by the community in the local board area. Staff recommend reallocating the available budget to have the action plan delivered by an external provider with expertise in this field, to maximise the impact the action plan can have on mitigating current safety risks.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
35. Subject to approval, a suitably-experienced external provider will be engaged to develop the action plan.
36. Upon completion, the action plan will be presented at a local board workshop, and the recommendations will inform community-led community safety initiatives in 2020 and beyond.
37. If there are costs associated with implementing any of the recommended actions identified in the plan, staff will present funding recommendations for consideration by the local board prior to implementation.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.
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Informal local board workshop views on the draft findings of the Animal Management Bylaw 2015 review

File No.: CP2019/16033

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. In May 2019, staff circulated a draft findings report on the bylaw review to all local boards. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. 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 Māngere-Ōtāhuhu 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


9. 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.

10. To help achieve its purpose, the bylaw enables rules to be made on specific animals in separate controls (see Figure 1 below). 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


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

The bylaw does not regulate animal welfare

13. 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.

The bylaw must be reviewed to ensure it is still necessary and appropriate

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

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

17. 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

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

19. 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

20. The following sections summarise 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.

21. The PowerPoint presented at the local board workshops is provided in Attachment A. The sub-sections below reference the relevant slide pages.

22. 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)

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

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

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

- Feeding wild pigeons and seagulls is causing a nuisance.

**Cats**
- 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.

**Pigs**
- In urban areas, temporarily keeping pigs for fattening causes nuisance.

**Rabbits**
- Rabbit infestations on council land cause nuisance to neighbouring properties.

**Roosters**
- Roosters are a nuisance and can be vicious, harmful animals.
- In rural areas, people are abandoning roosters.
- Rural areas have a higher tolerance for roosters.

**Stock**
- In rural areas there are issues with fences deteriorating and stock escaping.
- Loose chickens and wandering stock are a nuisance.

**Vermin**
- People complain about vermin and water rats in waterways, low tide or the deep bush.
- Open composting could create issues with vermin.
- Complaints about rats are increasing.

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

24. 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’.

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

**Table 2 - 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.

26. 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)

27. 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.

28. 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 3 - 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)

29. Currently, the bylaw does not mention companion animals (pets). The bylaw manages animals equally unless they are stock, poultry or bees.

30. 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.

31. 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 4 - 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 the 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.
32. 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)*

33. The bylaw does not require owners to provide their animal with identification.

34. 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5 - Local board informal views on identifying owned animals</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>

35. 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)*

36. 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 2 per cent of surveyed respondents who experienced animal nuisance reported it to the council.

37. 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6 - Local board informal views on council processes for managing animals</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>
38. 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 that 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)

39. Around 90 per cent of surveyed Aucklanders said the current bylaw controls for bees, stock and horses were about right or had no view.

40. 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.

41. 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Current control</th>
<th>Views on more control</th>
<th>Views on same or less control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bees</td>
<td>• Any properties, urban or rural, can keep any number of bees. • Beekeepers must manage the flight path and temperament of their bees. • Beekeepers must ensure nuisance from their bees’ excrement is minimised, and the bees have a suitable water source on the premises.</td>
<td>• The council should restrict beekeeping if people have bee-sting allergies. • Limit the number of beehives in an area to prevent colony competition. • Increase awareness and visibility of who keeps bees in an area. • Restrict beekeeping to rural areas. • Restrict the number of beehives a person can have in urban areas. • Restrict 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.</td>
<td>• Bees are not causing much nuisance, so there is no need for more regulation. • We should be encouraging beekeeping. Should regulate rather than overregulate. • Do not restrict bees to just urban areas. • Bees should be unregulated. • Would be concerned if licensing costs for beekeeping were introduced. • Should be careful about restricting bees as they are important to the ecosystem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>• Local boards are</td>
<td>• The same access rules</td>
<td>• Horse owners should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>Current control</td>
<td>Views on more control</td>
<td>Views on same or less control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>able to set specific controls for horses for local parks and beaches.</td>
<td>for dogs on beaches should be applied to horses.</td>
<td>responsible for removing manure. The bylaw should encourage accountability and consider that picking up manure is not always practical, e.g. on busy roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Horses are currently not allowed to be kept in urban areas without a licence from the council unless the premises is larger than 4000 square metres.</td>
<td>• Do not prohibit horses on beaches but restrict them to off-peak times.</td>
<td>• Should be allowed to ride horses on berms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horses are permitted in public spaces if:</td>
<td>• Should lobby central government to include the same powers that protect native fauna and wildlife from dogs for horses.</td>
<td>• Horses should not be banned from roads. There are few places to ride.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• manure is removed</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase communication and awareness of current controls to horse owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• consideration is taken to not intimidate or cause a nuisance for other public space users</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Would rather have horses on the roads than scooters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• beach dune damage is minimised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock</td>
<td>• 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 4000 square metres.</td>
<td>• Stock should not be kept in urban areas. This is also humane for the animal.</td>
<td>The current stock controls are adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stock in urban areas must also be restrained within the boundaries of the premises on which they are kept, and chicken coops must not be allowed.</td>
<td>• There should be penalties for poor stock fencing by roads in rural areas.</td>
<td>Support allowing pheasants in urban areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The bylaw needs a mechanism to deal with repeat ‘wandering stock’ offenders.</td>
<td>There are already legal consequences for not fencing your stock. The bylaw does not need to address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The criteria for keeping goats and other herbivores should be defined by the amount of grassy area on the property.</td>
<td>If you have a large property in an urban area, goats should be allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There should be restrictions on how far a chicken coop should be from the property boundary.</td>
<td>Make sure urban pet days are still allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fewer chickens should be allowed in urban</td>
<td>It does not matter where the chicken coop sits on the property if it is cleaned regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There should not be a complete ban on roosters in urban areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Views on new controls for specific animals (Slide 23)

42. 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.

43. The draft findings report identified that council compliance officers and the SPCA support microchipping and registering of cats.

44. Local boards provided mixed views on introducing controls for new animals. The local boards agreed that any regulatory response would need to match the scale of the issue, be cost-effective, and have measurable effects on reducing nuisance.

Table 8 - 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cause a nuisance and must be regularly cleaned.</td>
<td>• Roosters should not be allowed in rural lifestyle blocks in urban areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In rural areas the above controls do not apply. Rural residents must ensure their animals do not cause a nuisance to any other person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Informal local board views on controls for cats

Informal views on introducing controls for cats

- The bylaw should limit the number of cats a person can own.
  - Should make sure extremes are restricted, such as having 30+ cats.

- The bylaw should require the de-sexing of cats.
  - The council should work closely with the SPCA in this matter.
  - Make it compulsory for cat owners.

- Local boards have varying support for requiring microchipping of cats including:
  - Full compulsory microchipping across the region
  - Limited microchipping only to cats living in eco-sensitive areas.

- The bylaw should have the same registration process for cats as the council has for dogs.
- There should be a curfew for cats.
- There should be controls to dissuade people from feeding stray cats as it reinforces the cats’ behaviour.
- Publish best practices for tourists with cats and other animals visiting Hauraki Gulf Islands.
- The council should restrict cats from wandering.
- The council should restrict certain cat breeds, like Bengals.

Informal views on not introducing controls for cats

- Cat registration is difficult and has failed before. Auckland Council already has difficulty registering and enforcing dogs.
- Cats naturally wander. Containing them would be cruel.
- The council should invest in substantial long-term public education regarding cats.
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.

45. 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 2019-2029 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 2019-2029. 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

46. 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.

47. Some local boards said the bylaw should clarify property owners’ rights.

Enforcement

48. Some local boards said the council should be prepared to enforce any rules it may introduce.

49. 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, after trying to elicit voluntary compliance, the next step is prosecution. This can be costly to the council.
50. 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**

51. 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.

52. 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**

53. 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**

54. 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**

55. 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).

56. 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**

57. The cost of the bylaw review and implementation will be met within existing budgets.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

58. 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.

59. 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

60. 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.

61. 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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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 behaviour in public places
- manages animals in public places

Contains specific controls for:
- keeping of bees in an urban area
- keeping of stock in urban areas
- 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.
Informal local board workshop views on the draft findings of the Animal Management Bylaw 2015

People’s Panel data on animal ownership

No animal ownership (pg. 9)

Overall (pg. 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animals on property</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
<th>Average amount (Range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cats</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1.6 (1-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1.4 (1-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens / roosters</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6.7 (1-150,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish (indoor and/or outdoor)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13.2 (1-200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>(1-3,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>(1-50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bees</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>(1-80 hives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cows</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>(1-740)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbits</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>(1-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Included - insects, frogs, hedgehogs, and worms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses / ponies</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>(1-33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(1-950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(1-83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea pigs</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mice / rats</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(1-200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(1-1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owns no animals</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peopel's Panel data on animal ownership

Cats (pg. 8)  Chickens and roosters (pg. 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat ownership rates by local board area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manukas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many Aucklanders are experiencing animal nuisance
# Top issues from complaints data and People’s Panel

## Council complaints data 2015-2019

*(*pg. 15*)

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

## People’s Panel April 2019

*(pg. 16)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Examples of nuisance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,353 (56%)</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>895 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senescence nuisance</td>
<td>Odour from animal excreta</td>
<td>697 (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 dug 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>423 (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>Devoured animals in public areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad 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)

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

- Cats defecating in vegetable gardens, wandering onto neighbouring properties, owners not doing anything about it
- Harbouring vermin in tall grass or rubbish
- Neighbours feeding wild birds
- Smelly chicken coops, loose chickens
- Crowing roosters
How the bylaw currently addresses animal nuisance
Bylaw structure (1/2)

- **General nuisance clause**
  - Owners must ensure their animals do not cause a nuisance to any other person or cause a risk to public health and safety.

- **Obligations of animal owners in public places**
  - Owners must ensure their animals do not damage property belonging to another person.
  - Requires licence to keep bees or graze stock in public places.

- **Slaughter, hunting, removal or release of animals**
  - A person must ensure slaughter does not create a nuisance, including animal remains.
  - No slaughtering in public places or urban premises less than 4000 square metres (besides poultry)
  - No release or abandonment in a public place unless written approval from the council
  - No hunting or removing an animal in a public place unless written approval from the council

**Controls**

(next slide)
Bylaw structure (2/2)

- **Controls**
  - Keeping of bees in urban areas
    - bee management
    - flight path management
    - provision of water
  - Keeping of stock in urban areas
    - the number of stock that may be kept
    - the conditions in which they are kept
  - Horses in public places
    - general conditions of use
    - places with additional conditions
    - places where prohibited
Uncertainty on some definitions in the bylaw
Definition challenges

- **Owner** — “any person who has an animal in their possession or custody, or under that person’s care, control or supervision.”

- **Nuisance** — bylaw uses Health Act 1956 definition, and “includes a circumstance causing unreasonable interferences with the peace, comfort or convenience of another person.”

- **Animal management** — animal management officers mostly enforce dogs. AMOs not responsible for cats, wildlife, animal pests, birds, marine mammals or urban poultry, bees or stock.
  
  - **Stock** — “cattle, deer…poultry and any other animal kept in captivity, or farmed, an dependent on humans for their care and sustenance.”

  - **Poultry** — “means any live bird that is kept or raised for the purpose of producing eggs, hatching eggs or poultry products and includes chickens, ducks… roosters and swans.”
Uncertainty on processes and identifying owned animals
Processes and identifying animal owners

- Only two per cent of People’s Panel respondents experiencing nuisance reported their nuisance to the council.

- The council is generally not responsible for pests on your own property.

- The bylaw is difficult to enforce without an identified owner.
Some Aucklanders and compliance staff want additional controls on animals (particularly cats)
Current bylaw controls (1/3)

Beekeeping in urban areas

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 Aigles Beach, Hataitai 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 led along the beach below the high tide mark;
   (b) between 1 December and 15 February (inclusive 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 Karitoke 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 wherever 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>Cattle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donkeys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llamas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacocks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peahens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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

  ![Bar Chart](chart1.png)

  *People’s Panel – Bee controls*

  - About right: 66%
  - No view/don’t know: 24%
  - Less control: 7%
  - More control: 4%

- **Horses (pg. 56)** – ban from beaches, stricter manure accountability, regulation on roads

  ![Bar Chart](chart2.png)

  *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

  ![Bar Chart](chart3.png)

  *People’s Panel – Stock controls*

  - About right: 63%
  - No view/don’t know: 25%
  - More control: 9%
  - Less control: 3%
Views on new controls

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 pet 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 of companion animals**
- What is a “pet”?
- Can you keep pests as pets?

**Local board questions on identifying owned animals**
- Can a bylaw require that owners register their pets on an externally owned database such as the NZ Companion Animal Registry?

**Local board questions on council processes**
- What are the range of options property owners have to respond to animal nuisance?
- Is the question of culling managed under this bylaw or some other act?
- What is the process for obtaining an animal management licence?
- What is the process for keeping bees?
- How does and can Auckland Council manage pet owners living on boundaries of the Domain and large parks?
- Who enforces grazing stock in public places?
- What is the local board process for changing horse controls?

**Local board questions on cats**
- What is the cost for managing stray cats?
- Could the council implement a curfew on cats?
- What would a council rat control policy look like?
- What are the controls in place for tropical animals?
- Why are chickens not classified as pests in the Regional Pest Management Plan?
• Why could Omaui consider banning cats?
• What do we do about cats coming onto property and killing birds you’ve been looking after?
• What is the definition of feral cats in the Regional Pest Management Plan? Who is responsible for cat colonies?

**Other questions**

• Does the Crematoria bylaw cover animal crematoria? If not, does the odour (and nuisance) from them therefore come under the scope of the Animal Management bylaw?
• How do stock rules apply in semi-urban areas?
• How should the bylaw address bees that make toxic honey from contaminated tutu flower pollen?
• Will housing intensification increase animal nuisance problems?
• Should the bylaw manage the behaviour of humans, not animals?
• What are the rules for slaughter outside a regulated space?
• Will the Tenancy Act allowing pets increase the problem?
• Can the landowner take action to destroy animals that come onto their property? What methods will be allowed?
• What are the controls in place for tropical animals?
• What is the definition of wildlife?
• What animal management powers do we have under the Reserves Act?
• Muslim community on views on slaughter? Any approved process?
• Is the question of culling managed under this bylaw or some other act?
• What rights do property owners have to deal with the problem themselves?
• What happens if you abandon a fish in your private steams that runs into public water?
• What happens if your private lake floods and the aquatic pets get into public waterways?
• Could the bylaw say "no feeding of animals in a public place?"
• Can a bylaw require that owners register their pets on an externally owned database such as NZCAC?
• What are the range of options property owners have to respond to animal nuisance?
• Is the Regional Pest Management Plan adopted? Were chickens purposefully not classified as pests?
• If an animal trespasses on my property is this a nuisance?
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 Māngere-Ōtāhuhu 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 (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 included within the statement of proposal (Attachment E of the Hearings Panel Report)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
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<th>Michael Sinclair - Manager Social Policy and Bylaws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Kataraina Maki - GM - Community &amp; Social Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu and Otara-Papatoetoe Local Boards</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 351 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 333 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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Great Barrier**
### Attachment B

#### Item 24

<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>Awana Beach, Great Barrier Island</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitetā and Gulf</td>
<td>Page 295 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windy Canyon Great Barrier Island</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitetā and Gulf</td>
<td>Page 352 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Henderson-Massey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tui Glen Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking restricted freedom camping</td>
<td>Waitākere</td>
<td>Page 347 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingdale Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitākere</td>
<td>Page 321 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hibiscus and Bays</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkles Bay</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Page 275 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside Reserve (also known as Maygrove Reserve)</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Page 279 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matakia Bay / Beach / Parade and Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Page 283 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncansby Road Car park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Page 307 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntly Reserve, Campbells Bay</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited, and seeking restricted freedom camping</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Page 317 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton Road Car Park - Stanmore Bay</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Page 322 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothesay Bay Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking restricted freedom camping</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Page 339 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiwera Beach, The Strand Waiwera</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited, and seeking restricted freedom camping</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Page 349 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Howick</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockle Bay Beach</td>
<td>Seeking restricted freedom camping</td>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>Page 302 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockle Bay Domain</td>
<td>Seeking restricted freedom camping</td>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>Page 303 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millhouse Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>Page 330 of Attachment C</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>Tiraumea Drive Reserve - Pakuranga</td>
<td>Seeking restricted freedom camping</td>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>Page 346 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</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>Ōrākei</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 308 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>Papakura</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>Rodney</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>Grassed 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>Upper Harbour</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>Waiheke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment B  
**Item 24**

<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>Marae Reserve (Te Huruhu Bay Reserve) S3 Tahetai road, Waiheke island and Lot 1, Te Huruhu Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitemata 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>Waitemata 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>Waitemata 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 Pukematekeko 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>Waitematata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitematata and Gulf</td>
<td>Page 291 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitematata 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


Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu 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’ has involved detailed analysis of the urban tree cover; using a variety of data sources from the council, Statistics NZ, and other local government sources. The analysis has looked at the urban tree cover extents from a 2013 aerial analysis, alongside population statistics, and current growth projections outlined in the Auckland Plan.

4. The report has established that urban tree coverage in the local board area is approximately 8 per cent of the overall land area in 2013. The total tree cover is very low when compared to the averages across the region and 7 per cent below the minimum target that has been set by Auckland Council in the regional Urban Ngahere Strategy. The strategy sets a regional target to have no local board with a tree canopy coverage less than 15 per cent.

5. To continue increasing canopy cover in the long term a concerted effort will be required to plant new specimen trees every year.

6. In the 2019/2020 financial year the local board has provided funding to undertake the ‘Growing phase’ of the Ngahere program. This will commence work to develop the long term planting plan (1-10 years) to help coordinate and direct local planting initiatives to increase the tree cover in areas where it is most needed along with work to develop partnerships to help grow native plants locally.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) approve the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Urban Ngahere Analysis Report (Attachment A).

b) delegate authority through the Chief Executive to the General Manager, Parks Sport and Recreation to make minor changes and amendments to the text and design of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report that are 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 Strategy recommends implementation and analysis at the local level. Local boards were offered the opportunity to invest in area specific Urban Ngahere programs of work.

10. The local board Urban Ngahere program 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 to address areas of low tree cover. Māngere-Ōtāhuhu 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 15 per cent for the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board area. The report provides a number of key statistics:

- The local board area has an average tree canopy cover of 8%, which is the lowest for the region,
- 24 per cent of parks and open space has tree canopy cover
- 13 per cent of other public land has tree canopy cover (schools, hospital)
- 8 per cent of local roads have tree canopy cover, which is low,
- 50 per cent of urban tree cover exists on private land,

12. Section 7 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 lasting benefits for local communities.

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

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

14. Parks, Sports and Recreation (PSR) has collaborated with Community Facilities to 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.

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. PSR will investigate the opportunities for a wider collaborative approach across the council family to grow more trees in local communities and schools for local use.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe  
Local impacts and local board views

18. The local board has provided direction and support for the project at workshops in July and September 2018 to complete the ‘Knowing’ phase. The board provided in-principle support to adopt the report.

19. The board requests a wider collaborative program be considered with other areas of council including the Enviro-schools program as part of the next steps for the ngahere Growing work.

20. The 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

21. 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.

22. 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-pütea  
Financial implications

23. The local board has provided further funding in the 2019/2020 financial year to undertake development of a long-term planting plan and initial scoping of sites for new tree plantings. Further detail on this program will be presented to the local board at the beginning of 2020.

24. 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 annually into the future to help increase tree canopy cover in local parks and reserves.

25. 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 local area.

26. 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

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

28. 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

29. A canopy cover change update in the results section of the report, will be added once the 2016 data is ready later this year. An update of the findings will be presented to the local board in early 2020.

30. Community Services and Community Facilities will work collaboratively to develop an outline of the ‘Growing’ program to set out new tree planting plans for next five years. The long-term growing plan for the planting program will be adopted via a report in Quarter 4 of the 2019/2020 financial year.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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Local Development Initiative – Urban Ngahere Programme

Year 1 Knowing Phase

Urban Ngahere Analysis report for the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
Overview

This report was written for the Natural Environment portfolio of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board to provide background information and direction in the context of the recently published Auckland Council Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy, an overarching strategy for all of Auckland that seeks to know, grow and protect our ngahere. The intent of the report is to ensure decision-makers are well-informed on the scale, health and diversity of the trees within the local board area and to support an evidence-based, strategic approach to future management decisions in accordance with the goals of the Council's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy. The report aims to provide a baseline summary of the distribution, size-class structure, ownership and protection status of the urban ngahere within Māngere-Ōtāhuhu.

A healthy urban ngahere provides a multitude of social, economic and environmental benefits. However, concern has been raised that Auckland is moving backwards in regards to urban tree cover as a result of urban sprawl, urban intensification and recent weakening of tree protection rules, while there is an increasing awareness of the threat posed by climate change and the incursion of plant pests and diseases. All these threats may be better managed if there is a good understanding of the character and extent of the urban ngahere.

Urban ngahere (forest) comprises all the trees within a city – including in parks, on coastal cliffs, in stream corridors, in private gardens and along streets – both native and exotic species. This report focuses on the trees and vegetation in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu that are at least 3 metres in height, and the soil and water that support them.

The data presented in this report provides a detailed snapshot of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu urban forest cover based on an aerial ‘Light Detection and Ranging’ (LiDAR) survey conducted in 2013, which will also provide an accurate baseline for future comparisons. One of the most critical issues relating to the urban tree cover in Auckland, and the most important unknown, is the rate of change in the urban forest canopy extent and the numbers and sizes of trees being removed – analysis known as ‘canopy change detection’. Data from LiDAR will enable this process to be carried out. An updated analysis on the 2016–17 data is expected in September 2019, and the Local board will receive a detailed breakdown of this when the work is completed.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Urban forest covers approximately 8% of the total land area within the local board (one of the lowest coverages in any urban Local board in Auckland), including 7.2% of roads, 16.8% of public open space and 6.6% of private land. However, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu has varied population density due to the presence of significant industrial and commercial zones and a broad strip of largely undeveloped land along the western coastline. When considering only the predominantly residential areas of the board overall canopy cover is 10%. For context, the Urban Ngahere Strategy sets a target of 30% canopy cover across all of urban Auckland and a minimum cover for any local board of 15%.

Many of the benefits of attributed to urban ngahere are disproportionately provided by larger trees. Twenty percent of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu trees’ are over 15m tall, a relatively high proportion when compared with other local boards, however the great majority of these are located outside residential areas. Over half of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu’s urban forest is located on private land, with low levels of canopy cover in public parks and roads.

Approximately 47% of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu’s urban forest cover has some form of statutory protection, including 117 scheduled ‘notable’ trees or groups of trees. These notable trees are distributed somewhat unevenly though the local board area, with concentrations in central Ōtāhuhu, Māngere Bridge and Māngere East. It may be appropriate to add additional trees to the schedule to ensure protection of high quality and landmark specimens for future generations across the areas of
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, particularly those growing on private land where they otherwise have no protection.

The extent of protected ecological areas within the board is very limited, almost all of them being located beyond the urban fringe in Ambury, Ōtuataua, Pukekutu Island and Wiroa Island, some of which have limited public access.

Due to the low overall levels of tree cover in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu a goal to achieve more coverage across the whole board area is recommended and would give the community greater choices to interact with the ngahere in their local area. It is recommended that annually the local board supports local community tree planting and restoration projects along with looking at incentives to retain existing larger trees. These initiatives could be concentrated in areas with the areas with the lowest levels of tree cover, as identified in this report. For example Favona South, Favona West, Harania West, Māngere Central, Viscount, Ōtāhuhu West and Mascot each have less than 10% canopy cover.

Public reserve land is a good place to focus additional urban forest planting as existing coverage on such land in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu is low and it offers the best opportunities for long-term sustainable management. Additionally, the wider accessibility of trees on public parkland also means that the benefits they provide (e.g. better shade and increased emotional well-being) apply to a larger number of people, which is a major positive in terms of overall cost-benefit outcomes. Other future areas for action on improving urban tree cover could focus on concentrating efforts in parts of the local board with greater population densities and higher numbers of children and areas of established infrastructure not likely to be subject to significant disruption.

Planting more trees across the entire board area is an action that needs ongoing annual support with targeted funding. If implemented successfully the annual ngahere programme of growing will help to improve the environment for local communities, bringing longer term benefits as trees grow in size and scale their functional value increases improving air quality and soaking up (sequestration) carbon dioxide and reducing stormwater runoff. Working with developers, communities, school and private land owners to help to grow and plant more trees in the local board area is a key part of the next stage of the ngahere growing programme. It is only with a concerted effort of growing and planting more specimen trees over the next decade, will the local board and their communities see improvements over time as the tree canopy develops.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Overview

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board has provided funding to undertake an analysis of the tree cover across the entire extent of the local boards geographical area. This forms part of a programme of work across council to develop a detailed understanding of the city’s urban tree cover on public and private land, supporting a main objective of Council’s Urban Forest Strategy (2018), to ‘know’ the urban forest. The report’s focus is to provide the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board with an overview of their urban tree cover and aims to identify and recommend opportunities to nurture, grow and protect urban trees in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu. The analysis provides an important knowledge base for decision making that will support the delivery of a healthy ngahere for a flourishing future.

This report summarises the distribution, size-class structure, ownership, and protection status of trees and urban forest within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area. The report has been prepared for the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board to provide background information, context and direction for a locally focused approach to understanding the current pressures and look for opportunities to help grow and enhance urban ngahere. It provides a stock take of the tree cover on public and private land and identifies some key areas where opportunities exist to further enhance, nurture and grow the ngahere for local and regional benefit.

The data presented in this report is based on an analysis of a 2013 Light Detection and Ranging (LIDAR) survey that identified the extent and height distribution of all vegetation over 3m tall across Auckland.

Urban trees provide many benefits, as described below, but they also bring problems: fallen leaves, branches or whole trees falling over, excessive shading, blocking of views and damage to infrastructure through root growth. For this reason, care must be taken to plant the right trees in the right places in order to ensure the ngahere is developed on a sustainable footing.

Rapid population growth, recent legislative changes to the Resource Management Act, climate change and incursion of plant diseases all have the potential to cause significant changes to our urban forest. It is imperative that decision makers are informed on the scale, health and diversity of the urban trees in their local board area so that they can developed a sound and structured approach to future decision making.

1.2. What is Urban Ngahere?

Urban ngahere is defined in the Auckland Council Urban Ngahere Strategy. It includes the trees and vegetation in road corridors, parks and open spaces, natural stormwater assets, community gardens, living walls, green roofs and trees and vegetation in the gardens of private properties. It also captures the interconnected whakapapa of all living things in the wider ecosystem and the complex network of water, soil, air and sunlight that support them.

This report focuses on the trees and other vegetation within, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu regardless of type or growing location, that is three metres or taller in stature, and the soil and water systems that support them. This definition encompasses trees and shrubs in streets, parks, private gardens, stream embankments, coastal cliffs and embankments. It also includes both planted and naturally established plants, of both exotic and native provenance.
1.3. What are the benefits of the Urban Ngahere?

Figure 1 is an excerpt from Council’s Ngahere strategy highlighting some of the values that trees provide in urban and peri-urban areas to local communities. Scientific research over the last 3 decades has shown, both qualitatively and quantitatively, how the urban ngahere provides a multitude of benefits. Urban trees are crucial from an ecological standpoint, along with providing a wide range of landscape, environmental, social, health, economic, climatic, cultural and other practical benefits, including\(^1\):

a) Urban forest and other urban ecosystems are the primary form of contact with nature for many city-dwellers. Spending time in urban forest enclaves has been shown to improve mental health and well-being and reduce anger and aggression;

b) Urban forests provide critical ecosystem services such as air and water filtration, production of oxygen, carbon sequestration and nutrient cycling. Urban tree cover can help to reduce storm water peak flows and improve stormwater treatment at source, which in turn can help improve the regions harbours and water quality. Stream water quality can be significantly improved by tree plantings;

\(^1\) See also https://www.treepeople.org/resources/tree-benefits
c) Urban forest has been shown to have a diverse range of economic benefits such as enhanced property values, increased consumer spending in retail zones with street trees, reduced energy consumption, increased appeal to tourists and increasing road and footpath longevity by reducing UV radiation exposure levels;

d) In a neighbourhood with more street and park trees, park trees, accompanied in some cases by other plants, people judge walking distances to be less and are therefore more likely to travel on foot, which has health benefits;

e) Urban ngahere provides protection for residents from the sun while walking and playing, and from traffic by the physical barriers trees provide. The presence of street trees reduces driver speed and therefore reduces the frequency and severity of crashes;

f) Trees along streets and in urban town centres help to filter the air by trapping dust and particulate matter, which results from diesel burning vehicles. Air quality in Auckland is a regional problem that requires more focus on street side plantings or vegetation buffers;

g) Street trees and sidewalk gardens build neighbourhood and civic pride and neighbourhood park planting events are a great way to strengthen communities and bring neighbours together.

In addition, many of the native ecosystems within Auckland’s urban boundary are unique in their own right, being representative examples of naturally rare or unique ecosystems that have largely been cleared to make way for urban growth. Urban forest also provides habitat for other biodiversity, including native birds, reptiles, and insects.
The importance of urban forests is recognised worldwide, and extensive urban forests, and/or strategies to enhance and protect them are common in cities that feature in lists of the world’s most ‘liveable’. For example, the urban area of Vienna, which has recently replaced Melbourne as the world’s most liveable city has 50% vegetation cover of various kinds and Melbourne itself has a target to achieve 40% urban tree cover by 2040 (Anon 2012). Vancouver has a goal of planting 150,000 trees by 2020 (over 10 years) and increasing the cities tree canopy cover. Sydney plans to increase its average total canopy cover from 16% (2013) to 23% by 2030, and then to 27% by 2050, through targeted programs for trees located in streets, parks and private property (Anon 2013).

Auckland Council has now adopted a similar approach, developed an urban forest strategy, and within this document there are targets to increase the average tree canopy across the region through a range of programs. At a local level the objectives and principles of the strategy set out a framework of steps that include working with local boards communities with area specification implementation. Ongoing engagement with the local board and community will help to define the needs of each local area. This report aims to provide accurate analysis on the current tree cover in the board area to help direct future work, and to highlight areas of change where opportunities and threats exist.

1.4. Why we need data on the Urban Ngahere

Auckland’s ngahere is under pressure from urban intensification and development, weakening of tree protection regulations, the effects of climate change and the incursion of weeds, pests and diseases. Recognition of these risks was a main driver in the formulation of the recently published Auckland Urban Ngahere Strategy, an overarching strategy to manage, protect and grow Auckland’s urban ngahere. A key objective of the strategy is to gain a detailed understanding of the extent, number, size, quality and distribution of trees in the ngahere (the ‘knowing’ phase), in order to guide appropriate management and plan for a healthy future. A better understanding of the trends and status of the forest cover will help direct protection and planting efforts to where most value can be realised. The high level actions are outlined in the Ngahere Strategy.

![Figure 2: The knowing phase of the Urban Ngahere Strategy](Image)

In addition, Section 35(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) requires councils to monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of any policy statements and plans prepared under the RMA. Accordingly, Auckland Council has a statutory obligation to evaluate the effectiveness of the tree protection provisions in the Auckland Unitary Plan 2013 (AUP). While the AUP offers various degrees of protection to urban trees and groups of trees meeting specific characteristics (e.g. pre-identified
significance, vegetation by coasts or streams), other important large urban tree assets have no statutory protection at all and can therefore be removed.

There is significant anecdotal evidence from Council arborists, professional arborist groups, urban forest researchers, local board politicians and the general public that the urban forest is undergoing a period of rapid change. This report contains information that may provide a basis for future comparisons and assist Council’s efforts to monitor any such change and the effectiveness of its policies.

2. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

This report is framed around the key objectives of Auckland’s Urban Ngahere Strategy (2018), to know, grow and protect our ngahere. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board have provided funding for a work program that aims to enable an evidenced based approach to decision making and management of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu’s urban ngahere. This report is framed around the following topics:

- The distribution and height-class composition of urban forest within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board.
- The ownership distribution of the urban forest within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board.
- The protection status of the urban forest within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board, and the strength of the protection provided for in the AUP.
- Whether the urban forest cover of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Board varies between suburbs and is this related to socio-economic factors.
- How Māngere-Ōtāhuhu’s urban forest may be expected to change over time, and what are the future priority areas for investigation and research.
- What is the status of the ngahere, are there any trends that are developing and where are the pressures and opportunities.

3. Māngere-Ōtāhuhu LOCAL BOARD INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board spans the Auckland Isthmus, covering approximately 5000 hectares (ha) in south-western Auckland bounded by the Manukau Harbour to the north, west and south, Portage Road and the Tāmaki River to the north-east and Papatoetoe to the south-east (Figure 3). Its current population of 79,900 residents is expected to increase to 97,000 by 2033 (Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Plan 2017) and, potentially the area may see a 20% increase in households by 2042 (Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Area Plan 2013). Sixty percent of residents identify as Pasifika and is the youngest population in Auckland, with 45% being under 25 years old and 28% being under 15 years old.
Figure 3: The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board

Land-use within the board is varied, a result of the different phases of settlement and development undertaken by Māori and Europeans. These took advantage of the strategic location on the portage between the Manukau Harbour and the Tāmaki River, the quality of agricultural land in the region, the topography, access to ports and the harbour and the major road and rail links that traverse the area. The board is host to large industrial and commercial areas around the former railway workshops in Ōtāhuhu, along the coast of the Māngere Inlet (the inner harbour) in Favona and Māngere Bridge and the sprawling business park north of the airport, as well as the two large town centres of Māngere and Ōtāhuhu and extensive residential suburbs. There are numerous significant natural features in the area, particularly along the western side and adjacent to the coast including the Ōtuataua Stonefields, Ambury Farm Regional Park, coastal wetlands and several volcanic cones and lagoons.

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local board is located in the Tāmaki ecological district (Lindsay et al., 2009). In pre-human times, the predominant vegetation cover comprised volcanic boulderfields with broadleaf forest, mixed podocarp and broadleaf forest and coastal forest dominated by Pūriri on the fertile volcanic soils. By the time of European settlement, much of Auckland’s original vegetation had been altered due to repeated burning over hundreds of years of Māori occupation, leaving a preponderance of manuka scrubland. After 1840, a combination of land clearance and drainage firstly for farming and later for urbanisation resulted in the loss of most of the remaining indigenous forest cover of the area. (Lindsay et al. 2009, Singer et al. 2017). Only 2% of the original coastal...
forest, 1% of freshwater wetlands, 1% of the inland forests and 0.5% of boulder field forest of the Tāmaki ecological district remain.

WASHINGTONIA ROBUSTA, SEASIDE PARK, ŌTĀHUHU

Approximately 12% of the local board area is public parkland, with over 100 local parks as well as several significant sports parks including Māngere Centre Park, Moyle Park, Walter Massey Park, Sturges Park and Seaside Park and large passive reserves such as Māngere Domain, Ambury Farm Regional Park and Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve, which contains pockets of remnant rock forest with karaka, pūriri and titoki. Overall, very little original indigenous forest of the region remains.

The 2016 freshwater report card for the Manukau reporting area, which includes Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, rated water quality within the local board as grade E, the second worst rating available. This is likely due to the presence of significant industrial activity and the very high levels of impervious surfacing in the area. The average coverage of impervious surfacing in Auckland as a whole is 9% but within the Manukau reporting area the coverage is 47%. There is a strong correlation between the health of waterways and the land use within their catchment, with waterways that drain urban catchments typically having poor water quality and low ecological values.

Underlying the overall figure, the region received an F rating for both habitat quality and biodiversity, highlighting the link between the intense urbanisation of the catchments, vegetation loss and water quality. Given its long coastline and that it has catchments that drain into both of Auckland’s harbours, water quality should be considered a significant issue in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu.
Due to a lack of remnant bush and the generally sparse tree cover on public land, the largest single component of the urban forest in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu is the trees on residential land, which make up just over half of the board’s urban tree cover. Very little of this has any formal protection and is dominated by small to medium sized trees. With ongoing urban intensification, including redevelopment of swathes of Housing New Zealand land, much of the urban forest is under threat from development which could potentially lead to irreversible changes in urban forest cover (Brown et al., 2015).

4. METHODS

The term LiDAR stands for Light Detection and Ranging. It works on the same principle as radar, but uses light as a signal source rather than radio waves. It is an airborne optical remote sensing technology that measures the time delay between transmission of a pulse of light and detection of its reflected signal. This allows for remote measurement of the height of three-dimensional features and of the underlying terrain.

LiDAR data suitable for urban ngahere analysis was available from a survey conducted in 2013. A further survey was conducted in 2017, however the data from this later survey is currently being processed. While early results have been presented to Council’s Environmental committee the detailed data was not available at the time of drafting this report. When available it may be compared with the earlier data to help identify any trends or changes in urban forest cover, including to overall...
coverage as well as height distribution (an indicator of the quality and maturity of the ngahere). The board will be updated later this year when results become available.

4.1. Analysis methodology

The 2013 urban forest data presented in this report was collected between 17/07/2013 and 23/11/2013 with a sampling rate of at least 1.5 points per square metre and has a resolution of approximately 0.6m laterally and 0.1m vertically. Data-points classified as ‘vegetation’ were extracted to form an urban forest ‘layer’ of data for further analysis and interrogation within the ArcGIS 10.2 geospatial software, through combination with other spatial datasets (Table 1).

Table 1 List of data sources and descriptions used in analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Organisation source</th>
<th>Retrieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Owned Land (parcel level)</td>
<td>This includes roads (both formed and unformed), public parks administered by the Auckland Council and land administered by central government agencies (e.g. Department of Conservation and Ministry of Education).</td>
<td>RIMU, Auckland Council</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Parcels (all primary parcels except above)</td>
<td>Current land parcel polygons with associated descriptive data (Land Information New Zealand, 2010). This dataset does not include parcels that have been vested in council for roading.</td>
<td>LINZ</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Land</td>
<td>See Table 3. Covers land within open space zones or protected in the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (e.g. as part of a Significant Ecological Area or Outstanding Natural Feature)</td>
<td>RIMU</td>
<td>August 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data underwent quality control checks to eliminate obvious errors such as misclassified areas of man-made materials and other non-vegetation surfaces, which were removed. Objects with similar reflectivity to vegetation, such as transparent materials (glass) and power lines, were common sources of these errors.

4.2. Urban Forest Structure

LiDAR data includes a height component and this information was used to set a cut-off point for urban forest vegetation at 3m above ground level. In order to exclude low-lying vegetation such as mown grassland, low stature hedges and gardens only LiDAR data points over this height were classified as contributing to the urban forest layer. Also not included in the analysis is any new restoration and street tree plantings that have taken place since 2013.

For the purposes of the analysis of urban forest structure, the data points were sorted into height categories to reflect the varying contribution that trees of different height and maturity make to the
urban forest, local amenity, ecosystem services etc. The height categories are defined as: between 3-5m then at increments of 5m up to 30m, and trees over 30m.

4.3. Urban Forest Tenure

To determine the tenure of urban forest, the data points were compared to the zoning of different land parcels within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board. The zoning as corresponding to land tenure classification is summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: Classification of land parcels in relation to land tenure assessment

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

4.4. Urban Forest Protection Status

The level of urban forest protection was determined through an analysis of the underlying zones and protection layers in the AUP, the pressures on vegetation arising from the underlying land use and the practical constraints to vegetation clearance. Five different protection levels were assigned (shown in Table 3).

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

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

It should be noted that the following table was based on an understanding of the tree and vegetation protection rules contained in the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (2013) and the scale is a broad representation of the levels of protection of trees and vegetation. It should not be considered as entirely representative of the current rules that exist in the operative version of the plan, which was adopted by council in September 2016.
Table 3: Level of protection for urban forest based on proposed Unitary Plan zone and overlay rules and pressures on vegetation removal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection zone</th>
<th>Detail on rules and restrictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – no protection</td>
<td>There is no statutory protection for urban forest and no rules preventing tree or vegetation clearance in these locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – some protection</td>
<td>Open space (active recreation) zones and the road corridor. For both these areas restricted discretionary resource consents are required to clear trees &gt;4m in height. However, development pressures are often high and trees are often regarded as incompatible with the main land uses (e.g. utilities, sports fields, roading infrastructure). The AUP rules for street trees are more permissive than those for trees in open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – low protection</td>
<td>Within a coastal natural character area or an area zoned as ‘Open Space Informal Recreation’ (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove trees/vegetation &gt;4m in height). The AUP rules for trees in open space are more permissive than in coastal areas in terms of what utility operators can do around and to trees – including pruning as permitted activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 – low to moderate protection | Urban forest within:  
  * Outstanding Natural Features overlay (restricted discretionary consent is needed to remove 25m²+ of contiguous indigenous vegetation),  
  * Outstanding Natural Landscapes overlay (restricted discretionary consent needed for alteration or removal of 50m²+of any contiguous indigenous vegetation);  
  * Coastal yards (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove native trees/vegetation 3m+ in height)*  
  * Open Space - Conservation (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove trees/vegetation 4m+ in height). |
| 4 – moderate to high protection | Historic heritage (discretionary consent needed to remove trees/vegetation 3m+ in height)  
  * Riparian yard (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove any trees or shrubs)  
  * Lake protection zone (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove any trees or shrubs) |
| 5 – high protection | Significant Ecological Areas ("SEA") (discretionary consent needed to remove any trees or vegetation), Notable trees (discretionary consent needed to remove any notable tree or shrub) |

The protection classification is a guide only and does not represent a distinct legislative ability to prevent removal of a notable tree for example. So, although a site may have a level 5 protection over it using this system a consent can still be lodged with council to remove or modify it. It may make the proposal more difficult, but it should not be assumed that these percentages of protected vegetation won’t decrease over time and with urban intensification and there is no current ability to easily and affordably add a new notable tree to the plan or protect an area of significant vegetation (SEA).
4.5. Urban Forest in Relation to Socio-Economic Factors

To further analysis the urban forest data and potentially influencing factors, the data (including total canopy, tenure, size class distribution, and protection status) were categorised into Census Area Units (CAU). The CAU covered by the Local Board area are shown in Figure 4, with 20 units being present in total. In some instances in this report, data is omitted from CAU that have a population density of less than 1000 people / km² or where there is significant overlap with adjacent boards (Māngere East).

The socio-economic census data included in this report has been sourced from the 2013 New Zealand census records. This includes data on resident population and age distribution. Additional work is underway to compare the urban forest canopy data with data on other social factors such as health, income and number of cars per household. Further guidance will be provided to The Board if any such correlation that may help inform decision making is identified.

![Figure 4: Census Area Units (2013) of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board (highlighted in purple)](image)

In addition, a shade analysis study that was previously undertaken by Auckland Council – Community Services was consulted. This study sought, through desktop analysis, to understand tree canopy cover, the number of trees in community parks and whether shade was provided to playgrounds in each park. The work was completed to show where opportunities exist for improvements to the numbers of trees in local parks that can provide future health benefits for individuals, groups and the wider community. New tree plantings can provide long term shade benefits, are consistent with a
sustainable and carbon friendly approach and can be delivered at a local scale. A more detailed explanation of this study can be found in Appendix B.

5. RESULTS

5.1. Urban Forest Cover 2013 Overview

Urban forest canopy cover varies greatly across the Auckland metropolitan area (Figure 5), but is consistently low within Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board. Overall, urban forest covers 8% of the Local Board area as a whole, including 7.2% of roads, 16.8% of public parks and 6.6% of private land. Detailed mapping of tree cover at a more local scale is underway and will be available shortly.

![Figure 5: Urban forest cover within metropolitan Auckland](image)

When considering only area units where population density is at least 1000 people per square kilometre (i.e. excluding Māngere South and Māngere Station) or the majority of which are in an adjacent local board (Māngere East), overall urban forest cover in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu is 10% (Table 4 below). The percentages of urban forest cover for all the different land tenure categories are below the averages percentages found across all the local boards of Auckland. In particular, urban forest cover in public open space (12%) and on private land (10%) is especially low when compared to Auckland as a whole, where the figures are 33% and 17% respectively. Additionally, the percentage
of urban forest cover across each land tenure is very similar within the board, varying only between 8% and 12% across all four categories of tenure, whereas in Auckland as a whole the percentage of tree cover on public open space is typically twice than on private land and three times that on roads.

Table 4: Percentage of land with tree cover for each of Auckland’s urban local boards. Values are given for different land tenures and overall. Area units with population density less than 1000 people per square kilometre are excluded from the calculation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Local Board</th>
<th>Public open space</th>
<th>Private land</th>
<th>Roads</th>
<th>Other public land</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert - Eden</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport - Takapuna</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson - Massey</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipatiki</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketapapa</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Ranges</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When looked at the level of area units across all land tenures, the range of variation in tree cover is also shown to be relatively narrow, ranging from 6% in Favona South to 15% in Ōtāhuhu East (Figure 6).
Figure 6: Percentage of land area with canopy cover per area unit (all tenures), in ascending order

5.2. Urban Forest Structure

The height class distribution of the urban forest canopy within Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board is displayed in Figure 7. As shown, one quarter of the forest is between 3-5m tall, 37% is between 5-10m tall and a similar percentage comprises trees taller than 10m. These percentages are broadly in line with tree height distribution across Auckland; there is considerable consistency in this metric across all local boards regardless of land use, topography or historical development patterns.

The data shows a relatively high presence of large trees within the local board area, with trees taller than 15m representing approximately 20% of the total urban forest assessed. Of the local boards studied, only Upper Harbour and Hibiscus and Bays have a higher percentage of their canopy cover in this category. However, nearly 90% of this cover is found in Māngere South, including, effectively, all the trees in the board area over 30m tall. Māngere South comprises the airport, the Ihumātao peninsula, Puketutu Island and farmland beyond the rural-urban boundary around Lagoon and Crater Hill. Consequently this area is either undeveloped or in industrial or commercial use, with a very low population density. Of the well populated areas, only in Aorere, Favona South, Favona West and Ōtāhuhu West does over 10% of the canopy cover exceed 15m in height (Figure 8).
Figure 7: Height class distribution of urban forest canopy within Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board

Figure 8: Height class distribution of urban forest canopy per area unit in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
5.3. Urban Forest Tenure

The tenure distribution of the urban forest within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board is displayed in Figure 9. Half of the urban forest is located on private property and one quarter on public parks, the remainder being split between other public land (16%) and roads (9%). These figures are of course partly a reflection of the different amounts of land within these categories, so it is useful to also illustrate (Figure 10) the percentage of land in each tenure that has canopy cover.

![Pie chart showing the distribution of urban forest by tenure]

**Figure 9:** Distribution of total urban forest cover by land tenure within Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board

![Bar chart showing the percentage of land in each tenure with urban forest cover]

**Figure 10:** Percentage of each land tenure with urban forest cover within Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board, all areas.
This demonstrates that, despite containing a narrow majority of the urban forest of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, the density of canopy cover on private land is considerably lower (at 6.6%) than in public parks (16.8%). This is because there is over five times as much land in the former category.

In each category of land tenure, urban forest cover is low to very low within Māngere-Ōtāhuhu in comparison to other boards (Figures 11-14) and in fact has the lowest percentage canopy cover on private land and second lowest on public park land and other public land.

![Figure 11: Percentage of private land with canopy cover, by local board](image1)

![Figure 12: Percentage of roading land with canopy cover, by local board](image2)
Figure 13: Percentage of ‘other’ public land with canopy cover, by local board

Figure 14: Percentage of public park land with canopy cover, by local board

Figure 15 displays the distribution of height classes by land tenure, in relation to the total urban forest in each tenure category. This figure shows public parks have the most even distribution of height classes out of all the land tenures, with the other tenures having a much greater proportion of shorter (under 10m) trees. Those smaller trees make up only around 40% of the tree cover in public parks but over 70% of the cover in the other tenures.
There is considerable variation in tenure of urban forest throughout the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area, as shown in Figures 16 (total canopy cover in each tenure) and 17 (percentage contribution to total canopy cover by each tenure). Māngere Bridge, Ambury and Otāhuhu West stand out as containing the highest total urban forest overall, but the tenure distribution of that forest varies considerably. Only 8.6% of the forest cover in Otāhuhu West is located on public parks, whereas it makes up more than twice this proportion in the other two areas. Only 33% of the tree cover in Ambury is within private land but within Māngere Bridge and Otāhuhu West this figure is 60% and 68% respectively.

When looked as a proportion (and thereby allowing for the different size of the area units), there is considerable variation between different land tenures in the various area units, with between 5 and 34% of the tree cover being in road reserves, between 23 and 69% on private land, 3 to 39% on public parks, and 7 to 45% on other public land. Only 3% of the tree cover in Harania West is located on public parkland, that area having only a handful of small local parks amounting to an area of less than 1.5 ha.
Figure 16: Tenure of urban forest per area unit within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board.

Figure 17: Tenure of urban forest per area unit within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board.
5.4. Urban Forest Protection Status

In terms of protection status, analysis shows (Figure 18) that just over half (approximately 53%) of the urban forest cover with the Local Board lacks any protection and approximately 9% has a low degree of protection (Class 1), representing trees located within street corridors and active reserves.

The next largest protection category is the highest (Class 5) covering approximately 20% of the Board’s urban forest. The great majority of this is located in Māngere South, including on Wiroa Island (part of the airport site and not accessible to the public), the fringes of Puketutu Island (with limited access to the public), the Ōtuataua Stonefields and Crater Hill. There is relatively little urban forest (approximately 18%) with intermediate levels of protection, representing mainly coastal or riparian vegetation and passive reserves.

![Figure 18: Protection status of urban forest within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board](attachment_diagram)

When compared with other boards (Figure 19), the percentage of urban forest in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu that has no protection (53%) is very close to the mean (55%) for all boards, if the outlier of the Waitakere Ranges is set aside.
5.4.1 Significant Ecological Areas

The SEAs (Protection Class 5) have been identified for inclusion in the Auckland Unitary Plan as a result of a specialist study assessing areas of vegetation against five significance criteria. The terrestrial SEA extent within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board is shown in Figure 20 (pink hatching). As previously mentioned, the SEA areas are almost exclusively concentrated in in Māngere South in areas of very low population density, with additional areas along the coast of Ambury and within Ambury Regional Park. Only two very small isolated patches of SEA are found within the residential parts of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, along the coastal fringe on the inner Māngere Harbour.

5.4.2 Notable Trees

Notable trees have been identified as specimens with “exceptional arboricultural characteristics” (Schedule 10, Auckland Unitary Plan). Once scheduled, the trees have a high level of protection (and in this report are included in protection Class 5), with a ‘discretionary’ resource consent required for their removal. Recognising the potential for anomalies within the schedule as described in the methodology section of this report, there are 117 notable trees (some of which are in groups) within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board, with an average density of one notable tree approximately every 44 hectares. For a comparison, the Albert – Eden Local Board has one notable tree for every 3.5 hectares. The distribution of notable trees is shown in Figure 21. There are concentrations of notable trees around central Ōtāhuhu, Māngere Bridge and the older parts of Māngere East in the vicinity of Walter Massey Park but very few around Māngere town centre or in Harania, Favona or Māngere South. English oaks are the dominant notable tree species, largely due to inclusion of a single avenue of 28 trees of this species within Kings College. This on its own represents approximately a
quarter of all the notable trees in the local board. Native species make up approximately 35% of the remainder.

Figure 20: Map of Local Board showing Significant Ecological Areas (pink hatching)

Figure 21: Distribution of Notable trees within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
5.4.3 Protection Status by Area

The protection status of canopy cover in each of the area units (with population density over 1000 people / m²) has been categorised and is represented in Figures 22 and 23. As shown, the majority of the urban forest within the Local Board occurs in Ambury, Māngere Bridge and Ōtāhuhu West. However, there is no clear relationship between the amount of forest within an area and its protection status. Ambury has the highest proportion of protected forest (66%) as most of it is located within the regional park or adjacent to the coast, however most of the forest in Ōtāhuhu West is located on private land and lacks protection, such that the proportion protected is only 26%. On the other hand Ōtāhuhu East has a small land area with a relatively long coastline and contains a large reserve (Seaside Park) that accounts for approximately a quarter of the land in this area. It has a correspondingly high proportion of protected forest (53%).

In the areas with the lowest proportion of protected forest, (Hariana West, Favona West and Viscount) the protection is predominantly in class 1, i.e. the weakest levels of protection, applicable to street trees. These areas lack landscape features that would confer any higher levels of protection and contain only small local reserves with few trees or reserves set aside for active recreation.

![Figure 22: Protection status of urban forest within area units](image)
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5.5. Urban Forest in Relation to Socio-Economic Factors

5.5.1 Population

Across the urban areas of the Auckland Region there is a strong correlation between urban forest cover and population density (Figure 24), with urban forest cover per head decreasing as population density increases. Māngere–Ōtāhuhu follows this trend. This graph also provides further confirmation of the generally low levels of tree cover on public land in the board, with all the data points from Māngere–Ōtāhuhu (in blue) appearing at the lower end of comparative tree cover for all ranges of population density.
Figure 24: Tree canopy cover per person versus population density for area units within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board (blue dots) compared with all area units within Auckland (orange dots).

Figures 25 and 26 show the forest cover by land tenure, per area unit within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board, per head of general population (Figure 25) and per child under 15 years (Figure 26). Most commonly, the largest component of urban forest per head of population is on private land, the exceptions being Ambury, Harania North and Viscount. In Harania North this publically owned urban forest is mostly within public park land while for North Ambury and Viscount a large part of the urban forest is on other public land. The areas of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu that have a proportionally low amount of forest canopy cover on public land per head of population are Fairburn, Ōtāhuhu West, Favona North, Favona West and Māngere Bridge, each having 40% or less of their canopy cover on public land.

Probably most important data to examine is the proportion of urban forest cover by land tenure, per child under 15 years, particularly in regards to the amount of street trees and urban forest in public parks and other public land. Areas that have a relatively low number of street trees per child are: Favona North, Favona South, Harania East and Harania West. Arahanga, Māngere Bridge and Mascot have a larger proportion of street trees compared with the other areas. Several areas have very low levels of tree cover per child in public parks, including Fairburn, Favona South, Favona West, Harania East, Harania West, Māngere Central and Mascot. Ambury, Māngere Bridge and Ōtāhuhu East are the best served areas in terms of canopy cover on public parks per child.

Areas that have a low proportion of canopy cover per child on other public land (such as school grounds), are: Aorere, Fairburn Favona South and Harania East. Areas that have a relatively high proportion of canopy cover per child on other public land are Ambury, Ōtāhuhu West and Viscount.
Figure 25: Urban forest cover per head by land tenure per area unit within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board. Unit areas with population density less than 1000 people/km² are not shown.

Figure 26: Urban forest cover per child (under 15 years) by land tenure per area unit within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board. Unit areas with population density less than 1000 people/km² are not shown.
5.5.2 Shade Analysis

Public parks in total account for approximately 12% of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area. There are 229 parks in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, only 111 of which are regularly maintained by Council contractors (including all 24 parks that contain playgrounds). The assessment found that of the 24 playgrounds, 16 (two-thirds) lacked any degree of shade provided by trees. Two parks (Oruarangi Road Esplanade and Thomas Park) have no trees present at all, although neither has a playground. Visual estimates from high resolution aerial imagery (Figure 27) indicate that three quarters of all parks with playgrounds have low canopy cover (less than 20%), with the remaining quarter having moderate canopy cover (21-50%). There are no parks with playgrounds that have high levels of canopy cover (i.e. over 50%).

![Canopy Cover of all Parks with Playgrounds](Diagram)

Figure 27: Canopy cover (%) over parks in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu containing playgrounds.

6. DISCUSSION

6.1. Urban Forest Cover 2013 Overview

Urban forest covers 8% of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area as a whole and 10% of those parts of the board with population density above 1000 people per square kilometre. This is the lowest level of cover for any urban board and well below the minimum of 15% cover for each board that is a principle target of Auckland’s Urban Ngahere Strategy (which also has a goal of achieving an average 30% canopy cover across all of urban Auckland). Māngere South, despite containing large areas of pastoral land and park land along the western coastline actually has lower overall canopy cover than the fully urbanised portion of the board. Canopy cover is low across all areas of the board, with only Ōtāhuhu East reaching the 15% target for tree cover, largely due to its smaller and the presence of a large park with extensive restoration planting and coastal fringe trees. Favona and Māngere Station have particularly low levels of cover.
6.2. Urban Forest Structure

Research has shown that many of the benefits attributed to urban forest are disproportionately provided by larger trees (Davies et al. 2011, Novak et al. 2013, Moser et al. 2015). Large trees typically: create more shade per tree due to a larger and wider canopy spread (Moser et al. 2015); intercept larger amounts of particulate pollutants and rainfall due to significantly larger leaf areas; contain more carbon and have higher carbon sequestration rates (Beets et al. 2012, Dahlhausen et al. 2016); are often less susceptible to careless or malicious vandalism by passers-by once established; can be pruned to provide higher canopy clearance over roadways, parking lots and pedestrian footpaths; typically contribute more to calming and slowing traffic on local streets than small trees; and absorb more gaseous pollutants.

In the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board, approximately two thirds of the urban forest consist of trees under 10m tall. Large trees (>20m tall) make up approximately 20% of the urban forest. This is a relatively high proportion of large trees, however 90% of these are located in Māngere South, distant from the main population centres. Very tall trees (>30m) make up only 1% of total canopy cover and are effectively absent from most suburbs.

In recognition of the greater value of large trees, a goal of the Urban Ngahere Strategy is to ensure no reduction in the proportion of trees over 10m tall. The 2013 LiDAR data provides an important marker in this respect, with this figure for Māngere-Ōtāhuhu (as of 2013) being 37%. In order to maintain this figure it is important that future urban forest plantings are carried out in locations that can provide for the growth of large trees, where the will not conflict with existing or new developments and infrastructure.

6.3. Urban Forest Tenure

Half of the urban forest in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu is located on private property (nearly all of which is therefore unprotected); this is among the lower proportions of urban forest to be found on private land across all local boards. Correspondingly, the percentage of private land actually covered by urban forest (in areas where population density exceeds 1000/km²), at 6.6%, is the lowest for any urban board (or 10% when excluding the industrial suburb of Māngere Station and the substantially undeveloped suburb of Māngere South). By contrast the average canopy cover on private land across Auckland as a whole is 17%. This is likely, in part, to be a reflection of very low rates of home ownership. Only approximately 25% of occupants own or partially own their homes in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu compared with 43% for Auckland as a whole. Tenants will be much less inclined to make the investment of tree planting than would owner-occupiers, who stand to reap the long-term benefits from such planting.

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu also has a low to very low degree of canopy cover within the other land tenures, being 7.2% cover within roads, 16.8% within public parks and 7.4% within other public land. Average cover in these tenures across Auckland is 11%, 33% and 13% respectively. This means that any opportunity to increase planting, on any form of land tenure, should be encouraged if the goals of the Ngahere Strategy are to be met. For example, with only 13% canopy cover on 'other' public land there may also be an opportunity to encourage planting within this category of land such as schools and colleges, where additional educational benefits may be gained.

Public parks are a good place to focus additional urban forest planting as they offer the best opportunities for long-term sustainable management of the urban forest due to the lower chance of
conflict with future housing intensification, less infrastructure conflicts (which is often an important negative associated with street tree plantings), more considered selection of appropriate species and location for plantings, better arboricultural management (provided this is adequately funded). They are also better able to accommodate the types of large trees which provide the greatest benefits, and which may not be suitable for streets or private land due to space limitations. The wider accessibility of trees on public parkland also means that the benefits they provide (e.g. better shade and increased emotional well-being for park users) apply to a larger number of people, which is a major positive in terms of overall cost-benefit outcomes. However, in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu many of the larger reserves within or close to suburban areas are largely dedicated to active recreation and contain extensive sports fields, so that space for planting is limited. However the small local parks scattered throughout the board area, and particularly in Māngere East, have scope to accommodate many more trees on locations where they will offer direct benefit to residents. Additionally, there are several drainage and esplanade reserves that would accommodate more trees and vegetation that would have direct benefits for water quality, such as Tarata Creek Reserve, Harania Creek and Norana Esplanade. Ambury Regional Park, consisting predominantly of open pasture, could accommodate large numbers of additional trees.

Street trees have a varied role in the provision of urban forest in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, ranging from some mature and extensive street tree plantings in Ambury and Māngere Bridge to streets lacking any trees at all, particularly in Viscount and Arahanga.

Residential streets in Viscount and Ambury

Protecting existing street trees and establishing new street tree plantings in areas where they have less prominence provides a good opportunity to increase urban forest cover within the local board. In particular, establishment of trees in the road reserves in conjunction with the extensive redevelopment of Housing New Zealand owned properties around Bader Drive, either planned or underway, would greatly improve the urban forest in these locations.

6.4. Urban Forest Protection Status

Approximately 47% of the urban ngahere in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu has some form of statutory protection, slightly lower than the overall figure for Auckland of 50%. There is a relatively large proportion of high (Class 5) protection overall (predominantly within Significant Ecological Areas), however urban forest in this category is almost exclusively found in Ambury and Māngere South and to some extent in locations inaccessible to the public (Wiroa Island within the airport complex and on Puketutu Island). Outside of these two regions there are only 5.2 hectares of Class 5 protected forest within the local board.
This bias towards the western coastal parts of the local board means that within the residential parts of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, the proportion of the ngahere with any form of protection is only 36%, which is considerably lower than the average for the whole city.

The somewhat uneven distribution and low overall numbers of scheduled notable trees in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu is an issue that may warrant investigation as there may potentially be trees that have been so far been overlooked but would meet the necessary standards for inclusion on the schedule. In particular there are gaps in coverage in Favona South and West, Harania East, Arahanga and Mascot, as well as large swathes of Māngere South. Council’s Environment and Community Committee has recently resolved for the new Council, once sworn in, to review the Unitary Plan schedules of both notable trees and significant ecological areas. There is therefore an opportunity for The Board to request input into this process in conjunction with the elected councillor.

6.5. Urban Forest in Relation to Socio-Economic Factors

6.5.1 Population

Work is underway to compare the urban forest canopy data with data on social factors such as health, income and number of cars per household, however comparisons are provided in this report between urban forest cover and population density, number of children and shade analysis in regard to playgrounds, to determine whether the urban forest is located where it will have the greatest benefit. Benefits of urban forest for people are well-documented and summarised in various documents including Stanley (2018). Exposure to urban forest is important in terms reducing mental health issues, reducing stress levels, and improving physical health through providing air filtration, shade and reduced temperatures.

To achieve the greatest benefit from the existing urban forest for people, it would be preferable to have higher levels of urban forest in areas with greater population density. However this study showed a very strong correlation between increased population and decrease in forest cover. This is due to increased pressure on the urban forest through a combination of lack of suitable growing space, conflicts with infrastructure, real or perceived nuisance and vandalism. An increase in urban forest cover in local parks and riparian and esplanade reserves in residential suburbs could provide more universal benefits as a greater number of people are likely to encounter the forest. Urban ngahere on public land provides opportunities to connect with communities, educational opportunities and help to develop a sense of place.

There is a very close correlation between tree cover per head of overall population and tree cover per child under 15 years old, suggesting an even distribution of children throughout the residential parts of the board. In Māngere-Ōtāhuhu this age group makes up 28% of the population, which is the highest proportion anywhere in Auckland. Accordingly, targeting areas with low canopy cover per head of population will have particular benefits here. The data indicates that planting in the residential portions of Favona and central and eastern Māngere would best target this group. In addition to increasing urban forest on private land in these areas, an increase in urban forest cover of local parks could provide more universal benefits as a greater number of people are likely to encounter the forest.
6.5.2 Shade Analysis

The shade analysis demonstrated that only one third of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu playgrounds benefit from shade provided by trees, and that in general the parks containing playgrounds have low levels of canopy cover. Parks in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu have 12% canopy cover on average, and three quarters of the parks containing playgrounds have less than 20% canopy cover. The lack of shade is not the only concern, low levels of canopy cover also limit opportunity for park users to interact with trees and nature whilst in the park. Parks play a vital role in the community by providing a range of recreation opportunities, including connecting with nature and the attendant benefits this has for mental health and wellbeing.

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board have begun to address this issue, with funds provided for planting shade trees near playgrounds in the 2017-2018 financial year. It is important that these plantings are maintained to ensure they develop to maturity and further opportunities for such planting are taken to plant suitable species that will develop a wide crowns at maturity.

![New shade trees in Vickers Crescent Reserve, planted winter 2018](image)

7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Analysis of the LiDAR data has provided a better understanding of the status of the canopy cover in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board area, helped identify key areas of tree cover requiring protection and areas where the most value can be realised from tree planting initiatives. In addition, it has highlighted where further investigation may be useful in supporting those two goals. Collectively, these mirror the three main objectives of the Urban Ngahere Strategy: to ‘know, grow and protect’ the urban ngahere.
7.1. Knowing

7.1.1 Trend Analysis in Urban Forest Cover 2013-2016

The data presented in this report is a ‘snapshot’ of urban forest cover in 2013; a one-off measure of canopy distribution and height within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area. One of the most controversial issues relating to urban forest in Auckland and the most important unknown is the rate of change in the urban forest canopy, raising questions such as:

1. How has the total area of urban forest in the board area changed following the removal of general tree protection?
2. How has the size-structure changed? For example, has there been an increase in smaller trees and a decrease in larger trees, or vice versa?
3. If there have been significant gains and/or losses in tree canopy cover are they concentrated on a particular type of land tenure, or a within a specific geographical area?

These issues are critical to the future management of Auckland’s urban forest in terms of understanding which issues to focus management efforts on, such as community education and tree planting initiatives, and the most appropriate locations to focus those efforts in.

In order to assess change in the urban forest canopy the 2013 LiDAR needs to be compared with a more recent LiDAR dataset. Auckland Council undertook another aerial LiDAR survey in 2016 and the outputs of this survey are expected to be available for further analysis later this year. The time period between these two LiDAR surveys (i.e. three years between 2013 and 2016) covers the same time period that anecdotal evidence from Auckland Council and external arborists suggest coincides with a dramatic increase in the felling of trees on private land. This has occurred throughout the Auckland metropolitan area, including the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board. Analysis will enable an assessment of progress, or otherwise, towards the goals of the Urban Ngahere Strategy which encourage a focus on increasing tree canopy coverages where it is below 15% for any of the regions local boards.

7.1.2 Examination of Zoning and Development Potential

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

A more sophisticated approach to this type of analysis is also possible, by combining urban forest spatial data with information from the Auckland Growth Model (Fredrickson and Balderston 2013). The growth model incorporates proposed unitary plan zoning with a range of data on topography, location, lot size and other plan restrictions to predict the economic return of constructing new dwelling(s) on a specific lot. Combining the economic return of constructing new dwellings on individual sites with the current urban forest cover on those same sites should give a better indication of the potential loss of urban forest from the increasing density of dwellings within the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area.
7.1.3 Ground-truthing

LiDAR is a very useful tool, but has limitations. Records gained from direct observation can provide further insight into the condition of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu urban ngahere. For example, it is recommended that records of street and reserve plantings that have been carried out by Auckland Council – Community Facilities and are compared with the existing trees to determine survival rates and the common factors that improve the chances of tree survival. It is recommended this study is carried out within 2019 in time to inform any street tree planting carried out in subsequent planting seasons.

Council’s Community Facilities team, responsible for management of public trees, have recently launched a data collections app that will enable accurate and detailed data collection and a log of maintenance records for trees on public land. There is scope to collate and utilise this information to support the Urban Ngahere Strategy. Once this system is bedded in an update can be provided on the data collected and how it may feed into the strategy and guide planting.

Another valuable initiative would be to survey the local board’s notable trees to verify and update the Unitary Plan schedule, to invite nominations from the public to add trees to the schedule and to proactively survey those parts of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu that currently lack notable trees. Carry out survey work now to find and list the larger trees is important and potentially a first step towards having a bulk list of trees from the local board area considered for inclusion in the Unitary Plan Notable tree Schedule.

7.1.4 Other metrics

The urban forest exists as an integral part of the physical and ecological environment, so in addition to direct measurement of the size and extent of the forest, measurement of related metrics that are influenced by the forest will provide information on both the overall health of the forest and of the services it provides. For example, as noted above Māngere-Ōtāhuhu has historically suffered from poor stormwater water quality. Council’s ongoing monitoring of water quality allows target setting for improvements that complement the goals of the urban forest strategy and may potentially be realised through Healthy Waters’ targeted rates. Additionally, monitoring of ecosystem services, connectivity and biodiversity, i.e. the ‘mauri’ of the forest, will assist over time in monitoring the success of the strategy.

It is important for the board to recognise the importance of asking for accurate tracking and recording of this detail by the council. It is an important part ongoing in understanding the changes that are taking place in the local environment condition. Water and Air quality are vitally important aspects to track along with the ongoing annual success rates of the plantings’ of specimen trees in streets and parks along with the ecological restoration work that is underway in the local and regional parks network.

7.2. Growing

Analysis of the LiDAR date has provided a better understanding of the status of the canopy cover in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board area. As of 2013, urban forest covers 7.2% of roads, 6.6% of private land, 16.8% of public parks and 7.4% of other public land in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, with overall coverage of 8%. While this level of cover is well below the minimum coverage target within the Urban Ngahere Strategy of no less than 15% coverage for any local board.
This lack of tree cover is acknowledged as a particular challenge to the region on the 2017 Local Board Plan. It is suggested that The Board consider setting an attainable target and timeframe for increasing urban forest cover. It is important to note that incremental steps with high success rates are going to prove more economical and beneficial in the long term. Adopting the principles of the council Urban Ngahere Strategy of planting the right tree in the right place and working on planting in areas where there is the most need for the communities will help to deliver successful long term benefits.

7.2.1 Parks

The degree of urban forest coverage in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu is the second lowest of any local board. Local reserves sited in residential suburbs as well as drainage and esplanade reserves represent the most strategic locations to establish further urban forest, offering direct benefits to residents as well as improvements to storm water quality. Despite the low levels of tree cover on private property, planting in parks offers the best opportunities for long-term sustainable management of the urban forest due to the lower chance of conflict with infrastructure (which is often an important negative associated with street tree plantings), more considered selection of appropriate species and location for plantings, better arboricultural management (provided this is adequately funded), and a coherent policy for ongoing planting of replacement trees.

Work will take place during the growing phase of the strategy to develop more detailed direction on where to focus plantings and the standards required to ensure high success rates. There is also scope for community involvement as residents often feel a sense of ownership of their local parks. A positive start has been made to providing shade to playgrounds, this can be built upon using the findings of the shade analysis discussed in this report. A goal is suggested of providing shade trees to all of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu's playgrounds. Other under-developed local parks such as Boggust Park and Radonich Park have significant potential for additional tree planting.

Potential planting sites: Norana Esplanade and Tarata Creek Reserve

While there are many benefits to establishing a higher density of trees — and large trees in particular — on public land, there are some potential conflicts and costs involved. These include perceptions of public safety with areas of dense vegetation on public land (Jansson et al. 2013), the additional cost of managing more large trees for a parks department that struggles currently to meet the competing demands of different park users, and ensuring that urban forest plantings are compatible with existing use such as sports fields, open space for dog recreation etc.
Nevertheless, many of these conflicts can be resolved through appropriate species selection, planting design and location, and good community consultation. In addition, continuing to support community initiatives to carry out restoration planting and weed control in sensitive coastal and riparian environments will direct planting efforts to appropriate sites with minimal such conflicts.

7.2.2 Roads

The low coverage of urban forest on Māngere–Ōtāhuhu roads presents an opportunity to enhance overall tree cover, particularly in the residential streets around Bader Drive. As part of any street tree planting programme, it is recommended that community engagement is carried out to promote an understanding of the benefits of trees, help guide species choice and engender a sense of ownership of new street trees. Coordination with Housing New Zealand could also be an opportunity to seek beneficial outcomes for the community as they undertake the numerous redevelopments of their housing stock in this area, to ensure adequate planting is provided for.

Planting trees in well-prepared sites and providing protective cages during their establishment period may increase the cost of planting per tree and reduce the number of trees planted but has the potential to greatly improve the rate at which trees are able to survive and reach full maturity. Auckland Transport (AT), the road controlling authority, have comprehensive guidelines on planting trees, shrubs and raingardens in an appropriate manner to avoid conflicts with roading infrastructure, including recommendations for adequate soil volumes for different sized trees (Auckland Transport Roads and Streets Framework and the Transport Design Manual). Coordination with AT, particularly their mobility and safety teams would enable selection of suitable planting sites to complement infrastructure projects such as the Māngere Future Streets Initiative.

Overall, tree planting initiatives may be prioritised according to existing levels of tree cover. There are currently seven predominantly residential areas in Māngere–Ōtāhuhu with less than 10% canopy cover, being Favona South, Favona West, Harania West, Māngere Central, Viscount, Ōtāhuhu West and Mascot. Parks in these suburbs would be a particularly appropriate place to consider for planting initiatives, including of large trees, given the modest contribution parks currently make to overall cover. Increasing forest cover in these areas will have the greatest direct impact on residents.

7.3. Protecting

It is important for the local board to recognise the limited legislative tools that council currently has to protect and preserve urban trees on private land, which constitute over half of Māngere–Ōtāhuhu urban ngahere. It is also important to understand that the development opportunities enabled by the AUP will see further urban intensification and a further reduction in the space available for medium to large sized trees on private land. Strengthening initiatives to engage with, educate and support private owners of land featuring valuable trees may be considered. Such engagement is identified as a key mechanism in the Urban Ngahere Strategy to achieve this outcome.

Trees in streets will continue to come under pressure due to conflicts with other uses of the road reserve. Although protected, applications for resource consent to remove street trees in particular are very often granted. Perhaps the best way to protect street trees in future is non-statutory, that is to plant trees in a sustainable manner to minimise such conflicts.
With respect to the low numbers of scheduled notable trees in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, a programme of surveying and community consultation may identify additional trees worthy of being added to the schedule. The board is encouraged to consider such a program to record noteworthy trees in the local area on public and private land for inclusion in any future plan changes. Council’s Environment and Community Committee is proposing to review the Unitary Plan schedules of notable trees. There will therefore an opportunity for The Board to submit a request for trees to be added to the schedule.

There is much potential to build on and enhance the existing urban forest of Māngere-Ōtāhuhu so that residents may better enjoy the numerous benefits it provides. The Urban Ngahere Strategy provides the overall framework under which this opportunity can be realised. Its successful implementation will require ongoing commitment, but will provide lasting, inter-generational benefit.

Across all three phases of the strategy, engagement with Mana Whenua, local community groups, private land owners and the private sector is of paramount importance in order to highlight the benefits of the ngahere and their role, as stakeholders, in helping to plant, grow and protect ngahere on their land as well as public land. This key mechanism of engagement and management must be used to help know, grow, and protect our ngahere.
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Appendix A - LiDAR

The techniques considered for mapping Auckland’s urban forest at a high resolution included LiDAR, along with manual digitisation (marking up) of aerial imagery and field-work with aerial imagery followed by manual digitisation of field maps, or some combination of these methods. However both the latter approaches involved considerable man hours and were therefore too expensive to allow a universal sampling of urban forest within the Auckland urban area. Computer automated classification of satellite imagery could have provided a universal sample, but the resolution of this approach was insufficient in providing mapping and change data at the scale that was required for this more detailed analysis work, being down to individual trees and shrubs.

For these reasons, LiDAR was considered the best method for obtaining a universal sample of the urban forest for the purposes of this study.

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

The 2013 urban forest LiDAR data presented in this report was collected between 17/07/2013 and 23/11/2013. The classified ‘Raw Point Cloud’ data that the urban forest layer was created from. It has a resolution of approximately 0.6m laterally and 0.1m vertically, with a sampling rate of at least 1.5 points per square metre over open ground. Vertical accuracy is +/-0.1m @ 68% confidence. Data-points classified as ‘vegetation’ were extracted to form the foundation of an urban forest ‘layer’ of data for further analysis and interrogation within the ArcGIS 10.2 geospatial software, through combination with other spatial datasets.

The initial urban forest layer underwent some quality control checks to eliminate obvious errors found in the supplied classified point cloud data. During the processing of the raw data misclassified areas of man-made materials and other non-vegetation surfaces were removed. These types of errors are symptomatic of classification functions which classify surface objects of varying composition based on the strength of the LiDAR pulse return. Objects with similar reflectivity to vegetation, such as transparent materials (glass) and power lines, were common sources of these errors.
Appendix B – Parks and Open Space Shade analysis Study

Introduction
A desktop analysis of high-resolution aerial imagery was undertaken to understand tree canopy cover, the number of trees in community parks and whether shade was provided to playgrounds in each park. Surprisingly results have revealed there is high variation and no evident relationship to park size and the percentage of canopy cover provided. Obviously, a larger park has the potential to have more trees, but it may not have a high canopy cover percentage compared to a small park with one large tree offering high percentage of canopy cover.

Methodology

Using digital photo interpretation of aerial imagery, the factors recorded in this desktop analysis are:

- Park selection and type of park maintained or unmaintained
- Size of park
- Number of trees present
- Percentage of canopy cover
- Playgrounds or sports field presence
- Amount of shade provided to the playground if present
- Park selection & Type of Park
- All parks in the specified local board were assessed. Parks were identified using the Auckland Council GeoMaps Geospatial Information System (GIS), which records whether the park is maintained or unmaintained. To clarify unmaintained parks, are parks owned by council but are not maintained under the current full facility maintenance contracts. Most of the unmaintained parks are often stormwater ponds or narrow esplanade strips in areas that are not easily accessible or unpopular areas with little to no infrastructure. All parks that are owned by council are recorded in Auckland Council GIS data.

- Size of Park
- The Auckland Council GIS system provided the area of each park in square metres (m²) this was recorded to calculate the total percentage of land in the local board that is occupied by park space. Parks size and typologies ranged from; community parks to regional parks, sports parks and cemeteries.

- Number of Trees Present & Percentage of Canopy Cover
- Digital photo interpretation through visual estimates of high-resolution aerial imagery was used to estimate the number of trees and the percentage of canopy cover. If there were less than 20 trees an accurate figure could be made, and the number recorded, anything higher was an approximation.² Visual estimations of the percentage of canopy cover extent versus land areas were made. For the tree to be counted in the approximation, the majority of the tree needed to be within the park boundary. Playgrounds or Sports field & Shade

² For consistency and validity, the same person has carried out all estimation of number of trees and the percentage of canopy cover also.
- **Playground or sports field presence**
- Recording the presence of a playground and sports field presence utilized GIS aerial imagery and infrastructure layers.
- **Amount of shade provided if present**
- Visual Estimation of the amount of Shade on playgrounds provided by trees was recorded as three different categories; ‘trees provide some shade to the playground’, ‘trees provide a little shade to the playground’ and ‘trees provide no shade to the playground’.

Some of the benefits that will develop from implementing new tree planting in parks to increase canopy cover are:

- Provide shade and reduce the level of exposures to harmful Ultra Violet (UV) rays.
- Provide a cooling effect reducing the urban heat island effect associated with large expanses of buildings, concrete and asphalt in developed urban areas.
- Remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and store carbon in tree biomass.
- Filtering air pollutants and trapping particulate matter. Both are known causal agents of health and breathing problems for people who are regularly exposed to poor air quality and vehicle emission.
- Provide a connection with nature for park visitors.
- Improve mental health and well being.
- Provide opportunities for nature play.
- Provide habitat for animals, birds, insects.
- New plantings provide opportunities to connect with communities, educational opportunities and help to develop a sense of place.
Examples of the visual estimation process used to estimate the percentage tree canopy cover for a local park with a playground.

- **5% Canopy Cover**
  Redcastle Park
  (Māngere-Ōtāhuhu)

- **10% Canopy Cover**
  Mcleod Park (Henderson-Massey)

- **20% Canopy Cover**
  Jamie Hansen Park (Hibiscus & Bays)

- **40% Canopy Cover**
  Potters Park (Albert-Eden)

- **More than 60% Canopy Cover**
  Hillside Park South (Māngere-Ōtāhuhu)
Temporary arrangements for urgent decisions and staff delegations during the election period

File No.: CP2019/16485

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 routine business as usual 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 holders on certain matters. Where there is no nominated portfolio holder, staff consult with the chair. After the election, there will be no local board portfolio holders 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 business meeting, without consulting with the nominated portfolio holder or local board chair. Staff will consult with the local board chair following the inaugural meeting until new arrangements are made at the first business 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 Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) delegate to the chair and deputy chair the power to make, on behalf of the local board, urgent decisions that may be needed between the final local board business 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 holder (or chair where there is no portfolio holder 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 business 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 business 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 business 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 holders on certain issues. Where there is no nominated portfolio holder, staff consult with the local board chair.

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

20. Prior to the election, staff can continue to consult with portfolio holders as required by the delegation protocols (or chair where there is no portfolio holder). However, after the election, there will be no portfolio holders 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 business meeting. This is irrespective of the requirements of the current delegation protocols to consult with the nominated portfolio holder on landowner consents. Staff will consult with the local board chair following the inaugural meeting until new arrangements are made at the first business 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 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>Authors</th>
<th>Anna Bray - Policy and Planning Manager - Local Boards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu and Otara-Papatoetoe Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local board resolution responses and information report

File No.: CP2019/17091

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. This report provides a summary of resolution responses, feedback from the board and information reports for circulation to the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board.

Feedback reports for the local board:

2. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board feedback on the proposed Priority Products and Priority Stewardship Scheme Guideline is Attachment A to this report.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) endorse the local board’s feedback on the proposed Priority Products and Priority Stewardship Scheme Guideline.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board feedback on the proposed priority products and priority stewardship scheme</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Janette McKain - Local Board Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu and Otara-Papatoetoe Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board’s feedback to the: proposed Priority Products and Priority Stewardship Scheme Guideline – Sept 2019

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board supports in principle the proposed Priority Products and Priority Stewardship Scheme Guideline, and provides the following comments as part of its feedback:

1. The local board supports the six identified product groups noted here, and request to action the priority stewardship scheme before the end of 2019: tyres, electrical and electronic products, agrichemicals and their containers, refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases and farm plastics packaging.

2. The local board request the following items are included in the priority products list:
   - old sofas
   - mattresses and bed bases
   - cigarette butts

3. The local board continues to advocate for a resource recycling centre for the local area to allow residents to drop off unwanted items and materials for reuse and recycling. The aim is to reduce waste to landfill by reusing, re-purposing and recycling as much as possible.

4. The local area’s average household incomes, employment figures and home ownership, are low compared to the Auckland region. The local board calls for the priority stewardship scheme to be carefully designed not to further burden low income families, but still allow residents to contribute towards recycling and minimising waste material.

5. In helping businesses and people be more responsible in protecting the local environment, the local board supports an incentivised approach to waste management in addition to the regulatory approach being proposed.

6. The local board calls for more central government investment in local schemes, like the local board’s funded programmes, Business Waste Minimisation Education, Wai Care schools’, and the Mangere East Family Service recycling initiative, and compliment the proposed Priority Products and Priority Stewardship Scheme Guideline.

7. The local board request that its feedback on the Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw and amendments to the Trading and Events in Public Places Bylaw 2015 based on the following points is also considered in this feedback:
   - More resources to stop illegal rubbish dumping
   - Improve communication methods to all communities, and
   - Deliver a local recycling centre
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To present the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board with its updated governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The governance forward work calendar for the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board is in Attachment A. The calendar is updated monthly, reported to business meetings and distributed to council staff.
3. 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
   - clarifying the rationale for reports.
4. The calendar also aims to provide guidance for staff supporting local boards and greater transparency for the public.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:
a) notes the Governance Forward Work Calendar.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Calendar September</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Janette McKain - Local Board Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu and Otara-Papatoetoe Local Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Meeting (workshop or business meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Business meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October/</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November/</td>
<td>Business meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachment A**

**Item 28**

**Governance Forward Work Calendar**
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Workshop Notes

File No.: CP2019/01943

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. Attached are the notes from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board workshops held on 7th, 14th and 28th August and 4th and 11th September 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) receive the workshop notes from the workshops held on 7th, 14th and 28th August and 4th and 11 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>Workshop Notes 7 August</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Workshop Notes 14 August</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Workshop Notes 28 August</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Workshop Notes 4 September</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Workshop Notes 11 September will be tabled at the meeting</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Janette McKain - Local Board Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu and Otara-Papatoetoe Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board**  
**18 September 2019**

**Workshop record of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board held in the Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board Office, Wednesday 7 August 2019, commencing at 12.30pm**

**PRESENT**

- **Chairperson:** Lemauga Lydia Sosene
- **Deputy Chairperson:** Walter Togiamua
- **Members:** Nick Bakulich, Carrol Elliott, Makalita Kelo, Tafafuna'i Tasi Lauese, Christine O'Brien

**Also present:** Carol McKenzie-Rex, Janette McKain, Daniel Poe, Shoma Prasad, Rina Tagore

Member Lauese opened the meeting in prayer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeslot</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12.30 - 1.00pm | Nga Tapuwhae Community Building             | Linda Pillay, Greg, Hannah, Nichola Painter | Local initiatives and specific directions | The board gave feedback on the addition of Nga Tapuwhae Community Building – internal refurbishment and joinery (SharePoint ID #2976) project as part of the Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP) and the reprioritisation of funding.  
**Action:** Workshops to be set up monthly/bimonthly to discuss these projects which will form part of ongoing discussions during the development of the future work programme.  
A report will come to the September business meeting to facilitate the inclusion of the Nga Tapuwhae Community Building - internal refurbishment and joinery (SharePoint ID 2976) project in the current risk adjusted programme, reprioritisation of funding. |
| 1.00 - 1.45pm  | One Local Initiative - Mangere East Centre  | Roscoe Webb, Nichola Painter, Greg, Hannah, Linda Pillay | Setting direction, priorities and budgets | The board had a presentation on their One Local Initiative and confirm the next steps to progress an amended scope.  
**Action:** A memo will be sent to the officer regarding the way forward for the OLI.                                                                                                                   |
| 1.45 - 2.15pm  | Quarter 4 Report                            | Rina Tagore, Daniel Poe, Audrey Gan | Oversight and monitoring                  | The board discussed the Q4 report prior to it coming to a business meeting.  
**Action:** The Q4 report will be on the 21 August business meeting.                                                                                                                                      |
| 2.15 - 3.00pm  | Proposed new park in Aorere and land swap   | Karen Foster, Dane Grey, Sarah Coady, Wendy Rutherford, Debra Langton, Kate Richardson | Setting direction, priorities and budgets | The board discussed the proposed new park and proposed land swap with existing park.  
**Action:** A report will come to the board.                                                                                                                                                             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
<th>Type of Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00 - 3.30 pm</td>
<td>Community Safety Fund / Local Board Transport Capital Fund</td>
<td>Ben Stallworthy</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>The board had a presentation and provided feedback on the Community Safety Fund and Local Board Transport Capital Fund. <strong>Action:</strong> A report will be on the August agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30 – 3.45 pm</td>
<td>Opening for Peninsula Point Bridges Mangere</td>
<td>Cicilla Dve</td>
<td>Keeping Informed</td>
<td>The board discussed the opening for Peninsula Point Bridges in Mangere and indicated possible dates and times. This will be confirmed once more information has been received from the contractor and parks officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45 – 4.00 pm</td>
<td>Relationship Manager Update - Water Quality and Natural Environment Targeted Rates Memo</td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex</td>
<td>Keeping Informed</td>
<td>The board were updated on upcoming issues. Summary of information memos that have been sent to the board members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workshop record of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board held in the Mangere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Office, Wednesday 14 August 2019, commencing at 1.00pm

**PRESENT**

Chairperson: Lemauga Lydia Soene  
Deputy Chairperson: Walter Togiamua  
Members: Nick Bakulich, Makalita Kolo, Tafafuna'i Tasi Lauese, Christine O'Brien

**Apology:** Caroll Elliott

**Also present:** Carol McKenzie-Rex, Janette McKain, Daniel Poe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeslot</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.45 - 2.30pm</td>
<td>Facility Partnership Grants in 2019/2020 #602</td>
<td>Rose Ward, Debra Langton</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring</td>
<td>The board reviewed the process to allocate grant funding from the Facility Partnership Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30 - 3.00pm</td>
<td>Civic Events update</td>
<td>Cicilia Dwe, Robyn Henry (Skype)</td>
<td>Setting direction</td>
<td>The board discussed the dates and event proposals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.00 - 3.45pm | Review of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Area Plan in response to the development of a Spatial Delivery Strategy for part of Māngere by the Urban Development Group (formerly HLC) | David Wong, Principal Planner, Planning Central and South, Plans and Places, Marc Dendale, Joy LaNauze | Oversight and Monitoring | The board discussed the following:  
  - Review the boundary for the Māngere area  
  - Review key stages and timeline for reviewing and if needed updating the Area Plan for part of Māngere  
  - Determine exact boundary for the Māngere area  
  - Agree key stages and timeline for reviewing, and if needed updating the Area Plan  
  **Action:** A report will come back to the board in December. |
| 3.45 - 4.00pm | Relationship Manager Update  
  - Mangere Mountain Education Trust Statement of Intent  
  - Draft OLI | Carol McKenzie-Rex               | Keeping Informed                 | To update the board on upcoming issues. Summary of information memos that have been sent to the board members. |
Workshop record of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board held in the Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board Office, Wednesday 28 August 2019, commencing at 1.00pm

**PRESENT**
- Chairperson: Lemauga Lydia Sosene
- Members: Nick Bakulich, Carrol Elliott, Makalita Kolo, Tafafuna'i Tasi Lauese, Christine O'Brien

**Apology:** Walter Togiamua

**Also present:** Carol McKenzie-Rex, Janette McKain, Daniel Poe, Shoma Prasad

Member Lydia Sosene opened the meeting in prayer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeslot</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 1.30pm</td>
<td><strong>Community Facilities</strong> - 161 Robertson Road</td>
<td>Sumeet Prasad</td>
<td>Local Initiatives and specific</td>
<td>The board discussed 161 Robertson Road and gave feedback on the options presented. Action: A workshop will be booked post-election to discuss with the board the suggested community use and possible integration into the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mangere-Ōtāhuhu (Heritage building)</td>
<td></td>
<td>directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30 - 2.00pm</td>
<td><strong>Mangere-Ōtāhuhu renew Sports fields FY20+</strong></td>
<td>Phil Gedge</td>
<td>Local Initiatives and specific</td>
<td>The board gave direction on the inclusion of Murphy Park to the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu - renew sport field FY20+ (Sharepoint ID 2726) in the Community Facilities FY 2019-2020 Work Programme. Action: A report will come to the September business meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 - 2.30pm</td>
<td><strong>Community Facilities</strong> - Community Facilities Update</td>
<td>Nichola Painter, Greg Hannah</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring</td>
<td>The board discussed the Mahi Tahi and gave feedback on the $60k shortfall. Action: A report will come to the board regarding the $60k shortfall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.30 - 3.30pm | **Community Services**  
Arts, Community & Events (ACE)  
- Partnering with Business Associations  
- MAC Annual Report for FY18/19 and Annual Priorities for FY19/20  
- Present EOI proposals received from Broker for local board approval | Tiarla Fletcher, Zella Morrison, Liz Muliaha, Sarah Edwards, Renee Tanner, Bobby Kennedy  
Keeping informed  
The board discussed the art broker project proposals and gave feedback. Mangere Arts Centre gave a presentation on their Annual update. The board discussed the community safety action plan and a report will come to the September business meeting. |
| 3.30 - 4.00pm | **Community Services**  
Parks, Sport & Recreation  
- PSR: Ecological Volunteers work programme | Kara Goddard  
Oversight and Monitoring  
The board discussed the volunteer work undertaken in 2018/2019 and proposed work programme for 2019/2020. |
| 4.00 - 4.15pm | **Relationship Manager Update** | Carol McKenzie-Rex  
Keeping Informed  
The board were updated on upcoming issues. |
Workshop record of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board held in the Mangere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Office, Wednesday 4 September 2019, commencing at 1.30pm

PRESENT
Chairperson: Lemauga Lydia Sosene
Deputy Chairperson: Walter Togiamua
Members: Nick Bakulich
Tafafuna'i Tasi Lauese

Apology: Carrol Elliott, Makalita Kolo and Christine O’Brien
Also present: Carol McKenzie-Rex, Janette McKain, Daniel Poe, Shoma Prasad

Member Togiamua opened the meeting in prayer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeslot</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.30 – 2.15pm</td>
<td>12-16 High Street Optimisation</td>
<td>Sophie Bell, Gary Jackson</td>
<td>Keeping Informed</td>
<td>The board discussed the scenarios in relation to the potential optimisation of the High Street property and gave feedback. Action: A report will come to the September business meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15 – 3.00pm</td>
<td>Auckland Transport - Local Board Capital Fund (LBTCF)</td>
<td>Ben Stallworthy, Greg Hannah</td>
<td>Local Initiatives and specific directions</td>
<td>The board discussed the options and remainder of the LBTCF to support Auckland Councils Greenways project in Walter Massey Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 – 3.45pm</td>
<td>Youth Strategic Action Plan</td>
<td>Tanya Moredo, Nastassia Wolfgramm</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring</td>
<td>The board were informed with the progress of the Youth Strategic Action Plan and gave feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45 – 4.00pm</td>
<td>Art Piece</td>
<td>Sarah Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td>The board were updated and gave feedback on the transfer of ownership of the David Lange Memorial public artwork into the regional public art asset register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.44 – 4.15pm</td>
<td>Relationship Manager Update</td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex</td>
<td>Keeping Informed</td>
<td>To update the board on upcoming issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Placeholder for Attachment E
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Empowering Communities Through Social Enterprise

Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board 2018 - 2019

Manukau Beautification Charitable Trust
Graffiti Contract

- Trust was formed in 2001
- Serving the Six Southern Local Board
  - Howick
  - Franklin
  - Manurewa
  - Otara/Papatoetoe
  - Mangere/Otahuhu
  - Papakura
Two Sides of MBCT

Empowering Communities Through Social Enterprise

Clean-up Contracts

Biggest is Graffiti Contract to Auckland Council

25c - $
Boomer Business

Boomers contribution to “BUDDY BENCHES”

Manurewa High School students came to Boomer with a proposal to assist them in making Buddy Benches that will be supplied to Primary Schools around Auckland. It is their aim to have one of these benches in every school.

The benches teach young children about how important wellbeing and hauora is. It will provide students with a safe space where they will feel accepted and welcomed to talk about their emotions.
Another Boomer community project and mural for a town centre
Item 9.5

Garden wall project in Mangere Town Centre

To prevent graffiti vandalism
For 2019 the Trust successfully held

- 4 Town Centre Clean Ups
- Eye on Nature
- Tiaki – Guardians of the Environment
- 29 Community Projects
- 1,723 volunteers 5,752 hours serving the community
- 9 Murals
March 26-30, 2019

Eye on Nature takes children and their families on an experiential journey through our native New Zealand forest, learning how the health of the forest and all its inhabitants impacts the health of us all. This year’s theme was ‘Friend or Foe’.

- Three EON School Days
- EON Family Day opened to the wider community
- 45 Programme Partners Exhibited giving them the opportunity to engage with the public to grow their important messages
- 300 Volunteers

Over 12,000 people participated in the Eye on Nature Event in one form or another.
Nearly 1500 students attended the EON School Days over 3 days. The theme was "Nurturing our Forest: Friend or Foe".
Eye on Nature
Creative Art Competition

Kindergarten 1st prize - KINZ Mission Heights
Primary 1st prize - Sth Auckland Home Group
‘Friend or Foe of the forest’ examples of the wonderful Creativeness of our young people.
Eye on Nature High School Cooking Competition
Family Day – 45 Exhibitors/Programme Partners
ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABLE PRACTICES

Healthy Water only

Competition to encourage attendees to bring their own refillable drink bottles
ROOTS & HEALTHY FAMILIES

Teaching the public correct Recycling

PARA KORE
Local Talent performing throughout the day

Attachment A
Attachment A

Item 9.5

Educational Activities
Eye on Nature Wearable Arts Fashion Show
Now held at the Vodafone Event Centre

An Educational Wearable Art, students have to research and explain how their costume relates to the theme

- 3 AUT students were given the assignment to create the back drop, soundscape & programme
- Judges – MIT Senior Lecturer CA
  Auckland Art Gallery
  Auckland Botanic Gardens
- 59 Entries altogether
- Screened on Maori TV
South Auckland High Schools competed in a competition to come up with innovative, sustainable solutions to environmental issues that concern them.

The Trust worked with Sustainable Schools and NZ Engineering to paired the schools off with Businesses that could inspire and advise the schools in their projects. Tiaki is about encouraging students into Green Careers using STEM subjects.

**Participating High Schools**

Waiuku College  
Mission Height Junior  
Aorere College  
James Cook High  
Manurewa High School  
Papakura High School  
Rosehill College  
**Southern Cross Campus**  
Te Wharekura O Manurewa
WINNERS for TIAKI 2018

People's Choice: Aorere College

Junior Schools:
1st Place: Mission Heights Junior College: App-based recycling system working with True-test.

2nd Place: Aorere College: Incentive-based recycling system within their school, working with Fisher and Paykel Health Care.

Senior Schools:
1st Place: Southern Cross Campus: Plastic waste insulated homes, working with Boeing.

2nd Place: Manurewa High School: Using algae to produce biofuel, working with Auckland Transport.
Community Projects Highlights Town Centre

A Huge Thank You to all our wonderful volunteers – We couldn’t do it without you. You are valuable people to your community.
**Item 9.5**

July 27, 2018

Supporting Auckland Parks planting thousands of trees in the Puhinui Reserve.

12 MBCT staff and Volunteers worked for 4.5 hours, a total of 54 community hours.
August 25, 2018

‘Adopt a Spot’ - Monthly - Empowering Communities
6 Volunteers from Aiga Energy cleaned up Blake Road Reserve in Mangere.
1.5 hours x 6 = 9 hours served to the community

September 29 - 9 volunteers x 2hrs = 18 hours served to the community
November 17, 2018

Mangere/Otahuhu Local Board

35 members from the LDS church painted the fence lines in Windrush Reserve, Mangere.
Item 9.5

Attachment A

- Awareness of the importance of planting the Puhinui Stream. Working in collaboration with DC and the Auckland Biodiversity team, who provided the 430 native plants and education.

- Community members and 6 MBCT staff x 2 hours = 120 hours
December 5, 2018

MBCT working collaboratively with Aiga Energy (Z station), Auckland Council staff and Otahuhu Business Association to clean up Sturgess Park. painting fences, weeding invasive weeds and picking up rubbish

28 Volunteers 3 hours = 84 hours
Attachment A

Supporting Murals

Gemini Bar, Mainstreet, Otahuhu
Artist worked with Otahuhu Students to create this mural
Partnering with Chorus to run an annual mural competition
Six are selected, one for each of the Southern Local Board areas

Kia ora

Here is a drawing done by my daughter Wilhelmina. She drew this picture and said ‘I drew this because New Zealand is known for having the Kiwi’ and she believes it to be such a beautiful creature. She has featured the kawakawa plant used for healing and bright colours because she has a colourful spirit. We think this picture would be perfect for 64 Mascot Road Mangere because it would be seen by many children going to school which is across the road, there’s a diary on the corner, work & income on the same side with lots of people everywhere. Her picture would be a bright reminder of our beautiful Kiwi and our beautiful country New Zealand. I would like to paint this beautiful picture on behalf of my daughter and she monitor me and make sure I get the colours just how she wants it. We are actually good artists and she is quiet a special artist. We hope to get the chance to show how great her work is and especially get some money towards her camp and more drawing tools. Thank you.

64 Mascot Avenue, Mangere
Proposed projects to date for Mangere/Otahuhu 2019 - 2020

- July 13, 2019, - Mangere East Library tidy up back garden
- Sept 17, 2019 – Imrie Ave Walkway re paint
- Date TBC, 2019 – Koru School – Boomer Business (different shaped blocks)
- Eye on Nature 2020 – 28th March
The Manukau Beautification Charitable Trust would like to express our sincere gratitude to the six Local Boards of the Auckland Southern Region for the continued support you give the Trust. And look forward to working with you in the 2019-2020 year.
Jasvin Park Residents Society
Favona

21/08/2019

To
The Chairperson
Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board

Subject: Construction of a fence on Boggust Park Boundary

I write to you as the Chairman of the Jasvin Park Residents Society, a Society of 66 home owners in a subdivision in Favona. We have previously sent an email on the same subject and this is a more detailed letter.

Our members take great pride in our development, and actively maintain a neighborhood watch programme to ensure that all residents are safe and secure.

Unfortunately, recently some of our members, specifically those close to Boggust Park which offers easy and unprotected access to the Society, have been targeted and one of the family (in July 2019) was also assaulted inside their house by young men intent on causing fear and destruction. As I understand the Police is investigating the recent assault incident.

It does not appear that there is any specific motivation behind these attacks. Rather, it appears to solely cause fear and assert dominance. For the past couple of years, on number of occasions, vehicles and houses have been targeted, windows smashed, and possessions rifled through. The attacks have become brazen, with the assailants openly intimidating homeowners who dare to confront them.

As expected of any good citizens, we have always alerted the police at the earliest opportunity. However, a combination of a slow (from our perception) police response and the fast moving pace of the incidents has resulted in offenders not being apprehended, with the attacks on some occasions, recurring on subsequent nights.

We believe that a fence be installed at the earliest along the Boggust park boundary common/adjoining to our society. The critical boundaries are Bukem Place (park end) and Toutouwai Lane. As we understand, any open spaces which are being developed as PARKS, GARDENS, SPORTS COMPLEXES, RECREATIONAL GROUNDS etc., they all need to be properly fenced from all sides with at least one entry & exit point (Gates). Over the last couple of weeks we have observed that the council may have commenced some developmental work on Boggust Park and thought it to be an appropriate time to approach you for your timely intervention.

Any advice/assistance you can offer will be highly appreciated by the members of the Society.

Kind regards
Prasad Joshi (Chairman) & Manish Kumar (Secretary)
BestStart Mangere East Community Hub Vision -

Our vision is to support, innovate and provide services with a view to improve the hauora for all tamariki and their whanau within the Mangere East Community.

We believe that in every community there should be services for children and their families to meet their unique needs. These services should be built on the aspirations of the families with the support from the wider community services.

Our focus is to promote cooperation between community operations, services and government so that we can all make a difference while working with families.

The overarching vision for the hub will be to create a welcoming, friendly environment for local families where they can be supported to develop the skills to offer their children the best possible start in life. Given what we know about the importance of the early years and their impact on life it is envisaged that the hub will assist with improving family wellbeing and that of the Mangere community.