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Welcome

Apologies

Apology received from Deputy Chair Ross Robertson for absence.

Declaration of Interest

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

Confirmation of Minutes

That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 20 August 2019, as true and correct.

Leave of Absence

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

Acknowledgements

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

Petitions

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

Deputations

Standing Order 7.7 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Ōtara-Papatoetoe 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 - Otara Waterways and Lake Trust

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

Richard Myhre from the Ōtara Waterways and Lake Trust will be in attendance to present to the local board.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) thank Richard Myhre from the Ōtara Waterways and Lake Trust for his attendance and presentation.
8.2 Deputation - Manukau Beautification Trust

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
Paula Unger, Community Event Coordinator and Scott Henderson, Operations Manager from the Manukau Beautification Trust will be in attendance to present to the local board on their work in the community.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) thank Paula Unger and Scott Henderson from the Manukau Beautification Trust for their attendance and presentation.

8.3 Deputation - Saanjh Sports and Cultural Club

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
Aji Basra from the Saanjh Sports and Cultural Club will be in attendance to present to the Local board.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) thank Aji Basra from the Saanjh Sports and Cultural Club for his attendance and presentation.

8.4 Deputation - Tokelau Community

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
Molly Foai from the Tokelau community will be in attendance to present to the board on exploring avenues for a hall. They would specifically like to discuss the area next to their community preschool at Aorere park.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) thank Molly Foai from the Tokelau community for her attendance and presentation.

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 - AMMI Athletics at Rongomai Park

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
Emily Scanlan, Peta Leitu and Pawan Marhas from the AMMI Athletics Club Incorporated will be in attendance to provide the local board with an update on the progress of their application to be based at Rongomai Park and to acknowledge the Local board for their support.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) thank Emily Scanlan, Peta Leitu and Pawan Marhas from AMMI Athletics Club Incorporated for their attendance and presentation.

10 Extraordinary Business

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. A period of time (10 minutes) has been set aside for the Manukau Ward Councillors to have an opportunity to update the Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board on regional matters.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
a) That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board receive the verbal reports from the Manukau Ward Councillors.

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

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Carol McGarry - Democracy Advisor Otara-Papatoetoe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board Members’ Report

File No.: CP2019/02556

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Providing board members with an opportunity to update the local board on the projects and issues they have been involved with since the last meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board;
a) receive the board members’ written and oral reports.

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

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Carol McGarry - Democracy Advisor Ōtara-Papatoetoe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairperson's Announcements

File No.: CP2019/02563

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
This item gives the chairperson an opportunity to update the board on any announcements.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:
a) receive the chairperson’s verbal update.

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

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Carol McGarry - Democracy Advisor Otara-Papatoetoe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Valedictory reflections: end of term address

File No.: CP2019/17095

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide retiring Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board member 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 Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board member to share valedictory reflections or an end of term address, prior to the 2019 Local Board Elections.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:
a) receive valedictory reflections from Member Donna Lee.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Carol McGarry - Democracy Advisor Ōtara-Papatoetoe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu and Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval for the concept design for the Ōtara hub canopy and advise the board of the additional funding required to complete the project.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board passed resolution OP/2018/10 allocating $262,000 from its Local Board Transport Capital Fund to construct a canopy between Ōtara Music and Arts Centre (OMAC) and Fresh Gallery Ōtara.
3. The project is managed and delivered by the council’s Community Facilities department.
4. The local board requested a ‘signature’ canopy to provide rain protection along this pedestrian route to OMAC.
5. A concept design was prepared for the new canopy and received positive comment from the local board at their July workshop.
6. Additional funding of $120,000 is required to complete the preferred canopy design.
7. Auckland Transport will prepare a separate report seeking resolution on the additional funding required from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) approve the concept design for the Ōtara Hub Canopy as per Attachment A.
b) note that additional funding of $120,000 is required from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund to complete the project.

Horopaki
Context
8. A three-metre-wide pedestrian walkway, between OMAC building and the Fresh Gallery, links the Fair Mall carpark off Bairds Road to the main entrances of the Ōtara Library and OMAC.
9. Currently this walkway has no roof though steel beams span the width of the walkway at regular intervals.
10. The local board want a ‘signature’ canopy similar to the existing canopy on the other side of the Hub courtyard to provide rain protection to the entrances of the community facilities of the library, Citizens’ Advice Bureau (CAB) and OMAC.
11. Resolution OP/2018/10 was passed by the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board which allocated $262,000 from its Local Board Transport Capital Fund towards this project. The resolution notes “that since this project originated, the scope has changed and the value of the
agreement is also likely to change. This will be managed when the board approve a new scope”.

12. The project is to be delivered by council’s Community Facilities department, which build, maintain and renew council assets. Once the extent of the essential maintenance work to be done on the adjacent roof areas of the surrounding council-owned buildings was established, an architect was engaged to provide a design concept.

### Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

#### Analysis and advice

13. Three concept designs were produced that were worked up with the local board on 28 May 2019 and 23 July 2019. The three options are summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>No rain protection for 15m. Alternative routes under verandas available to pedestrians.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Low canopy of acrylic on timber frame and battens</td>
<td>Battens provide pattern and relate to timber canopies at library and OMAC entrances</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 High canopy of laminated patterned glass on existing steel beams</td>
<td>Patterned glass to match existing canopy on other side of courtyard. Limited palette of materials to reduce costs, junctions, ease of maintenance. Uses existing steel cross beams</td>
<td>$382,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 High canopy of laminated patterned glass on free standing steel structure</td>
<td>Most consistent appearance with existing canopy on other side of courtyard. Steel frame encroaches on the width of the walkway and covers existing windows.</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. At the workshop held on 23 July 2019 the local board supported option 2.

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

#### Council group impacts and views

15. The managers of the library and OMAC support the construction of a rain cover over the walkway between the two buildings to provide an alternative dry route to the community facilities.

16. In terms of asset management, the cost of the canopy needs to be considered in the context of location between two buildings that are nearing the end of their life. The planned roof maintenance will repair the leaks but does not include a full paint. It is considered that this work will last five years. Within that time, the future of the Ōtara Hub needs to be considered.

17. A discrete design on the glass is preferred as there is ‘a lot going on in the immediate vicinity’. Note there is new colourful signage to be installed above the Fresh Gallery.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

18. Installing a canopy will contribute to achieving Outcome 2: Revitalising town centres of the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Plan.

19. One of the key initiatives of this plan is to investigate opportunities for funding public facility improvements in town centres, e.g. toilets, footpaths, parking and public art.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

20. 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.

21. No specific impacts to mana whenua were identified for this canopy structure.

22. In terms of canopy design, Mana Whenua have been involved when art work for the existing glass canopy was first created by Jon Tootill in 2014, and the same pattern will be used on this canopy.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

23. The currently approved Local Board Transport Capital Fund budget of $262,000 is insufficient to complete the works.

24. The total budget required is $382,000, this includes $90,000 for canopy art work.

25. The local board needs to allocate an additional $120,000 in order to progress this project. Auckland Transport will prepare a separate report to obtain approval for the funding from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund to meet the remaining costs of this project.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

25. | Risk                                           | Mitigation                                           |
    |-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
    | Insufficient Budget                          | Cost estimate is based on a concept design with a 10% contingency |
    | Cost of maintenance                          | Simplest design, durable materials, least number of junctions |
    | Life of canopy limited to life of surrounding buildings | Design the fixing of the glass so glass can be dismantled and reutilised if required |

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

26. Receive report from Auckland Transport and approve additional budget if the local board agrees.

27. If additional budget is approved, detailed design, building consent and tender documentation will commence with construction anticipated to be completed in FY20.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Otara Hub Canopy Concept</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Lucy Ullrich - Growth Development Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorisers              | Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities  
|                          | Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu and Otara-Papatoetoe Local Boards |
Proposed new canopy at Ōtara Town Centre

The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board intends to provide weather protection over the walkway between the OMAC building and Fresh Gallery in the Ōtara Town Centre.

The proposed design is for a canopy that relates to the existing canopy on the west side of the library courtyard. A same pattern will be printed on the glass canopy.
Location of the proposed new canopy

Attachment A

Item 15
Proposed canopy design
Attachment A

Item 15

Glass pattern

Existing canopy
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To progress the allocation of the remaining Auckland Transport Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF), specifically to allocate additional funding for the Otara Canopy project.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. Local boards can use the LBTCF to deliver transport infrastructure projects that are not part of Auckland Transport’s work programme. There is currently $287,035 remaining in the local board’s LBTCF which can be allocated before the end of their electoral term.

3. In 2018, the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board passed resolution OP/2018/10 which allocated $262,000 to construct a canopy between Ōtara Music and Arts Centre (ŌMAC) and Fresh Gallery Ōtara.

4. As part of the project, staff were asked to scope a ‘signature’ canopy design to provide rain protection along this pedestrian route to OMAC.

5. The concept design for the new canopy was presented to their July 2019 workshop, where the local board considered the various options.

6. The preferred option indicated by the local board requires a total budget of $382,000, this includes $90,000 for the art work. There is a shortfall of $120,000.

7. The local board can allocate $120,000 from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund in order to meet the shortfall and progress this project.

8. A separate report on this agenda titled: Ōtara Hub Canopy, provides detailed information on the options considered by the local board.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) allocate $120,000 from the Auckland Transport Local Board Transport Capital Fund to the Canopy Ōtara Town Centre project, for a total of $382,000, including $90,000 for an art work.

Horopaki

Context
9. This report focuses on allocating the remaining budget left in the LBTCF.

10. 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 can be considered if there is a transport outcome.

11. There is currently $287,035 remaining in the Otara-Papatoetoe LBTCF which can be allocated by the end of the electoral term.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

12. Initial rough order of costs estimate for the canopy was $262,000.

13. Auckland Council – Community Facilities is responsible for delivery of this project as the eventual asset owner/manager of the canopy structure.

14. As part of the development process, the local board requested a ‘signature canopy’ be scoped as part of this project.

15. Three concept designs were produced that were workshopped with the local board on 28 May 2019 and 23 July 2019. The three options are summarised in the table below.

| Table 1: Ōtara concept design options |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Description                          | Commentary                                    | Cost   |
| Do nothing                           | No rain protection for 15m. Alternative routes under verandas available to pedestrians. | $0     |
| 1 Low canopy of acrylic on timber frame and battens | Battens provide pattern and relate to timber canopies at library and OMAC entrances | $250,000 |
| 2 High canopy of laminated patterned glass on existing steel beams | Patterned glass to match existing canopy on other side of courtyard. Limited palette of materials to reduce costs, junctions, ease of maintenance. Uses existing steel cross beams | $382,000 |
| 3 High canopy of laminated patterned glass on free standing steel structure | Most consistent appearance with existing canopy on other side of courtyard. Steel frame encroaches on the width of the walkway and covers existing windows. | $550,000 |

16. At the workshop held on 23 July 2019 the local board supported option 2, which is $120,000 over the current allocated budget.

17. The local board can allocate the additional funding from their LBTCF to deliver their preferred option.

18. It is recommended that the local board resolve to allocate the additional funding of $120,000 in this report to progress delivery of this project.

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

19. Local board views, informed by local community engagement, were incorporated in the initial decision to select this project as a LBTCF.
20. Local board plan outcomes are one of the criteria against which potential projects are assessed and this project was a key initiative aligned to the local board outcome of Promote economic development and public safety in the town centres and strengthen their roles as community hubs.

21. Local boards will continue to be engaged with LBTCF projects as they progress via Auckland Transport’s Local Board Monthly Update reports.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

Māori impact statement

22. No specific impacts to mana whenua were identified for this canopy structure,

23. Mana whenua were involved when the art work for the glass was first created by Jon Tootill in 2014. This same pattern will be used on this canopy.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

Financial implications

Table 1: Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Transport Capital Fund Financial Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Funds Available in current political term</th>
<th>$2,815,162</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount committed to date on projects approved for design and/or construction</td>
<td>$2,528,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget left</td>
<td>$287,035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. The financial implication of the board approving recommendations this report is the allocation of $120,000 of the LBTCF. This leaves $167,035 remaining.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

Risks and mitigations

25. Auckland Transport will put risk management strategies in place on a project by project basis.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

Next steps

26. Auckland Transport will progress the decisions made by the local board as a result of this report and provide updates via the monthly reporting process.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

**Ngā kaihaina**

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Kenneth Tuai – Elected Member Relationship Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon – Elected Member Relationship Team Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu and Otara-Papatoetoe Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To update the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board about transport related matters in its area including the Local Board Transport Capital Fund.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. This month’s report includes information on:
   - Improvements to the Station / Shirley roads and Gray Ave intersection
   - Update on Puhinui Station Interchange upgrade
   - Implementation of Dynamic Lanes for Redoubt Road, Manukau

3. This report also provides an update on Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) projects.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) receive the September 2019 - Auckland Transport monthly update report.

Horopaki

Context

4. This report addresses transport related matters in the local board area and includes information on the progress of the LBTCF projects.

5. Auckland Transport (AT) is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. It reports on a monthly basis to local boards as set out in the Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting supports the important engagement role local boards play within and on behalf of their local communities on transport matters.

6. The Local Board Transport Capital Fund is a capital budget provided to all local boards by Auckland Council (AC) and delivered by AT. Local boards can use this fund to deliver transport infrastructure projects that they believe are important to their communities but are not part of AT’s work programme. Projects must also:
   - be safe
   - not impede network efficiency
   - be in the road corridor, although projects running through parks can be considered if there is a transport outcome.
**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

Analysis and advice

**Local Board Transport Capital Fund**

7. Through Auckland Council’s Long-Term Plan 2018-2028, LBTCF funding has been increased to a total of $20.8 million per annum across all 21 local boards.

8. The allocation for the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board has also increased, with the updated figures for the remainder of this electoral term reflected in table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>Status change</th>
<th>Funds allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Footpath link from Belinda Ave to the existing Preston Road Reserve path north of Tangaroa College</td>
<td>Project in planning phase with preparation of reports for resource consent. Construction anticipated to be completed during the summer construction period.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$176,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety upgrades on East Tamaki Road</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade of Hunters Corner Streetscape</td>
<td>Plans have been updated and documentation is currently being prepared for procurement later this month. Project is scheduled to start in September 2019 with physical works starting in October.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,025,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Rongomai Walkway</td>
<td>Delivery by Auckland Council's Community Facilities department. Design complete. Transpower refused to permit path under lines</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Table 2 below shows the status of projects to which LBTCF has already been committed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>Status change</th>
<th>Funds allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canopy for Ōtara Town Centre</td>
<td>Canopy to provide all-weather access from eastern car park to the library</td>
<td>Project delivered by Auckland Council’s Community Facilities department. Two more design options were presented to OPLB workshop on 23 July. Direction to proceed with Option 1 – laminated glass canopy supported on beams across the walkway. A report in this month’s agenda by AC Community Facilities outlines the options presented to the local board and identifies the funding shortfall. A further AT report is also on this agenda requesting the allocation of the funds to meet the shortfall.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$262,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to Ōtara signage</td>
<td>Place-making signage</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath upgrade at Ōtara Town Centre</td>
<td>Upgrade of the footpath at the Ōtara Town Centre (along the southern side of town centre including 15-17 Fair Mall)</td>
<td>Design plan prepared. Consultation complete and work has been tendered. No bids received. Project is being combined with the Upgrade of Hunters Corner Streetscape project and will be tendered as one contract.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$203,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A path through Milton Park to Papatoetoe North School</td>
<td>Provide an alternate all-weather access for students from Papatoetoe North School</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-weather footpath upgrade from East Tamaki Road to Ōtara Creek Bridge</td>
<td>Upgrade of the two paths connecting to the renewed Ōtara Creek Bridge</td>
<td>This project is being delivered by Auckland Council’s Community Facilities Department. Funding agreement signed by AC. Public</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local projects and activities

**Improvements to the Station / Shirley roads and Gray Avenue intersection**

10. The Station / Shirley roads / Gray Avenue roundabout upgrade is a safety project to improve safety at this intersection which historically had a number of serious accidents due to the road layout.

11. The proposed improvements include pedestrian and cycling facilities and a raised speed table on the Gray Ave approach, and a roundabout to make it safer for users of the intersection.

12. The image below is the plan for the Station / Shirley roads / Gray Ave intersection:
13. As previously advised, the contract has been awarded and enabling works are scheduled to start in September, with construction beginning in October 2019.

14. Signs (variable message signs) have been located on Station Road to advise commuters of the start dates for the works. A letter will also be delivered to residents in the area prior to the start of the works.

15. Feedback provided by the local board members has been referred to the project manager for consideration in the traffic management plan.

Puhinui Station Interchange
16. The Puhinui Station Interchange is the first stage of the early improvements works associated with the Airport to Botany Rapid Transit project. This project is led by Auckland Transport and forms part of the wider Southwest Gateway programme.

17. The planned sod turning for the $60m station has been rescheduled for 17 September 2019 and construction is still set to begin later this month.

18. The existing train station will be temporarily closed during construction, from Saturday 28 September to early 2021.

19. To limit disruption during the station closure, a new, free Puhinui – Papatoetoe loop bus service will run every day, with services every 10 minutes during peak times, providing station users with southern and eastern train line connections from Papatoetoe Station.

Pah Road, Papatoetoe Safety improvements
20. The local board has requested that an investigation into safety improvements for the intersection of Pah and Ferndown Roads be undertaken as this intersection has been the site of a number of vehicle crashes.

21. The request has been referred to the Traffic Operations team for investigation and a report back to the local board of their findings in due course.

Dynamic Lanes for Redoubt road, Manukau
22. The installation of dynamic lanes on Redoubt Road in Manukau has been approved and construction is planned to begin in October.

23. The lanes will operate on a 350-metre section of Redoubt Road, between the Southern Motorway and Hollyford Drive.

24. The dynamic lanes will use overhead signs and on-road LED lights to change the direction of centre lanes at peak times.

25. Construction is planned to begin in October where AT will be installing:
   - Two gantries (overhead signs across the full width of the road)
   - One cantilever mast arm sign at each end
   - Small electronic messaging signs
   - On-road studs that light up (cats eyes)
   - The 4pm to 6pm clearway on the southern kerb of Redoubt Road will be changed to operate from 3pm to 8pm

26. Construction will involve:
   - Building foundations for the overhead signs,
   - Installation of controller cabinets
• Trimming of trees overhanging the road
• Underground drilling to provide ducting for services
• Drilling holes in the road to install the LED studs
• Installation of overhead signs which will be constructed off site
• Some line making and road side signage changes
• Testing of the system

27. During the construction phase, it is planned to limit impacts to peak hour traffic though night works with partial lane closures.

28. There will also be a limited number of night time full lane closures with residents vehicle access-only, though two-way traffic will be maintained for the majority of the construction period.

29. Construction is planned to run between September 2019 through to January 2020.

30. The contract for this project has been awarded to CSL Infrastructure.

31. Prior to, and during construction we will have a comprehensive communications campaign including:
   • A letter to residents along the route
   • A brochure
   • On-street signs (variable message signs)
   • Targeted social media posts
   • Media release
   • Public drop in session
   • Dedicated page on the AT website
   • Advertisements in local media

32. Local board members have raised the issue of vehicles turning into and out of Diorella Drive. Modelling analysis indicates that sufficient gaps should be created by the dynamic lane to safely allow turning traffic into and out of Diorella Drive.

33. However, if turning traffic does create a significant issue, a peak time right-turn ban into Diorella is a potential option. Ongoing monitoring will determine whether this will be required.

Regional Activities
Vision Zero Strategy

34. Auckland is now a Vision Zero region. Under Vision Zero, there’s a goal of no deaths or serious injuries on our transport network by 2050.

35. The success of this goal will be built on strong partnerships created under the Tamaki-Makaurau Road Safety Governance Group, made up of Auckland Transport (AT), Police, NZ Transport Agency, Ministry of Transport, Auckland Council, Auckland Regional Public Health Service and Accident Compensation Corporation (ACC).

36. Vision Zero is a Swedish ethics-based approach that focuses on a core principle that human life and health can never be exchanged for other benefits within society.

37. As the custodian of our region’s transport systems, Auckland Transport plays a vital role in shaping the future of our region. We will make this happen using an evidence-based approach and by refusing to trade-off people’s safety for other benefits.
38. Research shows active children grow up to be healthier adults. However, current research also shows that only seven per cent of five to seven-year olds are getting the recommended level of moderate to vigorous exercise. The top reason for parents not allowing their children to actively commute to school is the fear of speeding cars.

39. Vision Zero includes creating a more walkable and cyclable city where parents have the confidence to allow their children to run around local streets and be kids. Under Vision Zero, everyone can enjoy access to public transport, or other mobility options and know they’ll get home safe.

40. It’s an approach that has strong support from the Auckland Regional Public Health Service, road controlling authorities and Police and will look to partner with iwi, community groups and schools; along with every driver, rider and pedestrian to achieve our Vision Zero goal.

41. You can download the VZ Strategy & Action Plan here https://at.govt.nz/media/1980787/vision-zero-for-t%C4%81maki-makaurau.pdf

**AT’s Community Bike Fund**

42. Applications to AT’s Community Bike Fund opened on Monday 2 September and close on Sunday 29 September 2019.

43. Grants are available to community groups across Auckland to deliver projects and events that encourage and support riding a bike. Groups themselves do not need to be cycling-focused, rather any group interested in promoting bike riding in their community may apply.

44. Applications can be made for between $300 to $5000 for community-focused projects and events that encourage riding a bike as a regular transport option, improve cycle safety and contribute to the normalisation of cycling in Auckland.

45. Further information on the Community Bike Fund, together with information on projects previously funded by this grant, is available at https://at.govt.nz/cycling-walking/at-community-bike-fund/

46. All interested applicants should read the Community Bike Fund policy.

**Free Child Weekend Fares**

47. Aucklanders are embracing transport choice, with more than 100 million journeys taken on public transport in the past year.

48. To encourage greater use by families, with effect from Saturday 7 September children aged 5 to 15 using a registered AT HOP card are able to travel free at the weekends on AT’s bus, train and selected ferry services (Bayswater, Beach Haven, Birkenhead, Devonport, Half Moon Bay and Hobsonville Point). Note that children under the age of five travel free with a paying adult at any time.

49. This new scheme comes as part of the $1.1 million contribution from Auckland Council towards public transport initiatives announced earlier in the year, with more spending than ever before on building the public transport network across the region.

50. Making public transport free for under 16s on weekends and public holidays will encourage more people to leave their cars at home and use existing capacity. Every person on public transport is one less car on the roads, helping to reduce carbon emissions and traffic congestion.

51. To be eligible, children must have an AT HOP card that is registered with a child concession. Setting up a child discount concession is easy, with:

- the purchase of an AT HOP card for each child aged 5 to 15;
- creation of a MyAT account; and
• registration of the child’s AT HOP card.

52. A child concession will be applied automatically when a child’s AT HOP card is registered with the correct date of birth. It may take 24 - 72 hours after registration for the concession to be applied, so card(s) should be registered at least two days before any travel.

Further information on the free child weekend fares is available at: https://at.govt.nz/childweekendfares

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

53. The impact of information in this report are confined to AT and do not impact on other parts of the Council group.

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

Local Board Advocacy

54. This section provides a regular report about how AT is supporting the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board advocacy initiatives in the Local Board Plan, as outlined in the table below.

Table 3: Advocacy Initiative Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy Initiative</th>
<th>Key Initiative</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transform Manukau’s Metropolitan area through good planning and sustainable development.</td>
<td>Improve connectivity through providing public Wi-Fi and improving walking routes between Manukau Square and transport centre, Hayman Park, and public carparks.</td>
<td>AT is currently in the process of delivering the first stage of the Airport to Botany project (A2B) which will better connect Southern and Eastern Auckland to the Airport through improved public transport links. Work on the major upgrade of Puhinui Station is due to start in the third quarter of this year. Manukau is a key link in that public transport connection. As part of wider public transport improvements, AT has currently adopted peak-time bus lanes along Manukau Wiri Station Road to improve bus scheduling, as part of a wider programme of public transport improvements. AT completed the $50m Manukau Bus Station in early April 2018. The bus station has been successfully operating for over a year. The Intercity buses are now operating from the bus station, improving the station’s ability to serve commuters. Putney Way streetscape upgrades have been completed and are now operating, adding significantly to the streetscape link from Manukau Mall to the Bus and Train stations. The multi-coloured lighting funded by the local board and Panuku adds to the vibrancy of the area at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote economic development and public safety in the town centres</td>
<td>Investigate opportunities for funding public facility improvements in</td>
<td>AT is currently in the process of delivering footpath upgrades in Ōtara Town Centre and streetscape upgrades in Hunters Corner, Papatoetoe, which will improve both town centre’s visual amenity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Advocacy Initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Initiative</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and strengthen their roles as community hubs.</td>
<td>AT is in the process of delivering a series of road safety upgrades along Baird’s road, including Ōtara Town Centre and a roundabout at the intersection of Baird’s road and Hayman street, which will significantly improve pedestrian road safety through speed reduction and increased pedestrian infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Redesigning the entrances to Ōtara Library and Ōtara Music and Arts Centre, including the courtyard between the Council buildings in Ōtara Mall. | A new canopy linking the Western carpark to the courtyard between the Council buildings in Ōtara Mall is currently being programmed for delivery and funded through the LBTCF. |

| Advocate to AT to realign Station Road / Portage Road / Gray Avenue intersection. | AT is in the process of upgrading the Portage and Station Road intersection by installing a roundabout to improve vehicle and pedestrian safety at this junction. Physical work will begin in October of this year. |

| Work with AT to allocate funding and develop priority routes through parks and other public spaces for cyclists and walkers, as identified in the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Greenways Plan. | The local board is currently funding an upgraded section of the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Greenways Plan from East Tamaki Road to Lovegrove Crescent in Ōtara via its LBTCF. Footpath links in Rongomai Park which link Te Irirangi Drive to Preston Road are also under development. |

### Auckland Transport consultations

#### Local Board consultations

55. AT provides local boards with the opportunity to comment on transport projects being delivered in the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board area.

56. In the reporting period for August 2019, no projects were put forward for comment by the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board.

### Traffic Control Committee resolutions

57. Traffic Control Committee (TCC) decisions within the Ōtara-Papatoetoe local board area are reported on a monthly basis.
58. The decisions for August are listed in the table below:

Table 4: Transport Control Committee decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street name</th>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>Nature of Restriction</th>
<th>Committee Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swaffield Road, Middlemore Crescent</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking Changes Combined</td>
<td>No Stopping At All Times, Flush Median, Traffic Island, Edge Line, Give-Way control</td>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no impacts or opportunities for Māori. Any engagement with Māori, or consideration of impacts and opportunities, will be carried out on an individual project basis.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

60. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no financial implications.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamarurutanga
Risks and mitigations

61. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no risks.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

62. AT will provide an update report to the local board at a meeting early in the new electoral term.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories
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<th>Authorisers</th>
</tr>
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<td>Kenneth Tuai – Elected Member Relationship Manager</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon – Elected Member Relationship Team Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu and Otara-Papatoetoe Local Boards</td>
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New community lease for AMMI Athletics Club Incorporated at Rongomai Park, 80R Te Irirangi Drive, Clover Park (Covering report)

File No.: CP2019/17271

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. This is a late covering report for the above item. The comprehensive agenda report was not available when the agenda went to print and will be provided prior to the 17 September 2019 Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

The recommendations will be provided in the comprehensive agenda report.
Community lease renewal and variation for Youthline Auckland Charitable Trust at 145 St George Street, Papatoetoe

File No.: CP2019/14231

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To renew and vary the community lease for Youthline Auckland Charitable Trust for the occupation of 145 St George Street, Papatoetoe.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Community leases are one of the ways in which the council provides support to local community organisations, assisting them to sustain the activities and experiences they provide in alignment with recognised local priorities.

3. A process has been undertaken for the lease renewal that includes:
   • a review of the tenant’s performance to ensure that all lease conditions are being met
   • a review to determine there is sufficient need for the required use of the premises, or any part of the premises, and that it is not required for any other purpose
   • that the organisations hold sufficient funds to meet their financial liabilities and are financially sustainable
   • that the services and programmes offered align with the objectives in the Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board Plan 2017.

4. Youthline Auckland Charitable Trust entered into a lease with the former Manukau City Council in January 2009 for the council-owned building at 145 St George Street, Papatoetoe. The lease is for an initial 10-year term with two 10-year rights of renewal. The renewals commence on 1 January 2019 and 1 January 2029. The lease will finally expire on 31 December 2038.

5. The original 2009 lease agreement reflects the incorrect final expiry date of 31 December 2039. This will be corrected by a variation in the renewal and variation agreement. Additionally, the group wishes to vary the lease to allow for a sub-lease of the café operation to a commercial operator.

6. Staff are satisfied the group meets the standards specified above and recommends the lease be renewed under the existing terms of the agreement, with variations as detailed in the recommendation.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a. approve the renewal of the community lease to Youthline Auckland Charitable Trust for the land and building at 145 St George Street, Papatoetoe subject to the terms and conditions of the existing lease dated 19 March 2009, with the following amendments:
   i. an amendment to clause 6.0 (Assignment and Subletting) of the lease to allow for the subletting of the café operation to a commercial operator subject to the following conditions:
a. the third-party operator is identified through a publicly contestable process
b. a sublease of no more than 115 square meters (more or less) of the current leased area
c. the rent charged under the sublease is to be calculated at a market rental evidenced by valuation from a registered valuer
d. the subtenant's occupation and use is primarily focused upon providing services and/or goods to the tenant and users and visitors to the premises

ii. should a sub-lease be agreed on these terms, then the rent under the head lease paid by the club to Auckland Council will be 3% of gross revenue generated by the sublease

iii. an amendment to the original lease to correct the final expiry date to read 31 December 2038.

Horopaki

Context

The land

7. The current lease at 145 St George Street, Papatoetoe is for the land described as Lot 1 Deposited Plan 47333, comprising 2259 square meters, NA1814/58. The land is held in fee simple by Auckland Council as a classified local purpose (community buildings) reserve and subject to the Reserves Act 1977. The lease was issued under section 61 (2A) of the Reserves Act 1977.

8. The building is the former Papatoetoe Fire Station, purchased by the former Manukau City Council in 2006. Youthline entered into a lease agreement and spent more than $3 million to rebuild the building, retaining the 1950s façade. The building, with a footprint of approximately 1410 square meters across two levels, contains a variety of offices, meeting spaces, kitchenettes, performing arts space, an IT hub, an outdoor roof terrace and ground-floor decks. The original fire engine bay space contains the café and Little Flick, a fully restored 1950 Ford V8 fire truck. The truck had been based at Papatoetoe station from 1956 to 1975. In the grounds are kauri trees planted in memory of dead firefighters.

9. Under the terms of the lease, the council owns and insures the building with Youthline responsible for ongoing internal and external maintenance for the term of the lease.

Youthline Auckland Charitable Trust

10. Youthline Auckland Charitable Trust was first incorporated in October 2003. In 2009 the trust took over the former Papatoetoe Fire Station building and rebuilt much of the building, reopening in 2011. The trust shares the building with other youth-centred community organisations (counselling and support services, youth health services, regional office of the
Graeme Dingle Foundation, etc.). The Youthline phone, text and web-chat help-line services also operate from the property. Up to 60 local organisations regularly utilise the various meeting spaces within the building; including mothers’ coffee groups, nurse cluster, youth worker, caregivers, Maori and Pacific Island business association meetings, retirement home gatherings and others. Youthline have been operating the café within the building. The on-site café provides a space for relaxation and social interaction and is well supported by visitors to the building. Additionally, revenue from the café is used to support Youthline’s activities.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

11. Youthline has submitted a comprehensive lease renewal application, including financial statements.

12. Under the term of the lease, the renewal can be approved if council is satisfied that the group has not breached any terms, there is sufficient need for the activities undertaken and the property is not required for any other purpose.

13. The group is not in breach of the lease and the financial accounts reflect that they have sufficient reserves to meet their liabilities and appears to be well managed.

14. A site visit was undertaken in March 2019. The building and surrounds are well maintained.

15. Youthline have asked for a variation to the lease to allow for a sub-lease of the café operation to a commercial operator, as running the café themselves as a social enterprise does not fit Youthline’s strategic direction. A commercial operator would free-up Youthline to concentrate on providing their core business of supporting local youth and the wider community with their programmes, counselling support and seminars. They have expressed the wish to support a café, not be a café operator.

16. Under the Auckland Council Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012, where community groups undertake commercial activities and generate significant revenue over expenditure, the relevant local board may choose to charge a percentage rental at rent review, unless lessees can provide evidence of:

- planned building upgrade, development or maintenance; and
- planned programmes, services or activities.

17. The following table reflects the options for the board with regard to the sublease of the café:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Lease implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Allow for the sublease of the café operation to a commercial operator with a percentage of the market rental received by Youthline under the sublease to be paid to Auckland Council under the head lease (i.e. community lease). A variation of the community lease will be required to allow for the sublease and recovery of the percentage rental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Allow for the sublease of the café operation to a commercial operator with Youthline retaining the market rental received under the sublease. A variation of the community lease will be required to allow for the sublease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Do not allow for the sublease. No change will be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Staff recommend option A, as this provides a good balance between the community outcomes and the commercial operation. As owner of the building, council would have the ability to offset some of its costs against the percentage rental received. Additionally, Youthline would retain the greater part of the market rental which can be used to offset its maintenance obligations and provide funding for its activities.
19. The lease commenced on 1 January 2009 for a term of 10 years plus two 10-year rights of renewal. The agreement shows a final expiry of 31 December 2039. However, this should be 31 December 2038. Staff recommend that this be corrected by way of an amendment to the lease renewal agreement.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
20. The proposed lease renewal has been discussed with the Parks and Places Specialist and the Strategic Broker, who have no objections to the renewal.
21. There are no identified impacts on other parts of the council group. The views of council-controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of this report.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
22. The recommendations within this report fall within the local board’s allocated authority relating to local recreation, sports and community facilities.
23. The renewal was discussed with the local board at the monthly Mahi Tahi workshops on 26 March and, 28 May and 25 June 2019.
24. The recommendation supports the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board 2017 Plan outcomes empowered, inclusive and prosperous communities; and parks and facilities that meet people’s needs.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
25. Auckland Council is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and its broader statutory obligations to Māori. Support for Māori initiatives and outcomes are detailed in Whiria Te Muka Tangata, Auckland Council’s Māori Responsiveness Framework.
26. The lease renewal was presented at the South/Central Mana Whenua forum meeting of 29 May 2019. No objections were raised by the forum members present.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
27. There are no financial implications associated with the renewal of the community lease.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
28. The provision for the renewal of community leases is provided for in the lease agreements granted to the group.
29. Council has a contractual responsibility to agree to the lease renewal if the conditions stipulated in the leases have been met.
30. Should the renewal not be granted, it will:
   i. affect the group’s operations
   ii. reduce their ability to undertake their activities and support of the young people of the local Ōtara-Papatoetoe and wider communities.
31. Under the lease, Youthline is responsible for all maintenance of the building and its surrounds. Therefore, the ability to sub-let the operation of the on-site café will enable the group to generate additional income that can be put towards property maintenance and the provision of services to the local community.
32. If approval is not given to sub-lease the café:
   i. the tenant may have a reduced ability to maintain the building and surrounds
   ii. the local community will be denied the availability of a well-supported café.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

33. Subject to the local board approval of the renewal of the community lease, staff will prepare the renewal and variation agreement for the group to sign.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Jenny Young - Community Lease Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - GM Maori Responsiveness and Relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New community lease for Tennis Auckland Region Incorporated, Manukau Sports Bowl, 1 Boundary Road, Clover Park

File No.: CP2019/16120

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek a new community ground-lease for Tennis Auckland Region Incorporated at Manukau Sports Bowl, 1 Boundary Road, Clover Park.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Community leases are one of the ways in which the council provides support to local community organisations, assisting them to sustain the activities and experiences they provide in alignment with recognised local priorities.

3. Auckland Tennis Incorporated (now Tennis Auckland Region Incorporated) entered into a lease with the former Manukau City Council in January 1993 for the group-owned building and the surrounding courts at Manukau Sports Bowl. The lease term was 10 years with one 10 year right of renewal. The renewal was exercised in 2003 and finally expired on 31 December 2012 and is currently holding over on a month-by-month basis while a masterplan for Manukau Sports Bowl is developed.

4. In 2010 Tennis Auckland Region replaced the geodesic dome at the Stanley Street tennis centre and sought to relocate the original dome to cover two of the Manukau Sports Bowl tennis courts.

5. In August 2010 the former Manukau City Council resolved to contribute to the cost to relocate the geodesic dome. The council also resolved to take over the ownership and maintenance of the eight courts, lighting towers, nets and net posts. It was noted that the Board of Auckland Tennis had agreed to gift the courts, lighting towers, nets and net posts to Council.

6. In March 2011, the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board became aware that further funding would likely be required to complete the project, and the local board asked officers to investigate this (OP/2011/33). A report was presented to the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board in May 2011, where the local board resolved (OP/2011/57) to accept Tennis Auckland's gift of the geodesic dome to the Manukau Tennis Centre, subject to council officers sourcing an independent condition assessment of the geodesic dome, which was in storage at that stage, and to explore budget options to meet the project shortfall.

7. Further work took place and the project progressed. On 2 August 2011 the local board resolved that the then Chair write to Tennis Auckland on behalf of the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board thanking them for their funding towards the tennis dome (OP/2011/141). Manukau’s first public indoor tennis courts were opened as a partnership between Tennis Auckland Region and Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board with a free family day on 14 April 2012.

8. Agreement was reached that Tennis Auckland would maintain the council-owned assets with the local board contributing to the cost of these by way of an annual payment of $51,000 through the board’s Asset Based Services budget.

9. Tennis Auckland is seeking a new long-term lease for the land at Manukau Sports Bowl, in recognition of their ongoing investment and long-term vision for tennis at the park.
10. Manukau Sports Bowl is a local park under the local board’s governance and sits within the Transform Manukau project area. Transform Manukau is led by Panuku Development Auckland to develop a Manukau that will serve future generations, including consideration of long-term opportunities for Manukau Sports Bowl. There is a very relevant report on this agenda called “Planning the future of Manukau Sports Bowl”, explaining how Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board is in early stages of master planning for the sports bowl as part of Transform Manukau. All major stakeholders will be consulted, including Tennis Auckland, about the future of the park.

11. As a consequence of the master planning process, the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board has indicated a preference (at a workshop held on 10 September 2019) for a shorter lease option of two years, with a right of renewal for an additional two years, and including a clause to enable Manukau Sports Bowl development to proceed if planning is concluded and investment is available within the lease period.

12. Under council’s Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012, a group that owns its improvements has an automatic right to reapply for a new lease at the end of the occupancy term.

13. Tennis Auckland is currently developing the site into a multi-faceted community hub.

14. Staff are satisfied the group meets the standards specified above and recommends the lease be granted in accordance with the Auckland Council Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) grant, under section 54(b) and (d) of the Reserves Act 1977, a new community ground lease to Tennis Auckland Region Incorporated for the land at Manukau Sports Bowl, 1 Boundary Road, Clover Park (marked in red and hatched on the map attached as Attachment A) and described Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 60809 and Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 204744; subject to the following terms and conditions:

i. term – two (2) years commencing 1 October 2019 with a single two-year right-of-renewal and final expiry on 30 September 2023

ii. rent – one dollar ($1.00) plus GST per annum, if requested

iii. permitted use – for the purposes and activities of a tennis facility and community sports hub

iv. the approved community outcomes plan (Attachment B), to be included in the lease agreement as Schedule 3

v. the ownership and maintenance and renewal of the tennis assets be as follows:

vi. Tennis Auckland Region Incorporated shall be own, maintain and renew:

   A. the geodesic dome, internal structures and footings
   B. the existing club facility and nominated lease area
   C. the nets
   D. all signage relating to Tennis Auckland

vii. Auckland Council shall own and renew:

   A. the eight courts and lighting towers, including those covered by the
geodesic dome
B. all planting, fencing, footpaths and park related furniture
C. the net posts
D. security lighting for the entrance to the site
E. all other site assets not outlined above

viii. Tennis Auckland will maintain the assets listed in vii. a. to e. above.

ix. Auckland Council will reimburse Tennis Auckland Region Incorporated an annual amount, agreed between the parties from time to time to cover these costs.

x. an amendment to clause 6.0 (Assignment and Subletting) of the lease to allow for the subletting of part of the site to a commercial organisation subject to the following conditions:
   A. the third-party operator is identified through a publicly contestable process
   B. the rent charged under the sublease is to be calculated at a market rental evidenced by valuation from a registered valuer
   C. the subtenant's occupation and use be primarily focused upon providing services and/or goods to the tenant and users and visitors to the premises
   D. should a sub-lease be agreed on these terms, then the rent under the head lease paid by the club to Auckland Council will be 3% of gross revenue generated by the sublease

xi. provision within the lease to allow for early termination if, prior to the final expiry date, the master planning for Manukau Sports Bowl is concluded and investment is available to develop the reserve accordingly

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

Horopaki Context

15. This report considers the application for a new community ground lease to Tennis Auckland Region Incorporated for the group-owned building and the courts at Manukau Sports Bowl, 1 Boundary Road, Clover Park.

16. The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board is the allocated authority for local recreation, sport and community facilities; including community leasing matters.

Land

17. The tennis centre is located on the north west corner of Manukau Sports Bowl on land described as Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 60809 and Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 204744. The land is held in fee simple by Auckland Council as a classified recreation reserve. The use of the land is consistent with this classification and is anticipated within the adopted 2007 Manukau Combined Sports Park Management Plan, therefore no public consultation of the intention to grant the lease is required.

18. The current lease is for land of approximately 7,520 square meters, encompassing the existing building, two covered tennis courts, four artificial courts, two asphalt courts and a volley practice area, as shown in the aerial plan (Attachment A).
Tenant

19. Auckland Tennis Incorporated was registered with the New Zealand Companies Office as an incorporated society on 2 June 1922, and renamed Tennis Auckland Region Incorporated on 11 August 2008. The aims of the society are to:

- promote, develop, enhance and protect the sport of tennis mainly as an amateur sport for the recreation and entertainment of the general public of the region
- develop opportunities, programmes and facilities
- establish, promote and stage regional and other tennis competitions
- encourage and promote tennis as an activity that promotes the health and safety of all participants and respects the principles of fair play and is free from doping.

20. Auckland Tennis established a base at Manukau Sports Bowl and entered into a lease with the former Manukau City Council in early 1993. In 2010 the council contributed towards the relocation of the geodesic dome from the Stanley Street tennis courts to Manukau Sports Bowl. The dome covers two of the eight courts that make up the tennis centre at the reserve.

21. The lease expired at the end of 2012 and continues on a month-by-month basis, until terminated or a new lease granted. In 2017 Auckland Tennis applied for a new lease for the property, this has been on-hold, as the park is an identified “Unlock Manukau” site and a master plan for the reserve is to be developed.

Asset ownership and maintenance

22. In 2010 Auckland Tennis relocated a geodesic dome from their courts at Stanley Street, Auckland to the Manukau Tennis Centre. Manukau City Council resolved in August 2010 to contribute to the cost of the relocation of the dome. At the same time the future development, ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the various tennis-related assets was established and mutually agreed with Auckland Tennis.

23. As a result of the discussions Auckland Tennis agreed to maintain all the assets, with council reimbursing them with an annual payment for those assets belonging to council. Money is available from the Parks and Places Team budget to cover the annual reimbursement.

Proposed sub-regional tennis hub

24. Tennis Auckland Region has advised the local board of their plans to establish a sports hub from the building. During 2018/2019 the group has upgraded the kitchen, change rooms, ablution facilities and access to the clubrooms building; together with repairs to the dome, fencing and resurfaced the public tennis courts. Further work is budgeted for 2019/2020 to complete the renovation of the upstairs club and meeting room, reconfiguration of the downstairs area, exterior painting of the clubrooms and replacement of the floodlighting and curtain operating system in the geodesic dome.

25. They are asking for a long-term lease that will allow them to provide a mix of sporting, social and complimentary activity (i.e. a café/kiosk) and Tennis Auckland are working with the regional sports trust Community Leisure Management (CLM Community Sport), who wish to sub-lease the top floor of the building.

26. The proposed sports hub is planned to be a multi-faceted community hub, providing a gateway to optimise tennis participation and community activity. Tennis Auckland has a vision of partnerships with other stakeholders to assist with this aim. Manukau Sports Bowl is one of Tennis Auckland’s sub-regional facilities that provide a network of sustainable facilities that provide measurable benefits to local communities. The goal of the centers is to “use tennis as a vehicle to engage people and build a place to play, that transforms the facility, enhances the area and is enjoyed by the community.”
27. One of the proposed additions is the provision of a café or kiosk at the centre. Tennis Auckland wish to sublet a part of the grounds for a stand-alone kiosk that would provide drinks and snacks to users of the park.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

28. Auckland Council's Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 sets out the eligibility requirements and standard terms and conditions for community occupancy agreements.

29. Under the guidelines, the society has an automatic right to reapply for a new lease at the end of its occupancy term, a right which it is exercising.

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. It is recommended that a new lease be granted to Tennis Auckland Region Incorporated for a term of two years with one right of renewal for a further term of two years, as requested by the local board.

31. Staff undertook a site visit of the premises on 30 August 2019. The building appears well-maintained and managed. A regular maintenance schedule for the building and grounds is in place. During 2018/2019 the group has upgraded the community ablutions area, provided safe and easy access to the courts and building and resurfaced the public tennis courts. Further substantial investment in the tennis infrastructure at Manukau Sports Bowl is planned for 2019/2020.

32. After assessing the lease application and meeting with the tenant, staff have determined that the group qualifies for a new community lease because:
   i. The activity of the tennis centre supports the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Plan 2017 outcome: parks and facilities that meet people’s needs
   ii. Tennis Auckland Region Incorporated is not in breach of the current occupancy agreement
   iii. The society’s financial accounts have sufficient reserves to cover its operating costs with no declared conditional liabilities
   iv. Auckland Tennis funds its activities mostly by way of court and venue hire; grants and donations; corporate and individual community partnerships and sponsorships; events, affiliation fees, coaching, interest and grants.
   v. The premises meet the needs of the local community.

Options

33. The following options are presented for the board’s consideration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>Enables the local board to consider the proposed master plan for Manukau Sports Bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Two + two-year lease</td>
<td>Could dovetail in with the proposed masterplan for Manukau Sports Bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>Pros</td>
<td>Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ten + ten-year lease</td>
<td>Would give Tennis Auckland security of tenure to support their development plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. The local board have indicated a preference for option B.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

35. Staff have obtained feedback from the local parks and places specialist and the sport and recreation lead. No issues or concerns regarding the group were raised.

36. The proposed lease renewal has no identified impacts on other parts of the council group. The views of council-controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of the advice in this report.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

37. The recommendation within this report falls within the local board’s allocated authority relating to local recreation, sports and community facilities.

38. The lease was discussed with the local board at the board workshop on 6 August 2019, following a presentation by Tennis Auckland Region. The board indicated that they wish to offer a shorter term than the standard 10 years plus one right of renewal for a further ten years. This has been discussed with Tennis Auckland who have agreed to a term of two years, plus one right of renewal for a further two years.

39. The recommendation supports the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Plan 2017 outcomes of Manukau transformation and parks and facilities that meet people’s needs.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

40. Auckland Council is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and its broader statutory obligations to Māori. Support for Māori initiatives and outcomes are detailed in Whiria Te Muka Tangata, Auckland Council’s Māori Responsiveness Framework, the Auckland Plan, the Long-term Plan, the Unitary Plan and the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Plan 2017.

41. An aim of community leasing is to increase targeted support for Māori community development. Fifty percent of the children attending the centre identify as Māori.

42. The proposed new ground lease was conveyed to all members of the South-Central Mana Whenua Forum in August 2019, no obligations were exercised by forum members.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

43. There are no financial implications associated with granting of this community ground-lease.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

44. The provision for the renewal of community leases is provided for in the lease agreements granted to the groups.
45. Council has a contractual responsibility to agree to the lease renewal if the conditions stipulated in the lease have been met.

46. Should the renewal not be granted, it will affect the groups’ operations and their ability to undertake their activities and support of the local Papatoetoe, and wider, communities.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**  
**Next steps**

47. Subject to the local board approval of the new lease, staff will prepare the agreement for the group to sign.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**  
**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Site Map - 1 Boundary Road, Clover Park - Tennis Auckland Region Incorporated</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Community Outcomes Plan - Tennis Auckland Region Incorporated</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**  
**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Jenny Young - Community Lease Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorisers | Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities  
Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu and Otara-Papatoetoe Local Boards |
New community lease for Tennis Auckland Region Incorporated, Manukau Sports Bowl, 1 Boundary Road, Clover Park
## COMMUNITY OUTCOMES PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Group</th>
<th>Tennis Auckland Region Incorporated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name and Location of Land/Facility</td>
<td>Manukau Sports Bowl, 19R Boundary Road, Ōtara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Area</td>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed Annual Report Due Date</td>
<td>31 December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Auckland Plan Priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Direction 5&lt;br&gt;Priority 1&lt;br&gt;Provide Quality Opportunities for All Aucklanders to Participate in Recreation and Sport</td>
<td>Provide for: interclub, winter, indoor, before and after school use of the facility for the wider community.</td>
<td>Maintain availability of the facility by regular users (interclub and winter indoor) for at least 40 weeks per year. &lt;br&gt;(Annual report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Area 2 – Prioritise and optimise our recreation and sport facilities and public open space use and the capability of recreation and sport organisations</td>
<td>Develop alternative uses for the indoor and outdoor courts.</td>
<td>Aim for a minimum of two non-tennis regular users (sport or non-sport) of the facility per year. &lt;br&gt;(Annual report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maori

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Direction 2&lt;br&gt;Priority 5&lt;br&gt;Support Sustainable Development of Maori: Outcomes, Leadership, Community and Partnerships</td>
<td>Partner with a local iwi or marae for collaborative activities.</td>
<td>e.g. Matariki event or te reo tennis. &lt;br&gt;(Annual report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Direction 8&lt;br&gt;Priority 2&lt;br&gt;Improve Energy Efficiency, Security and Resilience</td>
<td>Tennis Auckland Sustainability Plan.</td>
<td>e.g. Implement an energy, water and waste minimisation plan tracking reductions. &lt;br&gt;(Annual report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approval for a new road name at 71-73 Kolmar Road, Papatoetoe

File No.: CP2019/17110

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval from the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board to name a new private road, being a commonly owned access lot, created by way of a subdivision development at 71-73 Kolmar Road, Papatoetoe

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. Auckland Council has road naming guidelines that set out the requirements and criteria of the Council for proposed road names. These requirements and criteria have been applied in this situation to ensure consistency of road naming across the Auckland region.

3. The Applicant, Aggarwal Developments Limited (via agent Madsen Lawrie Surveyors Ltd) has proposed the following names for consideration by the Local Board:

- Shahkot Way (Applicant Preferred)
- Gupta Way (Alternative option)
- Lomandra Lane (Alternative option)
- Kuini Lane (Alternative option)

4. The two Indian names were proposed to reference the large Indian community residing in Papatoetoe. The other two names are plant names; ‘Lomandra’, which is another name for the ‘Lime Tuff’ plant that is to be planted at the development as part of the approved resource consents landscaping plans, and ‘Kuinui’, which is Te Reo Māori for the quince fruit.

5. Any of the proposed road name options would be acceptable for the local board to approve for use in this location, having been assessed against the Auckland Council’s Road Naming Guidelines and the National Addressing Standards for road naming. All technical standards are met and the names are not duplicated anywhere else in the region. Mana Whenua were also consulted and a Te Reo Māori name has been proposed as a result. Therefore it is up to the local board to decide upon the thematic suitability of the names within the local context.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) approve the name (local board to insert chosen name) for the new private road created by way of subdivision at 71-73 Kolmar Road, Papatoetoe, in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974 (resource consent reference BUN60322322, SUB60322325).
Horopaki

Context
6. Resource consent BUN60322322 and SUB60322325 were issued in November 2018 for the construction of 14 new residential dwellings and one commonly owned access lot (COAL).
7. In accordance with the National Addressing Standards for road naming (the AS/NZS 4819-2011 standard), the COAL requires a road name because it serves more than 5 lots.
8. Site and location plans of the development can be found in Attachments A and B respectively.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice
9. The Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines allow that where a new road needs to be named as a result of a subdivision or development, the subdivider/developer shall be given the opportunity of suggesting their preferred new road name/s for the Local Board’s approval.
10. Auckland Council’s road naming criteria typically require that road names reflect one of the following local themes, with the use of Māori names being actively encouraged:
   - a historical or ancestral linkage to an area;
   - a particular landscape, environmental or biodiversity theme or feature; or
   - an existing (or introduced) thematic identity in the area.
11. **Theme:** The applicant has proposed two Indian names to acknowledge the large Indian community residing in Papatoetoe, as well as two plant names, one in Te Reo Māori. ‘Lomandra’ is another name for the ‘Lime Tuff’ plant that is to be planted at the development as part of the approved resource consents landscaping plans. The name ‘Kuinui’, is Te Reo Māori for the quince fruit.
12. Following community consultation undertaken by the developer, the Vice President from the Auckland Indian Retailers Association commented: “As we have a very large number of people from Jalandhar city in the surrounded area, Shahkot is well known to the community and it will make them feel like a home away from home” – see community consultation in paragraph 19 below for more details.
13. The Applicant’s proposed names and meanings are set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Names &amp; Preferences</th>
<th>Meaning (as described by applicant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shahkot Way</td>
<td>This is the name of the city where the developer originated in India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Applicant preferred)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gupta Way</td>
<td>The family name of the developer. This name was proposed based on the existing Indian names of local Auckland streets, which the applicant says reference the names of other developers of those sites, and also acknowledge the large Indian community residing in Papatoetoe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Alternative option)</td>
<td>• Deepak Lane in Papatoetoe: Approved by the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board in 2017 and the subject of a ‘stuff.co.nz’ news article celebrating the use of Indian street names: <a href="https://www.stuff.co.nz/auckland/local-news/manukau-courier/91027475/deepak-lane-the-first-street-in-papatoetoe-with-an-indian-name">https://www.stuff.co.nz/auckland/local-news/manukau-courier/91027475/deepak-lane-the-first-street-in-papatoetoe-with-an-indian-name</a>. Applicant says this is a reference to the name of one of the developers of that site; Goyal Deepak (not verified).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. **Assessment:** The names proposed by the Applicant have been assessed against the Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines and the National Addressing Standards for road naming. All technical standards are met and the names are not duplicated anywhere else in the region; however, the use of locally relevant names is encouraged and the use of personal names is not encouraged. Therefore it is up to the local board to decide upon the thematic suitability of the names within the local context.

15. The Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines do not prohibit the use of names from other regions or cultures. Road naming is at the discretion of the local board. The Indian names proposed can be interpreted as adding weight to the positive character of the diverse culture in Papatoetoe.

16. **Confirmation:** Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) has confirmed that all of the proposed names are acceptable and not duplicated elsewhere in the region.

17. **Road type:** ‘Way’ and ‘Lane’ are acceptable road types for the new private road, suiting the form and layout of the road, as per the Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines.

18. **Iwi Consultation:** All relevant local iwi were written to (via email) and invited to comment.

   - Ngai Tai ki Tamaki Tribal Trust responded, commenting that they support the name ‘Lomandra Lane’.
   - Te Ahiwaru–Waiohua wished to see Te Reo Māori names included, to acknowledge the historical connectivity of Papatoetoe. The applicant duly obliged and has included a plant name in Māori. The developer’s additional Te Reo suggestions ‘Tui Lane’ and ‘Harakeke Lane’, which were supported by Te Ahiwaru–Waiohua, were unfortunately not able to be used due to duplication issues with existing road names.

19. **Community Consultation:** The applicant contacted the Rotary Papatoetoe Central, the Hunters Corner Business Association, and the Auckland Indian Retailers Association for comment on the proposed road names. All three groups supported the applicants preferred name ‘Shahkot Way’, with the Vice President from the Auckland Indian Retailers Association further commenting: “As we have a very large number of people from Jalandhar city in the surrounded area, Shahkot is well known to the community and it will make them feel like a home away from home”.

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

20. The decision sought for this report has no identified impacts on other parts of the council group. The views of council controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of the report’s advice.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
21. The decision sought for this report does not trigger any significant policy and is not considered to have any immediate local impact beyond those outlined in this report.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
22. The review sought from the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board on this report is linked to the Auckland Plan Outcome “A thriving Māori identity is Auckland’s point of difference in the world – it advances prosperity for Māori and benefits all Aucklanders”. The use of Māori names for roads, buildings and other public places is an opportunity to publicly demonstrate Māori identity.

23. Following consultation with mana whenua, the developer proposed four Te Reo names including ‘Tui Lane’ and ‘Harakeke Lane’, which were supported by Te Ahiwaru–Waiohua. Unfortunately all except ‘Kuini Lane’ were not able to be used due to duplication issues with existing road names.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
24. The applicant has responsibility for ensuring that appropriate signage will be installed accordingly once approval is obtained for the new road names.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
25. There are no significant risks to council as road naming is a routine part of the subdivision development process, with consultation being a key part of the process.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
26. Approved road names are notified to Land Information New Zealand (LINZ), which records them on its New Zealand wide land information database that includes street addresses issued by councils.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Site plan of the development</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Location plan of the development</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Authorisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Salter - Subdivision Technical Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trevor Cullen - Team Leader Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu and Otara-Papatoetoe Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment A: Site Plan for 71-73 Kolmar Road, Papatoetoe

Private road to be named
Attachment B: Location plan for 71-73 Kolmar Road, Papatoetoe
Approval for a new road name at 71-73 Kolmar Road, Papatoetoe
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To fund, part-fund or decline applications received for the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Grants and Multi-Board Grants, Round One 2019/2020.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
3. This report presents applications received for the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Grants and Multi-Board Grants, Round One 2019/2020 (see Attachment’s B and C).
4. The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board has set a total community grants budget of $360,000 for the 2019/2020 financial year.
5. A total of $9,248 has been allocated for the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Excellence Awards. This leaves an amount of $350,752 available for contestable grants.
6. Forty-one applications were received for Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Grants, Round One 2018/2019, requesting a total of $422,828.82. In addition, 16 applications were received for Ōtara-Papatoetoe Multi-Board Grants, Round One 2018/2019 requesting a total of $78,067.58.
7. In total, fifty-seven applications were received for consideration by the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board for Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Grants and Multi-Board Grants, Round One 2019/2020 with a total funding request of $500,896.40.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
a) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application in Local Grants Round One 2019/2020, as outlined in Table One:

<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>LG2013-102</td>
<td>Wymondley Road School</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs of the Wymondley Road School 60th Jubilee celebrations, including catering, venue hire, commemorative t-shirts, bags, pens and printing.</td>
<td>$2,957.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>LG2013-103</td>
<td>Dawson Primary School</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards costs of the “Bikes in schools” programme, including bikes, helmets, bike track and a storage container.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2013-106</td>
<td>Garden to Table Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards a contribution to salaries for “Garden to Table” staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2013-107</td>
<td>Manukau Beijing Opera Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards venue hire costs for the Papatoetoe Town Hall for opera rehearsals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2013-109</td>
<td>The Dawson Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the &quot;Dawson Lights Up&quot; event, including food, stage hire, sound system, entertainment and administration costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2013-111</td>
<td>Susie Tearapo Kite</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs of the “Otara Kids Market” programme, including venue hire, feather flag advertising, vinyl signage, stationary and a sound system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2013-118</td>
<td>Hindu Heritage Research Foundation New Zealand</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards the “Papatoetoe Family Fun Day” event, including food, video and photography, stage hire and waste management costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2013-119</td>
<td>Hindu Heritage Research Foundation New Zealand</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards costs for the “Papatoetoe Deepavali Festival of Lights” event, including hall hire, printing, sound system, video recording, food, volunteer expenses, packaging disposals and hall décor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2013-120</td>
<td>South East Auckland Senior Citizens’ Association Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for the seniors Christmas event, including venue hire, catering, setup and pack down, entertainment and sound system hire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-122</td>
<td>Asthma New Zealand Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards a contribution to the salary of mobile asthma nurse educators.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-123</td>
<td>The Community Builders NZ Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for the &quot;Christmas lights&quot; event, including waste and traffic management, entertainment, a children bug ride and performer fees.</td>
<td>$21,941.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-124</td>
<td>Manukau Performing Arts Incorporated</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards costs of theatre safety curtains and ladders.</td>
<td>$8,055.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-128</td>
<td>Manukau Seniors Association Incorporated</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards costs for the Indian musical arts and culture workshop, including a harmonium, tabla, naal (drums) and venue hire.</td>
<td>$2,656.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-129</td>
<td>Theresa Turua</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards costs for the team sport tracksuits, training t-shirts and hoods.</td>
<td>$3,344.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-130</td>
<td>Otara Business Association</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards costs for the &quot;Otara Christmas in the Park 2019&quot; event, including performers fees, kid’s entertainment, prizes and giveaways.</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-131</td>
<td>Otara Business Association</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for the Otara senior citizens Christmas dinner on 11 December 2019, including transport, dinner and gift packs.</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-132</td>
<td>South Auckland Chinese Senior Friendship Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for the wellness programme for Chinese seniors, including refreshments, venue hire, food, petrol vouchers for performers, phone expenses, printing and stationary.</td>
<td>$2,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>LG2013-134</td>
<td>Auckland Indian Retailers Association</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards costs for the “Multicultural Diwali Mela” event, including sound, performers fees, chairs, stage hire and advertisements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>LG2013-135</td>
<td>Papatoetoe Senior Citizens Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the venue hire cost for the Papatoetoe senior citizens weekly gathering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>LG2013-136</td>
<td>Papatoetoe Central Main Street Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards event costs for the “Papatoetoe Santa Parade”, including food, performers fees, advertising, security, traffic management, fire brigade services and prizes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>LG2013-137</td>
<td>Papatoetoe Central Main Street Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for the “Papatoetoe Senior Citizens Christmas Dinner on 18 December 2019”, including transport, dinner and gift packs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>LG2013-138</td>
<td>Otara Business Association</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards costs for an Easter event including performers fees, kids’ entertainment, prizes and giveaways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>LG2013-140</td>
<td>Habitat for Humanity Greater Auckland Limited</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards curtain laundering costs for the “Habitat Curtain Bank”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>LG2013-142</td>
<td>Papatoetoe Central Main Street Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards cost for an Easter event, including advertising, performers fees, children’s entertainment, prizes and giveaways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>LG2013-143</td>
<td>World Council of Sikh Affairs</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards costs for the “Baisakhi Mela” event, including stage hire, marques, seating, competition prizes, entertainment, traditional games, traditional food, video recording and sound system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>Grant Reference</td>
<td>Grant Recipient</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Grant Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-144</td>
<td>LG2013-144</td>
<td>Life Education Trust Counties Manukau</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards a contribution to costs of the life education programme in schools, including educational resources, insurance, salary and a professional development workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-145</td>
<td>LG2013-145</td>
<td>Counties Manukau Sports Foundation</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards costs for the “Hauora Hakinakina - Wellbeing through Sport” programme, venue, bin and toilet hire, trophies, prizes, refreshments, photography, coaches, Maori Warden donation, traffic management and St Johns ambulance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-146</td>
<td>LG2013-146</td>
<td>Pacific Fusion Fashion Show</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for the “Dressed in Confidence” wellness program as part of the “Pacific Fusion Fashion Show”, including vouchers and international guest speaker fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-147</td>
<td>LG2013-147</td>
<td>Pacific Island Law Student’s Association</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards venue hire costs for the Pacific Island Law Student’s Association, “Annual Law Dinner 2019”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-148</td>
<td>LG2013-148</td>
<td>The Raukatauri Music Therapy Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards venue hire and transport costs for the “Music Therapy Satellite” programme in Otara.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-149</td>
<td>LG2013-149</td>
<td>Faith City Trust Board</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for “Project Wy” including printing of booklets and mentoring costs from 1 November 2019 to 4 September 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-151</td>
<td>LG2013-151</td>
<td>Papatoetoe Central Main Street Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards the Chinese New Year 2020 event costs including entertainment, costume hire, advertising and traffic management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-152</td>
<td>The Auckland Sikh Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards event costs of the 550th birthday of Guru Nanak Gurpurab, founder of the Sikh faith, including venue hire, advertising, food and facilitation.</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-154</td>
<td>Otara Health Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards costs for the Otara Sports Awards 2019 event, including trophies, venue hire, judges panel donation, media production and advertising.</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-155</td>
<td>Independent Living Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for cooking classes for the elderly, including venue hire, food, utensils, administration and petrol vouchers.</td>
<td>$2,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-157</td>
<td>Otara Health Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards costs for the “Otara Christmas in the Park 2019” event, including sausage sizzle, children’s rides, security, stage, costume and theatre property hire, performance fees, administration, media, communications and also costs for a community hui.</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-159</td>
<td>Elementz Sports Group Incorporated</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards team apparel for the “Elementreez” touch football coaching programme.</td>
<td>$5,634.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-161</td>
<td>Youthline Auckland Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards training, managing and supervising costs for Youthline Auckland.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-162</td>
<td>Otara Gambling and Alcohol Action Group Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Toward operations costs for the Otara Gambling and Alcohol Action Group, including online design, social media, alcohol free stencils and water-blasting, print design, flyers and volunteer support.</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application ID</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Main Focus</td>
<td>Requesting funding for</td>
<td>Amount requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-163</td>
<td>Papatoetoe Central Seniors Association Incorporated</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards venue hire and travel costs, for the “Happy Community, Better Life” programme.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2013-165</td>
<td>David Riley</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards book publishing costs including shipping, and illustration fees.</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$422,828.82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application in Multi-Board Round One 2019/2020, as outlined in Table Two:

Table Two: Ōtara-Papatoetoe Multi-Board Round One 2019/2020 applications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Main 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 towards sports equipment and a refurbished boxing facility in Mangere.</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-110</td>
<td>The Korean Society of Auckland Incorporated</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Toward costs for the Korean Day annual event on 14th 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 wages for professional mentors and a soloist to rehearse and deliver a concert.</td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-118</td>
<td>CNSST Foundation, formerly known as Chinese New Settlers Services Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for the “A Brighter Future for You” cohesion project, including venue hire, tablet and teaching fees.</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-123</td>
<td>Connect the Dots</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards costs for the &quot;Make Moments&quot; art workshop, including tutor fees, printing of postcards and art materials.</td>
<td>$2,887.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-141</td>
<td>Royal New Zealand Foundation of The Blind Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of digital talking books for the Blind Foundation library.</td>
<td>$1,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-144</td>
<td>Epilepsy Association of New Zealand Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards educators’ salary, fuel and telecommunications costs to deliver epilepsy support services.</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-146</td>
<td>Roopa Aur Aap Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the costs to provide family violence victim support, including rent, administration staff costs, counsellors and social worker salaries from 2 September 2019 to 28 August 2020.</td>
<td>$10,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-151</td>
<td>New Zealand Nepal Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards costs for the Nepal Festival 2020 event, including audio visual hire, insurance, waste management, marketing, and travel.</td>
<td>$8,007.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-152</td>
<td>Mika Haka Foundation Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the costs of the “YES Creative Hub” from 10 October 2019 to 10 October 2020, specifically rent, public liability insurance, utilities, safety officer’s salary and administration.</td>
<td>$9,794.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-153</td>
<td>The Operating Theatre Trust</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards 2,000 free show tickets and transport for children from low decile schools to attend the theatre production &quot;Greedy Cat&quot; by Joy Cowley.</td>
<td>$3,103.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-155</td>
<td>YMCA North</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards a contribution for costs for the “Counties Manukau Intermediate Sports Camps,” including catering, accommodation, YMCA staff, sports coaches, St Johns ambulance, medals, trophies and sports equipment.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-161</td>
<td>The Parkinson’s New Zealand Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the salary of six Auckland Parkinson’s community educators for the period of 1 October 2019 to 1 October 2020.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 22   | MB1920-164 | Counties Manukau Sports Foundation | Sport and recreation | Towards the catering, venue hire, event coordinator fee, decorations and printing costs to host the “2019 Counties Manukau Sporting Excellence Awards.” | $3,000.00  
| 22   | MB1920-170 | Environmental Education for Resource Sustainability Trust | Environment | Towards costs of the “Paper4trees” programme in schools and pre-schools, including native plants, courier fees, classroom bins, administration and office expenses. | $7,941.62  
| 22   | MB1920-178 | Kokotala Limited | Community | Towards financial literacy workshop costs, including venue hire, course material, information technology setup, an advertising banner, flyers and signage. | $3,333.33  
|      |          |              |          | Total       | $78,067.58 |

**Horopaki Context**

8. 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.

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

10. 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.

11. The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board adopted their grants programme for 2019/2020 on the 19th of March 2019 (OP/2019/83) and will operate three quick response and two local grant rounds for this financial year. Further to this is the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Excellence Awards which is open all year (OP/2018/144).

12. 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, community networks and workshops.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

13. 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
14. Based on the main focus of an application, a subject matter expert from the relevant department will provide input and advice. The main focus of an application is identified as arts, community, events, sport and recreation, environment or heritage.
15. 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
16. Local boards are responsible for the decision-making and allocation of local board community grants. The Ōtara-Papatoetoe 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.
17. The local board is requested to note that section 48 of the Community Grants Policy states “We will also provide feedback to unsuccessful grant applications about why they have been declined, so they will know what they can do to increase their chances of success next time”.
18. A summary of each application received through Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Grant Round One and Multi-Board Round One 2019/2020 (see Attachment B and C) is provided.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement
19. 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 grants processes.
20. Twenty-six applicants applying to Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Grant Round One and 11 multi-board applicants indicated that their project targets Māori or Māori outcomes.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications
21. The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board adopted the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Grants Programme 2019/2020 on 19 March 2019 (see Attachment A). The document sets application guidelines for contestable community grants submitted to the local board.
22. This report presents applications received for the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Grants and Multi-Board Grants, Round One 2019/2020 (see Attachment’s B and C)
23. The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board has set a total community grants budget of $360,000 for the 2019/2020 financial year.
24. A total of $9,248 has been allocated for the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Excellence Awards. This leaves an amount of $350,752 available for contestable grants.
25. Forty-one applications were received for Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Grants, Round One 2018/2019, requesting a total of $422,828.82. In addition, 16 applications were received for Ōtara-Papatoetoe Multi-Board Grants, Round One 2018/2019 requesting a total of $78,067.58.
26. In total, fifty-seven applications were received for consideration by the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board for Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Grants and Multi-Board Grants, Round One 2019/2020 with a total funding request of $500,896.40.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
27. The allocation of grants occurs within the guidelines and criteria of the Community Grants Policy and the local boards programme. The assessment process has identified a low risk associated with funding the applications in this round.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
28. Following the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board allocation of funding for Local Grants and Multi-Board Grants Round One, Commercial and Finance staff will notify the applicants of the local board’s decision and facilitate payment of the grant.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
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Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board – Local Grants Programme 2019/2020

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

Outcomes sought from the local grants programme

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

Our grants programme will be targeted towards supporting the following outcomes, as outlined in our Local Board Plan 2017.

- Manukau transformation
- Revitalising town centres
- Parks and facilities that meet people’s needs
- Healthy natural environment
- Empowered, inclusive and prosperous communities
- Honouring youth and seniors
- It is easy to get around

Our priorities for grants

The Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board welcomes grants applications that align with one or more of the following local board plan priorities:

- Promote economic development and public safety in the town centres and strengthen their roles as community hubs
- Improve water quality in local streams
- Minimise waste going to landfill
- Reduce plant and animal pests through safe neighbourhood action
- Celebrate heritage and cultural diversity of our communities
- Community capacity building and empowerment
- Promote better health and wellbeing in the community
- Promote community economic wellbeing and local employment
- Promote youth leadership and participation in employment, education training and business
- Ensure seniors in our area have access to quality facilities resources and activities
- Create opportunities for interactions between young and old
- Support local residents and organisations who will represent the area to demonstrate their excellence in conference and events
- Recognise and celebrate the contributions of the local applicants.

Note: these priorities relate to the local board initiatives as outlined in the Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board Plan 2017.
Higher Priorities

The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board will prioritise applications that align to the healthy environment principles including:

- smoke free, alcohol and drug free
- zero-waste
- promotion of healthy options for food and drink, including water as the first choice
- promotion of active lifestyles

Lower Priorities:

We will also consider applications for other services, projects, events and activities. However, these may be considered a lower priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Priority Areas</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ōtara – Papatoetoe Local Board will give applications lower priority and less favourable consideration if they contain one or more of the following:</td>
<td>- Ticketed events, commercial events or events that promote a brand or company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The purchase of assets, gear and equipment with limited future use or wider benefit to the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Feasibility studies, need analysis, project plan development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The board has also identified the following financial situation of an applicant, as a lower priority for funding:</td>
<td>- Applicant is not making any financial contribution of their own to the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Applicant has not considered other sources of funding for their project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Applicant has the capacity to access funding from other sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wages and salaries, except where requested project facilitator fees are one-off costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the **eligibility criteria** outlined in the Community Grants Policy, the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board will not fund:

- Applicants who failed to provide accountability forms from a previous funding allocation
- Applicants who provided unsatisfactory accountability forms from a previous funding allocation.

**Investment approach**

The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board has allocated budgets to support the local grants programme as follows:

a) **Quick Response Local Grants:**
   - Minimum amount per grant: $500
   - Maximum amount per grant: $2,000

b) **Local Grants:**
   - Minimum amount per grant: $2,000

c) **Pursuit of Excellence Grants:**
   - Maximum amount per grant: $2,000

**Application dates**

Grant rounds for 2019/2020 will be as follows:

**Quick Response 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>14 October 2019</td>
<td>8 November 2019</td>
<td>10 December 2019</td>
<td>20 December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>20 April 2020</td>
<td>15 May 2020</td>
<td>16 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>26 July 2019</td>
<td>17 September 2019</td>
<td>1 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>10 February 2020</td>
<td>20 March 2020</td>
<td>19 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multi-board funding: we have agreed to work with other local boards to deliver multi-board funding on a case-by-case basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019/2020 multi-board 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>3 June 2019</td>
<td>19 July 2019</td>
<td>17 September 2019</td>
<td>1 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>20 January 2020</td>
<td>13 March 2020</td>
<td>19 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pursuit of Excellence Grants:
The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board set up the Pursuit of Excellence Award to:
- increase the profile and image of the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board area assist applicants to build their capacity in serving the community
- Promote diverse participation in local government and civic life
- Foster the development of a sustainable workforce for local industry and surrounds
- Strengthen the development of community unity in Ōtara-Papatoetoe.

Pursuit of Excellence Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply anytime within the grant round year 1 June 2019 – 1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accountability measures
The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board requires all successful applicants to:
- provide information on how the project contributed to local board priorities and outcomes
- extend to the local board chairperson an invitation to the funded project, programme, activity or event where appropriate
- meet council standard financial accountability requirements
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To approve:
   - preparation of a plan to improve safety and increase use and participation of the park by the local community in the short-term
   - preparation of a programme of work to support master planning for the medium and long-term future of the Sports Bowl
   - further investigation into a short-list of sport and recreation services to be provided at the redeveloped Manukau Sports Bowl.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. Manukau Sports Bowl is a 21ha park strategically located adjacent to State Highway One and near Manukau City Centre and the proposed light-rail station. The park forms part of the Panuku led Transform Manukau programme and has capacity to meet regional plus local sport and recreational provision gaps and provide a recreational hub for Manukau’s growing population.

3. The Manukau Sports Bowl is a significant site, but under-utilised and not meeting its potential to support local community sport and recreation needs. The council has an opportunity, through the Transform Manukau programme, to enhance and develop the park.

4. The local board provided $20,000 Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) opex (OP/2017/86) in FY18 and $20,000 LDI opex (OP/2018/105) in FY19 to identify regional and local sport and recreation needs to inform future provision at the park. The local board provided feedback on assessment findings at a March 2019 workshop and informally agreed a short-list which will inform the next phase of planning.

5. It is recommended that the board approves the short-list of services for further investigation and supports preparation of a programme of work that outlines principles, timelines and steps to develop a masterplan for the park. It is also recommended that the board supports preparation of a plan to improve park safety and increase use and participation by the local community in the short-term without compromising future park development.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) approve further investigation of the following short-list of sport and recreation services to be provided at the redeveloped Manukau Sports Bowl:
   - Indoor court facility (including basketball, volleyball and table tennis)
   - Cycle/walkways – loop track network
   - 3x3 outdoor basketball courts
   - Velodrome
   - Tennis centre
• Athletics track
• Informal recreation space
• Destination play space
• Sports fields (potentially 24-hour use capability)
• Olympic pool
• Informal sportsfields to provide for beach volleyball, kilikiti, kabaddi, grid iron and touch rugby.

b) approve preparation of a programme of work to support master planning for the medium and long-term future of the Sports Bowl

c) approve preparation of a plan to improve park safety and increase use and participation by the local community in the short-term without compromising future park development

d) support staff investigating Manukau Sports Bowl funding opportunities through the Transform Manukau programme.

e) note that funding has not yet been identified for capital investment into the Manukau Sports Bowl.

Horopaki Context

6. Manukau Sports Bowl is a 21ha park strategically located close to Manukau City Centre and readily accessible from the Southern Motorway.

7. There are several drivers for redeveloping the park including:
   • under-utilisation
   • a lack of pedestrian/cycling connectivity and poor legibility of the park’s design
   • a suboptimal and underutilised velodrome.

8. There are also opportunities relating to redeveloping the Sports Bowl including:
   • The scope of Panuku’s Transform Manukau programme includes the Sports Bowl, and there may be potential to deliver capital investment in the medium term through that programme.
   • Opportunities to increase safety and recreational provision for the local community without compromising future park development.

9. In 2018, the local board funded a sport and recreation needs assessment (Attachment A) and Panuku funded a desktop study of community facility needs assessment (Attachment B). The key findings of these assessments are discussed below.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

10. Visitor Solutions assessed the sport and recreational needs related to the key facilities located on the Sports Bowl and reviewed council and sporting strategic plans, together with desktop analysis of demographic and population needs. Consultation with lessees will form part of the next phase of investigations.

11. The assessment noted potential for some parcels of land around the margins of the Sports Bowl to be vested for an alternative future use but recommended that a detailed feasibility
and master planning exercise focusing on identified sport and community needs first be completed.

12. The assessment prioritised the following codes and activities as medium/high to very high based on gaps in the regional network:
   - Indoor court facility (including basketball and volleyball)
   - Indoor table tennis centre
   - Cycleways
   - Walkways
   - 3x3 outdoor basketball courts
   - Velodrome
   - Destination playground
   - Tennis centre

13. Parks, Sports and Recreation staff’s initial analysis indicates that the best mix of development options are those that involve meeting the highest priority indoor court facility needs (in alignment with the Draft Auckland Indoor Court Facilities Plan) and the highest priority local needs such as 3x3 outdoor basketball courts, destination playground, walking and cycling pathway connections and informal sportsfield space.

**Key findings of the community facility needs assessment**

14. The high-level Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board community facility provision assessment found that there are no significant projected provision deficiencies identified except for indoor court and library space. We note however that the Sports bowl is not well located for library provision; the nearby Manukau City Centre library is better located. Indoor court space is discussed above.

**Local Board short-list**

15. At a March 2019 workshop the local board provided feedback on the assessment findings and supported further investigation with the community on the following recommended short-list of services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services Short-list</th>
<th>Services Short-list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor court facility (including basketball, volleyball and table tennis)</td>
<td>Cycle/walkways – loop track network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x3 outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td>Velodrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis centre</td>
<td>Athletics track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal recreation space</td>
<td>Destination play space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports fields (potentially 24-hour use capability)</td>
<td>Olympic pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal sportsfields to provide for beach volleyball, kilikiti, kabaddi, grid iron and touch rugby.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Services short-list for further investigation
Suggested programme of work

16. Staff recommend further investigation is carried out with Panuku and the local board to identify capital funding for redevelopment of the Sports Bowl and funding to develop a masterplan that shapes its long-term future.

17. The masterplan should:
   - provide a framework for the local board’s decision-making and investment for future development of the park and its facilities
   - develop an integrated and cohesive approach to designing the park
   - further investigate services identified in the short-list (table 1)
   - consider the network gaps and opportunities for sport and recreation alongside the plans of park lessees
   - ensure local sport and recreational needs are identified through working with the local community, mana whenua and mataawaka.

18. As funding for a masterplan has not yet been identified, staff recommend designing a short-term improvement plan that won’t undermine long term aspirations including:
   - Safety: crown-lift trees and remove selected bushes to increase sight-lines in and through the park.
   - Loop track: activate the park by developing an all-weather loop track that provides for walking, jogging, cycling, scooters, trikes and bikes. The track should connect with the existing pathway along the park road and provide all-weather access from Sandrine Avenue.
   - Play provision: improve informal play and nature play opportunities
   - Youth activations: provide beach volleyball, 3x3 basketball court and other activations.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

19. Staff have discussed with Panuku the opportunity for capital expenditure on the Sports Bowl, however further work is needed to understand that opportunity.

   Parks, Sports and Recreation staff have worked with the Service Strategy and Integration (SS&I) team who are responsible for the development of park masterplans to determine masterplan costs and next steps for the Sports Bowl. There is also a need for further work to investigate local needs and impacts to inform the scope of a masterplan.

20. A masterplan is noted as a possible work programme item for the Financial Year 2020/2021, subject to funding being identified.

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

Local impacts and local board views
https://acintranet.aklc.govt.nz/EN/workingatcouncil/techandtools/infocouncil/Pages/LocalImpactsAndLocalBoardViews.aspx

21. Workshops were held with the local board in November 2017 to provide feedback on project scope. In March 2019 the board provided feedback and recommendations on the short-list of services to inform masterplan preparation. The local board requested the inclusion of local sports including kilikiti, kabaddi, grid iron and touch rugby and a potential Olympic Swimming pool to be included in the short-list of services.
22. Approval of this report is a step towards delivering the following Local Board Plan 2017 outcomes:
   • Outcome 1: Manukau Transformation - Manukau metropolitan centre becomes the thriving heart of our area: an attractive visitor destination, business centre and place to shop, live, learn, work and play.
   • Outcome 2: Parks and facilities that meet people’s needs - Our communities have access to parks and facilities to help build a sense of identity and belonging, boost participation in community activities, and promote healthy lifestyles.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

23. Redevelopment of the Manukau Sports Bowl will benefit the local community and iwi through increased access to sport and recreation. The masterplan will be prepared using Te Aranga Māori Design principles and will reflect the sport and recreational needs of tangata whenua through consultation and engagement.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

24. The following actions to be undertaken in financial year 2019/2020 will be covered by staff time and come at no cost to the board:
   • further investigation of the short-list of sport and recreation services to be provided at the redeveloped Manukau Sports Bowl
   • investigating Manukau Sports Bowl funding opportunities through the Transform Manukau programme
   • preparation of a plan to improve park safety and increase use and participation by the local community in the short-term without compromising future park development.

25. The progression of a masterplan in financial year 2020/2021 will require approximately $60,000 local board LDI opex and/or Panuku funding.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

26. Community consultation will form part of the masterplan and improvement plan preparation process.

27. To prevent raising local community expectations, masterplan consultation will clearly communicate the timeframes and phasing for Manukau Sports Bowl redevelopment.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

28. Parks, Sport and Recreation will continue working with the local board and Panuku to design a programme of work as noted above, including incorporating drafting of a masterplan into the SS&I work programme in financial year 2020-2021, subject to funding being identified.

29. Short-term park improvements will be workshoped in Q4, 2020 to inform next steps.
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Planning the future of the Manukau Sports Bowl
Landowner application for Puhinui Bridge and collector road connection from 100 Prices Road to 69 McLaughlins Road, Wiri

File No.: CP2019/14083

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To request landowner approval from the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board on behalf of the applicant, Southern Gateway Consortium, for the construction of the Puhinui Bridge and collector road between 100 Prices Road and 69 McLaughlins Road, Wiri, Auckland 2104.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The proposal is to create a permanent bridge and a collector road by extending Prices Road to McLaughlins Road across Puhinui Stream. The link across Puhinui Stream opens a new access route between Puhinui and Wiri for both vehicle traffic and other transport modes.

3. These works are proposed to enable the development of 150ha of land owned by the Southern Gateway Consortium bounded by Puhinui Road, (State Highway 20B), State Highway 20, the Puhinui Stream and Prices Road. This land is zoned Light Industrial in the Auckland Unitary Plan – Operative in Part and is within the Puhinui Precinct. The land on McLaughlins Road is zoned Heavy Industry Zone.

4. The road and bridge connect to roading infrastructure improvements on Puhinui Road that are being undertaken by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) and include a relocated and upgraded intersection with Prices Road. These works will be undertaken jointly by the Southern Gateway Consortium, Auckland International Airport Limited, NZTA, Auckland Transport and Auckland Council.

5. The bridge crossing is designed as a five-span structure with a single span structure across the Puhinui Stream. The remaining four spans include two 37m, one 20m and one 16m span making a total length of 147m. The new road and bridge will feature footpaths on both sides and cycle provision on the northern side, to encourage cycling by commuters, and will connect to Te Araroa Trail.

6. A four-arm roundabout is to be created at the Prices Road end and a Give Way control on McLaughlins Road’s southern approach giving priority between the new road link and the northern approach of McLaughlins Road. The access from the proposed roundabout connects to the current access into Colin Dale Park.

7. Vegetation clearance is required for the construction of footings on the west side of the bridge that will be restored in accordance with the Puhinui Precinct Plan. Erosion and sediment control measures will be adopted to minimise the effects on Puhinui Stream and stormwater runoff from the new road and bridge surface will be treated prior to discharge to Puhinui Stream.

8. Auckland Transport will own, manage and maintain the infrastructure as part of the hand-over at the end of the project.

9. The Southern Gateway Consortium have been engaging with Te Ākitai Waiohua as identified in the Auckland Unitary Plan - Operative in Part as having strong spiritual association with the Puhinui area and have reached an agreement.

10. Mana Whenua engagement is required to be undertaken with all interested iwi. In this regard, further meaningful engagement is recommended with Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngāti te
Ata Waiohua to allow full assessment and review of the proposal with a Cultural Impact Assessment and agreement between parties if requested by iwi.

11. Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua advises us that the Puhinui-Matukutureia area is of significant interest to Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua, as their eponymous ancestor Te Ata i Rehia was born on Matukutureia and shares a close whakapapa relationship with Te Ākitai Waiohua.

**Ngā tūtohunga**

**Recommendation/s**

That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) approve the landowner application from Southern Gateway Consortium for the construction of the Puhinui Bridge and collector road between 100 Prices Road and 69 McLaughlins Road, Wiri, on Aerovista Place Reserve which is legally described as Lot 3 DP 160324 with the following condition:

i. Southern Gateway consortium to undertake thorough engagement with Ngāti te Ata Waiohua and Ngāti Tamao to allow full assessment and review of the proposal with a Cultural Impact Assessment and agreement between parties if requested by Mana Whenua, prior to resource consent being approved.

**Horopaki**

**Context**

**Site details**

12. The council land is within the Aerovista Place Reserve and is an unclassified local purpose (esplanade) reserve subject to the Reserves Act 1977. The land is zoned informal recreation. The adjoining land, Southern Gateway Consortium's (the Consortium) land, is zoned light industry in the Auckland Unitary Plan – Operative in Part (AUP-OP) and is within the Puhinui Precinct. The land on McLaughlins Road is zoned heavy industry as indicated in Attachment A to this report.

13. The new road and bridge alignment is close to the existing pipelines that carry petroleum products to and from Wiri Oil Terminal. The surrounding area is pastoral, with the proposed bridge and road alignment crossing the Puhinui Stream and related floodplain. The bridge crosses through a Significant Ecological Area that extends from the north along the whole stream alignment and much of the riparian area. Part of the restored riparian margin that has reached canopy closure is identified for vegetation removal and replanting.

**Proposal**

14. The new road connects SH20B Puhinui Road and McLaughlins Road. This construction ensures that adequate transport infrastructure capacity is in place prior to land use development and future subdivision. Attachment B to this report, Assessment of Environmental Effects, outlines the proposed works and planned mitigation. The proposed works are planned to start in January/February 2020 with an 18-24-month construction period.

15. The Prices Road extension is proposed to have a 23.10 metre road reserve width, consisting of a 9.5 metre carriageway, with the remaining width providing for a berm, footpath and utility corridor on each side as indicated in Figure 1. The northern side also includes a dedicated cycle path. The cycle path is clear of the carriageway and there are limited vehicle access opportunities as it is an industrial area with large sites, contributing to a safe cycleway.
16. Two new intersections are proposed at each end of the new section of road with a roundabout controlling a crossroad junction at the northern end providing an entrance to Colin Dale Park with a future access road towards the east. An intersection at the McLaughlins Road end will be controlled by a priority Give Way on the southern approach giving priority between the new road link and the northern approach of McLaughlins Road. The new Give Way control on the McLaughlins Road approach will be supported with a realignment in order to reduce speeds and promote the new Prices Road corridor as the primary movement in the future. The radii and carriageway widths have been minimised to control turning speeds while still accommodating the appropriate design for vehicles.

17. The five-span bridge structure is designed with the abutments to be outside the 100-year floodplain with the footing being 10 metres back from the top of the stream bank edge on both the east and west sides. There is safety railing for protection along the length of the bridge.

18. The underside level of the bridge is 3.4m above the ground level at the intermediate bridge footing on the western bank where the Te Araroa Trail is located. This is approximately 11.58mRL, which is 600mm above the 50-year Average Recurrence Interval flood plain level as indicated in Figure 2.

19. The walkway/cycle access track connecting to Te Araroa Trail is currently on private land but will be constructed to the council standards and specifications and vested to the council on completion of the subdivision. This is indicated in Attachment C to this report.
Vegetation clearance and stormwater considerations

20. To enable construction, some riparian vegetation from along Puhinui Stream will be removed and the species composition under the bridge changed as currently many of the species present there will grow taller than the bridge. The landowner approval will include specific conditions regarding replanting such as the species used for enrichment, stream edge planting, spacing and a three-year maintenance schedule as requested by the council’s ecologist and senior arboriculture and eco specialist. An overview of the project was provided to the Puhinui Stream Steering Group.

21. Stormwater during construction and runoff from the road will be treated to the required standard via a centralised bio-retention device in this sub catchment prior to discharging into the stormwater network. The device is sized for hydrological mitigation (retention and detention), which results in a larger device than a water quality only device to provide the required water quality treatment for the catchment.

Planning Context

22. The application aligns with the Ōtara - Papatoetoe Local Board Plan 2017, specifically Outcome 7: It’s easy to get around, as the proposed works will ensure connectivity including walking and cycle way accessibility.

23. The Puhinui Precinct as outlined in the Auckland Unitary Plan – Operative in Part (AUP-OP) allows for development if it is supported by transport infrastructure. It states that significant transport upgrades will be required to support the level of development and to ensure transport network improvements are coordinated. This reflects its significant size and the strategic location of light industry zoned land in proximity to the intersection of two major transport corridors and the critical link to Auckland International Airport.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

24. The options for the local board are to approve or decline the landowner request for the Puhinui Bridge and road connection.

25. The advantages of approving the landowner application are that:

- the proposed connection will enable the development of the land within the Puhinui Precinct as planned in the Auckland Unitary Plan – Operative in Part
- essential roading infrastructure and connectivity provides an important link between Puhinui and Wiri in the local road network
- the bridge crossing over Puhinui Stream has been located and designed to avoid and minimise adverse effects on the significant ecological area in the riparian margin of the stream
- the bioretention device is designed to provide the requisite filtration to remove contaminants from road stormwater runoff
- the bridge aesthetics will be carefully considered at the detailed design phase as it is going over the top of our national trail, so detailing will be important
- the Consortium have committed to cultural design input as agreed with Te Ākitai prior to the bridge detailed design being approved by the council as a condition of resource consent.

26. As discussed in the previous sections Mana Whenua engagement is required to be undertaken with all interested iwi. In this regard, further thorough engagement is recommended with Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngāti te Ata to allow full assessment and review of the proposal with a Cultural Impact Assessment and agreement between parties if requested.
27. If the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board declines the landowner application essential infrastructure and connectivity to the Puhinui Precinct and airport will not be able to proceed. Business growth and employment opportunities for local and neighbouring communities would be inhibited and this option is not recommended by staff.

Specialists’ comments/consultation

28. Auckland Council’s parks and places specialists, senior arboriculture and eco specialist, senior maintenance delivery coordinators, senior parks planner and local board advisors have reviewed the proposal and are in support of the Puhinui Bridge and collector road proceeding. The landowner approval conditions will include mitigation planting with detailed landscape design, a maintenance schedule and reinstatement to be undertaken at the completion of the construction works.

Recommendation

29. The recommendation to the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board is to approve the application for the construction of the Puhinui Bridge and road connection between 100 Prices Road and 69 McLaughlins Road, Wiri as the overarching benefits to the local and wider communities with increased connectivity to the roading networks of SH20, SH20B and employment opportunities during construction and future light industrial land use will be beneficial. The area is culturally significant to Ngāti te Ata and Ngāti Tamaoho as well as Te Ākitai so further on-going engagement is recommended prior to resource consent being granted.

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

30. The Consortium has had early and ongoing consultation with Auckland Transport on the many transport related aspects of the proposal. These include the road and bridge design and alignment, the provision of both off and on-road footpaths and cycleways (including the link to Te Araroa Trail), stormwater drainage and treatment for the road and construction traffic effects. These matters have all been resolved or will be the subject of conditions of resource consent.

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

31. Workshops to outline the proposal and respond to questions were held with Ōtara-Papatoetoe and Manurewa Local Boards and staff. All matters have been answered or will become part of the conditions of the formal landowner approval. These include queries about engagement with mana whenua, lighting, safety for egress and entry to the new road, embossing of the underside of the bridge, planting remediation, stormwater run-off during construction and on completion when operating as part of the roading network. All conditions will be mirrored in the resource consent conditions by the senior parks planner.

32. The collector road and bridge will be a time saving connection to the roading networks of SH20, SH20B for locals travelling to work and to the airport and for business transportation especially when the subdivision of the surrounding land to light industry is completed. The path connections to both Colin Dale and Puhinui Reserves will provide improved connectivity for all park users.

33. Recreational use will also be improved as a result of increased walking and cycling connections to Te Araroa Trail and Colin Dale Park.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

34. Te Ākitai Waiohua have had on-going engagement with the Consortium and have signed a comprehensive commitment by Southern Gateway Consortium to matters raised by Te
35. An initial site visit and follow up meeting with Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngai Tai Ki Tamaki and Ngāti te Ata Waiohua has been undertaken, but further engagement is required. A commitment to a Cultural Impact Assessment and an agreement if requested by Ngāti te Ata Waiohua and Ngāti Tamaoho is recommended to meet landowner requirements prior to resource consent being granted.

36. Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua advises us that the Puhinui-Matukureia area is of significant interest to Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua, as their eponymous ancestor Te Ata i Rehia was born on Matukureia and shares a close whakapapa relationship with Te Ākitai Waiohua.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

37. On completion of the bridge and road construction, ownership and management is to be transferred to Auckland Transport so there are no financial operational implications for the local board. The walkway/cycle access track connecting to Te Araroa Trail is currently on private land but will be constructed to the council standards and specifications and vested to the council on completion of the subdivision.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

38. Improvements to the roading network is required to be undertaken concurrently with urban development of the Puhinui Precinct. Without this connectivity the functionality of the road network including the critical link to Auckland International Airport will not be created and maintained. The construction ensures more transport choices with a cycle and walkway and closer relationship between home and work access.

39. If the proposal is declined suitable business land will be inaccessible. The bridge and road connection increase efficient use of business land and improves opportunities for affordable business with the light industrial zone being accessible. Additional business zoned land will assist in the economic prosperity of Auckland.

40. The bridge and road infrastructure could cut off access and links to the open space and the esplanade reserve, but this is mitigated for the Puhinui Reserve with the proposal to create a walkway from the bridge connecting to Te Araroa Trail. This will provide public walking and cycling access. The roading entrance to Colin Dale Park will be upgraded with a new road off the proposed roundabout to give a more defined access point to the park. Pedestrian access to Colin Dale Park is to be considered at a later stage.

41. Water quality could be degraded during construction and subsequent use of the road and bridge. Silt fences are planned to prevent sediment laden water entering the Puhinui Stream and around each earthworks catchment dirty water diversions are proposed taking any sediment laden water to the sediment retention ponds or decanting earth bunds as outlined in the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.

42. Areas where vegetation removal is required will be replanted with suitable indigenous, riparian plant species. Species selection for replanting will focus on low vertical growing, shade tolerant species to cope with the shade and height of the bridge.

43. If comprehensive engagement with all interested iwi is not undertaken there is a risk that landowner obligations will not be meet.
 Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

44. If the application is approved the decision will be communicated to the applicant with a formal land owner approval letter. Conditions will be placed on the land owner approval regarding (but not limited to):

- health and safety conditions
- ensuring the applicant controls rubbish at the site
- planting and maintenance schedule to be provided to the council’s senior arboriculture and eco specialist for approval
- compliance with all regulatory documents
- reinstatement of the council land such as the grass reinstated and the remainder of the reserve to at least its original condition.
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Attachment A: Auckland Unitary Plan – Operative in Part - Land Zoning

The Southern Gateway Consortium’s land is zoned Light Industry Zone in the Auckland Unitary Plan – Operative in Part (AUP-OP) and is within the Puhinui Precinct. The land on McLaughlins Road is zoned Heavy Industry Zone.

Figure 1: Location of the application and Unitary Plan land zoning
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1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

Southern Gateway Consortium (the Consortium) seeks resource consent for subdivision, earthworks, a bridge and related stream works, and stormwater discharges in relation to new and upgraded road infrastructure and a bridge over the Puhinui Stream at Prices Road, Puhinui. These works are proposed to enable the development of 150ha of land owned by the Consortium bounded by Puhinui Road (State Highway 20B), State Highway 20, the Puhinui Stream and Prices Road. The proposed bridge over the Puhinui Stream will connect Prices Road to McLaughlins Road. The consent boundary is depicted on Figure 1.1.

These works are being undertaken in anticipation of road infrastructure improvements on Puhinui Road that are being undertaken by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA), which are to comprise a relocated and upgraded intersection with Prices Road. These works will be undertaken jointly by the Consortium, Auckland International Airport Limited, NZTA, Auckland Transport and Auckland Council.

The Consortium’s land is zoned Light Industry Zone in the Auckland Unitary Plan – Operative in Part (AUP-OP) and is within the Puhinui Precinct. The land on McLaughlins Road is zoned Heavy Industry Zone (Figure 1.2).

1.2 Document Structure

This Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) has been prepared to meet the requirements of Section 88 and the Fourth Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The AUP-OP also has specific requirements that are fully set out in Section 5 of this AEE. The AEE relies on the separately provided plans and documents listed below:

- Computer Register (CFR) Land Title;
- Geotechnical Investigation Report Southern Gateway – Prices to McLaughlin Connection, Wiri (Geotechnical Report) by Lander Geotechnical Consultants J00863 dated 28 September 2018;
- Prices Road Bridge: Design Requirements Report. (Bridge Design Report) Novare Design October 2018
- Stormwater Management Plan and Flood Risk Assessment: Southern Gateway Consortium Prices Road to McLaughlin Road Link (SMP/FRA) Stormwater Solutions CKL L3028 29 October 2018
- Memo: Southern Gateway – Puhinui Bridge Stream Crossing Assessment (Ecological Report) CKL 1 November 2018
- L3028 – Southern Gateway Prices Road, Wiri Engineering & Infrastructure Report by CKL dated 31 October 2018 (Engineering Report); and
- Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) and Site Management Plan (SMP) 100 Prices Road & 69 McLaughlins Road, Wiri Reps 1212/PSI/2018 and 1212a/SMP/2018 September 2018 Geosciences Ltd.
Figure 1.1  Consent Boundary, Oil Pipelines and Proposed Infrastructure Works

Figure 1.2  General Location of Application Land and Unitary Plan Zoning
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1.3 Consent Requirements

The proposed activity requires the resource consents for the following reasons:

**Auckland Unitary Plan: Operative in Part**

- Subdivision that does not comply with Standard I432.6.1 Transport (Table I432.4.2 (A54)) as a non-complying activity.
- Vacant site subdivision in the Light Industry Zone that meets minimum site sizes and access (Table E38.4.3 (A35) as a restricted discretionary activity.
- Vegetation removal for a network utility (road) not meeting standards for vegetation clearance in E26.3.5.2 in relation to the riparian margin and the Significant Ecological Area (Table 26.3.3.1 (A77)) as a restricted discretionary activity.
- A new bridge (and associated bed disturbance, reclamation, diversion of water etc.) over the Puhinui Stream within a Significant Ecological Area complying with standards (Table E3.4.1 (A29)) as a discretionary activity.
- Earthworks for a network utility > 2500m² and > 2500m³ (Table E26.5.3.1 (A97) and (A202)) and earthworks for a network utility within a Sediment Control Protection Area (Table E26.5.3.2 (A107)) all as a restricted discretionary activity.
- Diversion and discharge of stormwater runoff from impervious areas and from > 5000m² of road complying with standards (Table E8.4.1 (A5) and (A11)) as a restricted discretionary and discretionary activity respectively.

**Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011**

To enable soil disturbance and removal from a piece of land that is subject to the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011 (NESC) in the absence of a detailed site investigation the proposed development is to be considered as a discretionary activity under Regulation 11 of the NESC.

1.3.1 Overlays, Controls and Designations

In addition to the zoning and precinct provisions noted above, it is noted that the following overlays, controls and designations apply to the site:

**Overlays:**

Significant Ecological Area Overlay applies to the Puhinui Stream and riparian area, through which the bridge will pass.

Natural Resources: High-Use Stream Management Areas Overlay

Natural Resources: High-Use Aquifer Management Areas Overlay [rp] - Manukau Southeast Kaawa
Natural Resources: High-Use Aquifer Management Areas Overlay [rp] - Manukau Waitemata Aquifer

Infrastructure: Aircraft Noise Overlay - High aircraft noise area (HANA), Auckland Airport - high aircraft noise area

Infrastructure: Aircraft Noise Overlay - Moderate aircraft noise area (MANA), Auckland Airport - moderate aircraft noise area

Controls: Emergency Management Area Control - New Zealand Refining Pipeline, Infrastructure

Macroinvertebrate Community Index - Rural

Stormwater Management Area Control - Puhinui, Flow 1

Designations: Airspace Restriction Designations - ID 1102, Protection of aeronautical functions - obstacle limitation surfaces, Auckland International Airport Ltd

Overall, the application is for a non-complying activity.
2. Existing Environment

This section of the report describes the overall wider environment of the Consortium land within the Puhinui Precinct, and then provides a more specific description of the land affected by the proposed activities for which consent is sought.

2.1 General Site Description

The Consortium land is located in the eastern part of the Puhinui Peninsula. The land is currently rural in character, being generally in horticultural or pastoral use. To the north across Puhinui Road the land is similarly undeveloped, with the Papatoetoe Cemetery and Crematorium located on the intersection of Puhinui Road and State Highway 20. Across State Highway 20 to the east current development includes residential areas to the northeast giving way to business land in the southeast. A mixture of light industry and manufacturing occupies this area as well as prison facilities and the Wiri Oil Storage terminal. To the southwest lies Puhinui Reserve, a large area of public open space and Colin Dale Park, which is to be developed for a sports park and a site for a marae. To the west is more land zoned Light Industry, mainly owned by the Auckland International Airport Limited.

The Consortium land is of generally flat to rolling character with a 10m elevation difference from north to south over a distance of 1200m. Small watercourses which drain into the Puhinui Stream extend north and west across the site. Within the pastoral spaces remnant shelterbelts and scattered specimen trees exist. The vegetation along the Puhinui Stream is a mixture of exotic scrub, willow, pine, and some indigenous revegetation areas.

2.2 Consents Area Description

The area subject to the current application is limited to the southwestern part of the site, providing for an extension of Prices Road and a bridge over Puhinui Stream linking to the southern end of McLaughlins Road (Figure 2.1). This area is pastoral, with the main stem of the Puhinui Stream (a permanent stream), a tributary (an intermittent stream) and related floodplain areas being located within the proposed road alignment. The bridge crosses the Puhinui Stream through a Significant Ecological Area (SEA) that extends from the north along the whole stream alignment and much of the riparian area.

Puhinui Stream flows in a southwesterly direction towards the Manukau Harbour, more or less parallel to McLaughlins Road, with a naturally meandering channel that varies in width from 3m to 8m. At the proposed bridge crossing location the channel is generally U-shaped with steeply sloped and undercut banks (see photos in Ecological Report). The stream banks are more than 1m high on average and show signs of active erosion, slumping and undercutting. The floodplain width is generally variable along the length of the stream and approximately 128m wide at the proposed bridge crossing location.

The specific nature of the SEA at the crossing point comprises restored riparian buffer approximately 13m wide on either side of the streambank. The revegetation was carried out some 10-15 years ago and has reached canopy closure with both early successional species including flax, manuka, toetoe and karamu, and scattered larger species such as rimu, totara and karaka. The vegetation is valued for its rarity within an area with limited indigenous
terrestrial vegetation cover and its contribution to the surrounding area’s indigenous vegetation intactness as a migration corridor or buffer. The Te Araroa Trail is located on western riparian area of the stream.

The new road and bridge alignment is close to the existing pipelines that carry petroleum products to and from the Wiri Oil Terminal. The pipelines and associated designation and easement cross the northern section of new road close to the proposed roundabout.

The land on the eastern (McLaughlins Road) side of the bridge is currently undeveloped and in rough scrub. It is understood this land has been subject to filling.

Figure 2.1 Local Environment
3. Proposed Activity

It is proposed to subdivide the site and construct a collector road and permanent bridge crossing across Puhinui Stream between Prices Road and McLaughlins Road. These activities have related earthworks, servicing and stormwater management.

3.1 The Subdivision

The subdivision is for the purposes of creating the road. The parent lots remain generally large lots or severance areas that will be amalgamated with adjacent lots. No subdivision of the Puhinui Stream title is proposed (Figure 3.1). More details on subdivision and related activities are provided in the Engineering Report.

![Map of Proposed Subdivision]

Figure 3.1 Proposed Subdivision

3.2 The Road

It is proposed to create a four-arm roundabout and extend Prices Road to McLaughlins Road across the Puhinui Stream. The Prices Road extension is proposed to have a 23.10m road reserve width, consisting of a 9.5m carriageway, with the remaining width providing for a berm, footpath and utility corridor on each side (Figure 3.2). The northern side also includes a dedicated cycle path. The bridge structure narrows the road reserve to 14.75m wide. The new...
intersection with McLaughlins Road will have a Give Way control on the McLaughlins Road southern approach and give priority between the new road link and the northern approach of McLaughlins Road.

The link across the Puhinui Stream opens up a new access route between Puhinui and Wiri for both vehicle traffic and other transport modes. The new road and bridge will feature footpaths on both sides and cycle provision on the northern side, thus encouraging cycling use by commuters and others. The cycle path is clear of the carriageway and there are limited vehicle access opportunities (being an industrial area with large sites), contributing to a safe cycleway.

**Figure 3.2 Prices Road Extension Cross-section**

### 3.3 The Bridge

The bridge is to be a five span structure with a single 37m span across the Puhinui Stream channel (Figure 3.3). The remaining four spans will include two 37m, one 20m and one 16m span for a total bridge length of 147m. The total bridge length was designed to ensure the bridge abutments remain outside the 100yr ARI floodplain extent. The proposed crossing location is a straight, perpendicular crossing. The intermediate bridge footings are to be located a minimum of 10m back from the top of the streambanks on the east and west sides of Puhinui Stream respectively. The soffit level (underside) of the bridge is to be approximately 11.58mRL, which is 800mm above the 50yr ARI flood plain level and 3.4m above the ground level at the intermediate bridge footing on the western bank where the Te Araroa Trail is located.

**Figure 3.3 Bridge Long Section**

[Note exaggerated vertical scale]
3.4 Earthworks

The earthworks for the project includes the new Prices Rd extension, the roundabout and the intersection with McLaughlins Rd. It also includes the proposed wetland and bioretention devices. The cut volume is 5,242 m$^3$ of which some 3,000 m$^3$ will be cut to waste. With the quantity of fill needed to form the new road of 11,688 m$^3$, some 9,500 m$^3$ of material will be for this purpose. This is likely to comprise a mix of earth fill borrowed internally and imported aggregate fill as part of the bridge abutment and road construction. Earthworks are proposed over an area of 3.56ha.

A small retaining wall (0.8m high maximum) is proposed along the northern boundary of 102 Prices Road in order to retain the road berm material.

The various components of the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan are described in more detail in the assessment of effects section below and in the Engineering Report.

3.5 Contaminated Soil

A preliminary site investigation has been undertaken in order to assess whether or not any potentially contaminating landuse activities included on the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) Hazardous Activities and Industries List (HAIL) have been, are currently, or are more likely than not to have been undertaken on the piece of land (see PSI report). The PSI included a search on the property file, a review of the Auckland Council Contaminated Land Database, review of available historical aerial photographs, and a site inspection of both properties.

The property files and contaminated land database search did not reveal any items relating to actual or potential sources of contamination on the piece of land. Review of the historical aerial photographs revealed that 100 Prices Road was the location of market garden activities from the late 1980s, and prior to that was likely the location of dairy farming activities. The bulk storage and use of persistent pesticides associated with horticultural activity is a MfE HAIL item.

Limited information regarding the site at 69 McLaughlins Road was available in the Council records, however aerial imagery indicates that the site was used for commercial / industrial activities from the late 1960s until the 1990s after which time the site has lain vacant. Information provided by CKL in the form of historic investigations in 69 McLaughlin's Road confirm that the piece of land is part of a larger former landfill. The site inspection revealed that fill material, including small volumes of building rubble was present in the spoil from recently cut and reinstated test pits. As the fill is unverified and previously identified as landfill, it is considered to be a MfE HAIL item. It is considered that the potential exists for fill to have been impacted by building materials including treated timber, asbestos containing material, and lead based paints.

Given the potential for MfE HAIL activities to have been undertaken on the land it is concluded that the regulations of the NESCS and AUP(OP) with respect to contaminated land apply to the proposed development. A site management plan has been prepared in order to document the site practices and procedures required to be in place for the protection of human health and the environment as a result of the potential mobilisation of contaminants in soil during development earthworks.
3.6 Stormwater and Flooding

A Stormwater Management Plan and Flood Risk Assessment (SMP/FRA) has been prepared in support of this application. The Puhinui Precinct Plan requirements and the overarching Stormwater Catchment Management Plan (still in development) for the wider development area guide the stormwater management.

3.6.1 Stormwater

The proposed development is contained within two of the seven sub-catchments for the precinct. It is proposed to provide SMAF 1 Retention, Detention and Water Quality Treatment for the proposed road reserve and thirty percent of the future adjacent developable area within two centralised devices (one for each of the two sub-catchments).

The first device is a constructed terraced wetland with a densely planted retention zone, located south of the western abutment of the proposed bridge. A high flow bypass will be included to route flows in excess of the 2yr ARI event past the wetland in order to prevent high velocity flow from entering the wetland. The wetland consists of a forebay, densely planted retention zone and constructed wetland zone that will cover an area of approximately 1,792m² (875m² retention zone plus 917m² wetland/detention zone). The wetland zone will be constructed in cut to maintain connectivity to the groundwater to improve plant health and survivability. The wetland will discharge to the adjacent stream channel via an outflow structure with an 89mm² detention orifice.

The second device is a bio-retention device located to the north of the road alignment near the eastern bridge abutment. The bio-retention area will be approximately 4.5m wide x 50m long. Due to the risk of historic contamination in the underlying soil, the bio-retention device will be fully lined with an impermeable liner and the retention objectives will be met by providing long duration (72hr) release of the 5mm retention volume. This release will be controlled by a 17mm² orifice located within the overflow manhole of the bio-retention device. The bio-retention device will discharge to the existing public stormwater network within McLaughlins Road, which in turn discharges back to the Puhinui Stream approximately 100m downstream of the site.

3.6.2 Flooding

To minimise the hydraulic effects of the proposed bridge, the abutments are to be located outside of the existing 100y flood plain (including climate change). Piers will be located either side of the main channel to minimise disturbance of the stream and existing vegetation. The bridge will then span the flood plain to the east and west abutments with a total of five spans (four piers).

4. Assessment of Environmental Effects

Pursuant to Schedule 4.2(3) and 4.6 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (Act), an application for resource consent shall include an assessment of any actual or potential effects that the activity may have on the environment, and the ways in which any adverse effects may be mitigated.
Schedule 4.2 (3)(c) of the Act specifies that an assessment of effects shall be in such detail as corresponds with the scale and significance of the actual or potential effects that the activity may have on the environment.

4.1 Ecological Effects

The construction of the bridge structures has potential adverse effects on the streams, riparian vegetation and 100yr ARI floodplain the road and bridge cross. These effects include stream channel encroachment, erosion, sedimentation and riparian vegetation removal. The principal means by which these effects have been avoided is to choose a crossing location that avoids larger vegetation and where the SEA is at a relatively narrow point, and the proposed multi-span bridge design.

The bridge abutments are to be located outside the 100 yr ARI flood plain, so will not effect the natural function of the flood plain. The intermediate bridge footings associated with the span crossing Puhinui Stream will be located outside of the stream channel and riparian margin. The intermediate footing on river left (east) will be located outside the existing, replanted riparian buffer, while the footing on river right (west) will require approximately 20m² of riparian vegetation clearing during construction.

The vegetation communities within the collector road right of way, including the two additional intermediate footings and bridge abutment footprints will be cleared. However, these communities are characterised by exotic scrub species including pampas (cortaderia selloana), Chinese privet (ligustrum sinense), woolly nightshade (solanum mauritianum), gorse (ulex europaeus), blackberry (rubus fruticosus), black wattle (acacia crebra) and tradescantia (tradescantia fluminensis). All of these species are classified as Sustained Control pest plants under Auckland’s Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan (Nov 2017).

The adverse effects of vegetative clearance will be mitigated through a range of measures including:

- Minimising the overall working area;
- Locating work staging areas outside the riparian and Te Araroa Trail areas;
- Avoiding and minimising soil disturbance;
- Replanting cleared areas with suitable, eco-sourced, indigenous, riparian plant species; and
- Monitoring plant survival and undertaking weed control for a period of 12 months.

4.2 Traffic Effects

The Transportation Report has assessed potential effects for traffic and transport both on and off the site. The report draws the following conclusions:

- The proposal only involves the construction of a road and a bridge and does not involve activities that will generate traffic movements. All such activities will require further consents (see Table I432.4.2 (A10)) for buildings and structures all of which require consent pursuant to a restricted discretionary activity;
- The design of the proposed intersections adopt the geometric design in the Auckland Transport standards and meets the recommended sight distances in AUSTROADS.
publication “Guide to Road Design” Part 4A “Unsignalised and Signalised Intersections”, and are therefore acceptable in terms of safety effects;

- The standard of pedestrian and cycling facilities means that people in these travel modes can move safely through the area;
- Property access points will be located safely and more than 10m from the roundabout, consistent with AUP(OP) standards; and
- In terms of capacity, the local road network can accommodate the traffic volumes associated with the construction phases, and the application of a Construction Traffic Management Plan will ensure that any potential impact on the surrounding area is minimised.

4.3 Earthworks

The general approach to minimising the effects of earthworks is to maintain a separation between the earthworks activity and areas subject to overland flow and inundation. Where this is not possible measures are taken to minimise the potential for sediment-laden water to reach waterways.

The road and bridge and related works have been located to avoid both the Puhinui Stream and its tributaries and the related 100 Year flood plain (see CKL Plan L3028 Dwg 20 Erosion & Sediment Control Plan and CKL Plan L3028 Dwg 210 Earthworks Cut Fill Plan). The exceptions to this approach are the bridge piers and the wetland zone (lower terrace) of the constructed stormwater management wetland.

The three bridge piers on the western bank, and the associated stabilised access road will be within the bounds of a super silt fence to prevent overland flow to the Puhinui Stream. The Puhinui Stream tributary that lies between the two most western piers will also have its flow temporarily diverted during bridge pier construction. Super silt fences are also proposed around the single eastern pier construction area, and the earthworks area for the wetland pond construction (see CKL Plan L3028 Dwg 20 Erosion & Sediment Control Plan).

Around each earthworks catchment dirty water diversions are proposed taking any sediment laden water to the sediment retention ponds or decanting earth bunds as proposed.

For the purposes of protecting local amenity and dust control stabilised access points are established at the Prices Road and McLaughlins Road entry points to the construction area.

Collectively, these measures will avoid and minimise the potential for earthworks activities and sediment laden water to have adverse environmental and amenity effects.

4.4 Stormwater

The effects of developing the site and the resulting increase in impermeable area have been assessed. The assessment assumes that the Maximum Probable Development for the future industrial/commercial land use is 90% and that the link road reserves are 70% impermeable, based on the indicative road cross-sections.

The proposed mitigation devices will include provision for 100% of the required mitigation volume for the proposed link road (including the bridge see Bridge Design Report) and 30% of
the required mitigation volume for the future developable area. The remainder of the required mitigation volumes for the future developable area will be managed at source.

The proposal provides for full mitigation of additional stormwater up to the 2yr ARI event. Peak flows in excess of the 2yr ARI (including the effects of climate change) will bypass the proposed mitigation devices to improve the efficiency of the devices and prevent high velocity flows from entering the wetland and bioretention facilities. The proposed development will result in a peak flow increase of approximately 64-94% for the 100yr ARI rainfall event (including the effects of climate change). However, due to the site's location near the bottom of the Puhinui Stream Catchment, Peak Flow Attenuation is not being proposed as the coincidence of the delayed peak release from the site and peak flows from the upper catchment would increase the risk of flooding. By allowing the peak flows to discharge from the site unattenuated, the 100yr ARI peak flow in the Puhinui Stream adjacent to the site will not be increased.

4.5 Flooding

Based on the HEC-RAS one-dimensional modeling, the proposed bridge and piers will result in a 10mm increase in the top water level upstream of the bridge with no significant change in channel or flood plain velocity. Therefore, the effects of the bridge are considered to be less than minor with respect to the hydraulics of the Puhinui Stream and its floodplain.

4.6 Existing Land Uses

Existing land uses in the vicinity of the application have been noted above. Other than land owned by the Consortium, land directly adjacent to the road alignment includes Colin Dale Park and Puhinui Reserve (Auckland Council) and 102 Prices Road, an existing rural property with a single dwelling, zoned Light Industry and within the Puhinui Precinct. The proposed road in the McLaughlins Road area does not directly interface with other property.

The applicant has had discussions with Auckland Council Parks in relation to the access leg from the proposed roundabout into Colin Dale Park. The access leg connects to the current access to the park and is considered to be an appropriate design for intended uses.

The proposed road extends along the northern boundary of 102 Prices Road. While being subject to the introduction of traffic and associated noise and activity from the proposed road, this property (area = approximately 0.7ha) and its use for a range of light industry uses will benefit from the road access and frontage proposed by the new road. An access point to the property is provided from the new road.

The applicant has had discussions with Refining NZ and Wiri Oil Services Ltd in relation to their respective oil pipeline designations. It has been agreed that the proposed road would largely run parallel to the designation. This places the pipeline designation and associated easement within the front yard area of the future lots to the north of the road. In this location, the land can be used for carparking and landscaping, activities compatible with the easement and potential pipeline access. This location is considered to minimise the effects of the new road on the pipeline, and the effects of the pipeline on future land use.
5. Regulatory Assessment

5.1 Statutory Framework

The consent authority’s decision on the proposed activity is to be made in terms of section 104, 104B and 104D of the RMA and must have regard to the purpose and principles of the RMA as set out in Part 2, sections 5 to 8. Section 104(1)(b) requires consideration of the matters any relevant planning documents including:

- A national environmental standard
- A national policy statement
- A regional policy statement or proposed regional policy statement
- A plan or proposed plan

5.2 Part 2 and Higher Order Policy Statements

As noted above, this application is subject to Part 2 of the RMA, and also to the National Policy Statement – Freshwater Management 2014 and to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016.

In relation to the application of Part 2, in the recent Court of Appeal case¹, the Court stated:

‘If it is clear that a plan has been prepared having regard to pt 2 and with a coherent set of policies designed to achieve clear environmental outcomes, the result of a genuine process that has regard to those policies in accordance with s 104(1) should be to implement those policies in evaluating a resource consent application. Resort to pt 2 in such a case would likely not add anything. It could not justify an outcome contrary to the thrust of the policies.’

The provisions of the AUP(OP) are consistent with and respond appropriately to the two relevant national policy statements. Accordingly, it is considered that there is no need to examine either Part 2 or the national policy statements in any detail. The relevant Unitary Plan matters are addressed below.

5.3 Unitary Plan Provisions

When considering an application for resource consent for an activity that is classed as a non-comply activity the Council will consider “all relevant overlay, zone, Auckland-wide and precinct objectives and policies that apply to the activity or to the site or sites where that activity will occur.”(AUP(OP) Rule C1.8)

These matters and assessment criteria are considered below in terms of the activities for which consents are being sought.

¹ RJ Davidson Family Trust v Marlborough District Council [2018] NZCA 316
5.3.1 Subdivision and Road Formation,

Rule A54 in Table I432.4.2 lists subdivision that does not comply with the standards for transport in I432.6.1 as a non-complying activity. However, the transport standards relate to two matters:

i) Construction traffic, which must meet the NZTA Code of Practice for Temporary Traffic Management; and

ii) The commencement of activities that generate traffic prior to four specific road infrastructure upgrades as follows:

(a) a new double lane roundabout on SH20B that provides localised widening on the SH20B approaches to allow for two circulating traffic lanes. The roundabout should include a free eastbound through movement for SH20B traffic;

(b) an additional southbound right turn lane from Roscommon Road (north) into Vogler Drive;

(c) a new road connection between SH20B (Puhinui Road) and McLaughlins Road; and

(d) widening improvements on the Puhinui Road approach to the SH20/Puhinui Interchange

In relation to construction traffic, traffic movements related to the road and bridge construction enabled by these consents will need to be managed pursuant to a Construction Traffic Management Plan that meets NZTA requirements as the rule notes. The certification of such a plan by the Council is proposed as a condition of consent.

In relation to traffic movements from other activities, the subdivision, road and bridge consents being sought will not actually enable any land use that will generate traffic movements, so while ‘technically’ being a non-complying activity, the proposed activities do not actually trigger the need for the road infrastructure upgrades.

Objectives and Policies

Relevant objectives and policies in the Puhinui Precinct for subdivision are:

I432.2 Objectives

(8) Subdivision and development of land is staged to ensure adequate transport infrastructure capacity is in place prior to land use development.

(9) Subdivision and development establishes a transport network that provides for the safe and efficient movement of all travel modes.

(10) The timing and sequencing of integrated development provides for the efficient and effective provision of all infrastructure including transport networks, …

(11) Subdivision and/or development within the precinct facilitates a transport network that:

(a) integrates with, and avoids adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of, the surrounding transport network, including any upgrades to the surrounding network; and

(b) facilitates transport choices by providing for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport facilities, and vehicles; and
(c) avoids where practicable, or otherwise remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the environment, including effects on Mana Whenua values. …

I432.3 Policies

(6) Require the provision of transport infrastructure prior to undertaking development or subdivision.

(7) Require all development to provide information on transport infrastructure on a network wide basis.

(8) Require subdivision and/or development within the precinct to provide for a transport network that:

(a) Does not compromise the safe and efficient movement of pedestrians, cyclists, public transport and vehicles; and is

(b) Designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of any relevant code of practice or engineering standards.

There are objective and policies in Urban Subdivision E.38.2 and E38.3, and in Infrastructure E26.2.1 and E26.2.2 that are similar to the above in terms of seeking the integrated and comprehensive provision of infrastructure during subdivision and development, and ensuring that infrastructure (roading in this case) is safe and efficient.

The subdivision, road and bridge consents in this application are part of a broader road infrastructure programme for the Puhinui Precinct that will address the matters in (a) to (d) above and the wider matter of the southern access to Auckland International Airport, to be in place “prior to land use development”.

The extension of Prices Road to and across the Puhinui Stream is envisaged by the Puhinui Precinct provisions I432.6.1.2 as referenced above ((c)a new road connection between SH20B (Puhinui Road) and McLaughlins Road). It is a functional and operational need of the local transport network. The benefits it provides for the local network are through an alternative route to the developing industrial area, and as an alternative link to the airport from the southeast should an interruption to access occur in the State Highway 20/20B intersection area, thus improving the resilience of the network.

The effects of the proposal on the pipelines owned by Refining NZ and Wiri Oil Services Limited have been considered above. The road has been located to minimise both the effects of the road on the pipelines, and the potential effects of the pipelines on the road operations, consistent with (10) above.

The proposed roading has been assessed in terms of its provision for alternative transport choices such as walking and cycling in the Transportation Report. These facilities will promote the adoption of new routes between Puhinui and Wiri and have been designed to Auckland Transport standards. The road extension is a collector road that could be modified in the future for public transport purposes.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed subdivision and roading provision is consistent with, and certainly not contrary to the relevant objectives and policies.
5.3.2 Vegetation Removal

The vegetation removal required for the bridge across the Puhihi Stream and through a Significant Ecological Area requires consents pursuant to Rule E26.3.5.2. As previously described, the alignment of the road has been selected to minimise the removal of vegetation. The Ecological Report also recommends other mitigation measures as conditions of resource consent.

Objectives and Policies

26.2.2 Policies

(4) Require the development, operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading and removal of infrastructure to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, including, on the:

(e) the values for which a site has been scheduled or incorporated in an overlay.

(5) Consider the following matters when assessing the effects of infrastructure:

(a) the degree to which the environment has already been modified;

(b) the nature, duration, timing and frequency of the adverse effects;

(c) the impact on the network and levels of service if the work is not undertaken;

(d) the need for the infrastructure in the context of the wider network; and

(e) the benefits provided by the infrastructure to the communities within Auckland and beyond.

(6) Consider the following matters where new infrastructure or major upgrades to infrastructure are proposed within areas that have been scheduled in the Plan in relation to natural heritage, Mana Whenua, natural resources, coastal environment, historic heritage and special character:

(a) the economic, cultural and social benefits derived from infrastructure and the adverse effects of not providing the infrastructure;

(b) whether the infrastructure has a functional or operational need to be located in or traverse the proposed location;

(c) the need for utility connections across or through such areas to enable an effective and efficient network;

(d) whether there are any practicable alternative locations, routes or designs, which would avoid, or reduce adverse effects on the values of those places, while having regard to E26.2.2(6)(a) - (c);

(e) the extent of existing adverse effects and potential cumulative adverse effects;

(f) how the proposed infrastructure contributes to the strategic form or function, or enables the planned growth and intensification, of Auckland;
(g) the type, scale and extent of adverse effects on the identified values of the area or feature, taking into account:

(i) scheduled sites and places of significance and value to Mana Whenua;

(ii) significant public open space areas, including harbours;

(iii) hilltops and high points that are publicly accessible scenic lookout;

(iv) high-use recreation areas;

(v) natural ecosystems and habitats; and

(vi) the extent to which the proposed infrastructure or upgrade can avoid adverse effects on the values of the area, and where these adverse effects cannot practically be avoided, then the extent to which adverse effects on the values of the area can be appropriately remedied or mitigated.

(h) whether adverse effects on the identified values of the area or feature must be avoided pursuant to any national policy statement, national environmental standard, or regional policy statement.

With reference to Policy E26.2.2.6(h), Policy B7.2.2(5) in the regional policy statement states:

Avoid adverse effects on areas listed in the Schedule 3 of Significant Ecological Areas – Terrestrial Schedule and Schedule 4 Significant Ecological Areas – Marine Schedule.

However matched against this policy is regional policy statement Policy B3.2.2(3) that states:

Provide for the locational requirements of infrastructure by recognising that it can have a functional or operational need to be located in areas with natural and physical resources that have been scheduled in the Unitary Plan in relation to natural heritage, Mana Whenua, natural resources, coastal environment, historic heritage and special character.

In weighing up the tension between these two policies, the alternatives for the alignment and design of the road, and the need for the road in terms of the local network and the economic and social benefits derived from the infrastructure, have been assessed.

As stated above, the road and bridge link across the Puhinui Stream is anticipated by the Puhinui Precinct provisions and will be an important network link for both capacity and resilience. Alternative crossing points of the stream and SEA were considered prior to the purchase of land on McLaughlins Road, at which time it was recognised that the proposed crossing point is one of the narrowest resulting in the least disruption to the riparian environment and SEA vegetation. The bridge design has also minimised the extent of disruption through the abutments being kept outside the floodplain, and only one bridge pier being located within the SEA. The quality of vegetation, other than the riparian restoration, is considered to be low and previously modified, and this will benefit from the replanting of the cleared area with suitable, eco-sourced, indigenous, riparian plant species.
It is further noted that the passing of the Te Araroa Trail along the Puhinui Stream has not been interrupted by the bridge structure with sufficient clearance for users to pass under the bridge supports.

In summary, while the values for which the site has been scheduled will be adversely affected, there are economic and social benefits from the development of the infrastructure, and the removal of the SEA and other vegetation can be suitably mitigated with riparian planting.

5.3.3 Bridge within an SEA

The building of the bridge over the Puhinui Stream, within an SEA, makes the following provisions relevant.

Objectives and Policies

E3.2 Objectives

(4) Structures in, on, under or over the bed of a lake, river, stream or wetland are provided for where there are functional or operational needs for the structure to be in that location, or traverse that area.

(5) Activities in, on, under or over the bed of a lake, river, stream and wetland are managed to minimise adverse effects on the lake, river, stream or wetland.

E3.3 Policies

(1) Avoid significant adverse effects, and avoid where practicable or otherwise remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of activities in, on, under or over the beds of lakes, rivers, streams or wetlands within the following overlays:

... (d) D9 Significant Ecological Areas Overlay;

(7) Provide for the operation, use, maintenance, repair, erection, reconstruction, placement, alteration or extension, of any structure or part of any structure in, on, under, or over the bed of a lake, river, stream or wetland, and any associated diversion of water, where the structure complies with all of the following:

... (d) the structure is for any of the following:

... (iii) necessary to provide access across a lake, river, stream or wetland;

... (iv) associated with infrastructure;

As with the provisions above, the provisions in E3 both provide for the bridge structure, by way of its functional and operation need as infrastructure, but at the same time require that significant adverse effects are avoided, and other adverse effects remedied and mitigated. By
avoiding the stream channel and banks with pier structures, significant adverse effects have been avoided. Other effects have been remedied or mitigated as described previously.

5.3.4 Earthworks

The relevant objectives and policies for earthworks relating to network utilities are as for general earthworks in Chapters E11 and E12 as follows:

Objectives and Policies

The objectives of E11.2 require sediment generation to be minimised and to avoid, remedy and mitigate adverse effects on the environment. The policies in E11.3 require the implementation of specific engineering requirements (standards), recognition of the attributes of the receiving environment, and managing the potential cultural impacts of land disturbance.

The objectives and policies of E12 are similar to E11 with some additional emphasis on amenity effects such as noise, dust and vibration.

Standards

In order to be considered as a restricted discretionary activity the earthworks must comply with the general standards listed in Rules E26.5.5.1 and E26.5.5.2. The earthworks will be undertaken subject to an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) submitted to and certified by the Council as being in accordance with Auckland Council Guideline Document 2016/005, Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for Land Disturbing Activities in the Auckland Region (GD05). Implementation in accordance with the ESCP will ensure that many of the relevant standards will be complied with (such as Standards (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (16), and (17).

In relation to other specific standards it is noted that:

i) the applicant accepts the standard Council consent condition in relation to the importation of cleanfill (standards (7) and (16));

ii) there are no kauri trees in the site area (standard (8));

iii) land disturbance is outside the Riparian Yard (standard (12));

iv) there is no filling within the 1% AEP floodplain; and

v) the proposed earthworks will comply with the accidental discovery protocols as set out in Standard E26.5.5.1.

Matters of discretion

In relation to the matters of discretion in E26.5.7.1:

i) Accidental discovery protocols will be observed;

ii) Specific measures have been taken to protect the water quality in the Puhinui Stream and the nearby tributary for the duration of the works;

iii) Earthworks within the SEA have been limited to a single pile and related access;

iv) Dust control measures will be undertaken to minimise effects on the single house on 102 Prices Road; and
v) The design has demonstrated that the land disturbance and final ground levels will not adversely affect the nearby oil pipelines, with the design having been undertaken in consultation with Refining NZ and Wiri Oil Services Ltd.

5.3.5 Stormwater

The relevant objectives and policies for stormwater management are in Chapter E1 as follows:

**Objectives and Policies**

**E1.2 Objectives**

(1) *Freshwater and sediment quality is maintained where it is excellent or good and progressively improved over time in degraded areas.*

(2) *The maori of freshwater is maintained or progressively improved over time to enable traditional and cultural use of this resource by Mana Whenua.*

(3) *Stormwater and wastewater networks are managed to protect public health and safety and to prevent or minimise adverse effects of contaminants on freshwater and coastal water quality.*

The stormwater policies in Chapter E1 which achieve these objectives are extensive and are not repeated in full here. The overall outcome sought by the policies for stormwater are that the adverse effects of stormwater runoff from greenfields development on freshwater systems and freshwater are avoided as far as practicable, and otherwise minimised or mitigated.

The Puhinui Precinct has specific stormwater objectives and policies as follows:

**Objective I432.2 (4) Subdivision, use and development is managed to maintain or enhance water quality within the Puhinui freshwater catchment and receiving coastal environment, including the integration of Mana Whenua values, maori, matauranga and tikanga associated with fresh water and coastal water resources.**

**Policy I432.3 (3) Address potential adverse effects from subdivision, use or development on identified Maori cultural landscape values by:**

(e) *implementing an integrated stormwater management approach across the Puhinui precinct and incorporating matauranga Maori alongside engineering methods, including retention and enhancement of intermittent and permanent streams and natural floodplains to provide natural attenuation and applying the SMAF Overlay to all sub-catchments draining to streams in addition to quality treatment;* …

As detailed in the SMP/FRA, the stormwater management plan for the site has been developed in the context of the existing Network Discharge Consent (8917) and Auckland Council’s current process of obtaining a region-wide discharge consent. The precinct-specific requirements must also be taken into account. The high level objectives for the site stormwater management plan are summarised as:

- WQ treatment (90th percentile storm) for all roads and hardstand/carpark areas to minimise contaminants entering the receiving environment;
• Inert roofing and cladding materials for buildings to reduce contaminant generation;
• SMAF 1 Retention (5mm) for all impervious surfaces to mimic the pre-development hydrology and maintain stream base flows; and
• SMAF 1 Detention (95th percentile) for all impervious surfaces draining to the Puhinui Stream to reduce the erosive velocities of frequent storm events.

It is considered that the implementation of these objectives will also meet the AUP(OP) objectives and policies overall.

5.4 SECTION 104D ASSESSMENT

Section 104D of the RMA provides that resource consent for a non-complying activity may only be granted if either (a) the adverse effects of the activity on the environment will be minor or (b) the activity will not be contrary to the objectives and policies of the relevant plan. This is frequently referred to as the "gateway test."

Based on the conclusions in each effects section in Section 4 above, the application passes the first limb of section 104D(1)(a) in relation to adverse effects.

The application has also been considered against the relevant provisions of the AUP(OP) under section 104D(1)(b) and is considered not to be contrary to the relevant objectives and policies. In particular, those objectives and policies on the precinct transportation provisions have been addressed. Because the activities for which consent is sought do not generate traffic movements, they do not challenge the intent of these provisions, which is to ensure that appropriate roading infrastructure is in place before land uses operate and generate traffic.

5.5 SECTION 95 NOTIFICATION ASSESSMENT

5.5.1 Public Notification

Section 95A provides consent authorities with the discretion to publicly notify or limited notify an application for resource consent. The principle matter for consideration in this application is whether, pursuant to section 95A(8)(b) and Step 3, the proposed activity will have or is likely to have adverse effects on the environment that are more than minor.

The proposed road and link between Prices Road and McLaughlin Road will be an important addition to the local roading network. It is part of the overall roading infrastructure upgrade for the Puhinui Precinct and State Highway 20B. Nevertheless, the actual and potential effects of the works themselves, including the bridge over the Puhinui Stream through a small section of SEA are no more than minor, taking into account the management and mitigation measures included in the proposal and the matters referred to in section 95D. It is also considered that no special circumstances exist, therefore the application should not be publicly notified.

5.5.2 Limited Notification

Under section 95B of the Act, if Council does not publicly notify an application, the Council must decide if there are any affected persons. Under section 95E the Council must decide that a person is an affected person if adverse effects on them are minor or more than minor (but not
less than minor). Relevant matters to consider for limited notification in terms of the Steps in section 95B are:

i) No written approvals have been provided. However, the location and design of the road and bridge have been undertaken in consultation with NZ Refining and Wiri Oil Services Ltd. These parties have indicated their agreement to the road location and the pipeline crossing point south of the proposed roundabout. The proposal does not require their consent as the requiring authorities, neither do the works conflict with the purpose of the designations.

On a broader front, the Consortium have been engaging with New Zealand Transport Agency, Auckland Transport and Auckland International Airport on the relocation of the Prices Road/State Highway 20B intersection. These parties have also been kept advised of the works covered by this application and approve of them. As noted above, the works do not actually enable the generation of traffic, other than construction traffic for which a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be required.

ii) There are no protected customary rights groups associated with the site. Nevertheless, the Consortium has had an ongoing relationship with Te Akitia, who exert mana whenua status over this area, throughout the Auckland Unitary Plan process that created the Puhinui Precinct. At the time of writing Te Akitia representatives have been advised of the road and bridge proposal and stormwater management approach, but written approval is being sought.

iii) No consultation has been undertaken with the persons at 102 Prices Road. It is considered that the owners of this property are affected persons and written approval will be sought.

iv) Discussions have been had with Auckland Council as owners and managers of Colin Dale Park in relation to access from the proposed roundabout and connection to the south-western interceptor for wastewater, this facility lying within the park. It is understood that the access is acceptable. Discussions with Auckland Council (Parks) as landowner of the Puhinui Stream have yet to held.

In the absence of the written approvals referred to above, limited notification would be anticipated.

6. CONCLUSION

The proposed road and bridge will enable the development of the Consortium’s land within the Puhinui Precinct and provide for an important link between Puhinui and Wiri in the local road network. The key matters that have been addressed are:

- The proposed activities do not generate traffic and consequently they do not challenge the important matter of providing all of the road infrastructure upgrades prior to land use as set out in the Puhinui Precinct provisions, and are
not contrary to the objectives and policies on roading infrastructure, despite being a non-complying activity;

- The crossing of the Puhinui Stream has been located and designed to avoid and minimise adverse effects on the SEA in the riparian margin of the creek, water quality in stream and tributaries and the potential for flooding in the locality;

- Earthworks have been designed to avoid and minimise adverse effects through the adoption of best practice and the avoidance of waterways; and

- Stormwater management is the subject of a stormwater solution that meets the objectives for the Puhinui Precinct and which will be consistent with the future region-wide network discharge consent.

Overall, it is considered the application meets the requirement of sustainable management in Part 2 of the RMA and should be granted consent.
Landowner application for Puhinui Bridge and collector road connection from 100 Prices Road to 69 McLaughlins Road, Wiri
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Attachment C

Item 24
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report


Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board provided funding in 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 the 2013 aerial analysis work, alongside population statistics, and current growth projections outlined in the Auckland Plan.

4. The report has established that urban tree coverage in the local board area is approximately 9 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 6 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 increase canopy cover a long term concerted effort will be required to plant new specimen trees every year.

6. In the 2019/2020 financial year the local board has provided operational 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 Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) approve the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Urban Forest (Ngahere) Analysis Report (Attachment A).

b) delegate authority through the Chief Executive to the General Manager, Parks Sport and Recreation to make minor changes and amendments to the text and design of the Ōtara-Papatoetoe 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 programmes of work.

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

The report provides a number of key statistics:

- The local board area has an average tree canopy cover of 9.1%, which is second lowest for the region,
- 13.1 per cent of parks and open space has tree canopy cover
- 6.4 per cent of local roads have tree canopy cover, which is low,
- 8.4 per cent of urban tree cover is on private land,
- 53 per cent of urban tree cover exists on private land,

12. Section 9 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-pūtea**  
Financial implications

23. The local board has provided further funding in the 2019/2020 financial year to undertake the development of a longer-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 regularly, over a number of years, 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 in 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. 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 chapter will be added as an update addendum to the analysis report once 2016 data is ready later this year. The updated chapter 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.
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Informal local board workshop views on the draft findings of the Animal Management Bylaw 2015 review

File No.: CP2019/15534

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

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

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:
a) receive this report on informal workshop summary views from local boards on the draft findings of the Animal Management Bylaw 2015 review.
b) provide any formal views on the draft findings of the Animal Management Bylaw 2015 review.
Horopaki
Context


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

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

   Figure 1 – Animal Management Bylaw 2015 framework

The bylaw does not address dogs


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

The bylaw does not regulate animal welfare

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

15. Issues with predators eating protected wildlife or animals trampling natural fauna are addressed through other legislation such as the Animal Welfare Act 1999, Wildlife Act 1953 and Biosecurity Act 1993.

The bylaw must be reviewed to ensure it is still necessary and appropriate
16. Auckland Council must complete a statutory review of the bylaw by 30 April 2020 to prevent it from expiring.

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

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

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

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

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

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birds</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Types of nuisance caused by birds is very subjective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People are abandoning geese and ducks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breeding parrots is a nuisance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkeys and peacocks are causing a nuisance in rural areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeding wild pigeons and seagulls is causing a nuisance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 26

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.

- 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)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 4 - Local board informal views on the definition of ‘nuisance’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The definition of nuisance in the Health Act 1956 is outdated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having specific and measurable criteria for nuisance is good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nuisance definition is difficult to enforce without some specific criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensification and tenancy laws allowing for pets will increase nuisance incidents, so the definition needs more specific criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting animal nuisance can cause tension between neighbours. Specific criteria would be useful, so neighbours are not left to interpret nuisance on their own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A broader definition of nuisance fits with common law and covers more occurrences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There cannot be one definition of nuisance since there is no one definition of Aucklanders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The definition of nuisance in the bylaw should have both general and specific parts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incorporating companion animals into the bylaw needs to be reviewed (Slide 15)

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

31. Some Aucklanders find it confusing that the bylaw does not specifically address companion animals. There is misunderstanding that stock animals which are kept as pets instead of food, such as pigs and goats, are not subject to the bylaw’s stock controls.

32. Local boards had mixed views about creating a definition for companion animals. Some viewed the rules should apply based on how the animal is kept. Other local boards said the rules should apply regardless if the animal is a pet.

Table 5 - Local board informal views on adding companion animals in the bylaw’s definitions

Companion animals should have separate rules

- Some animals should be defined as companion animals in the bylaw.
- The bylaw should make exceptions if any animal is defined as stock but is a pet.
- Companion animals should be excluded from the bylaw rules.
  - Goats are popular pets and can be good companions.
  - Farm animals as pets can provide the same benefits as traditional pets.
- Companion animals should not have separate rules

- Companion animals which are stock animals should still require same licensing process as other stock animals.
- Companion animals should not have their own rules as some neighbours are not familiar or okay with stock animals being kept as pets.
- Having a specific definition increases complexity and introduces subjectivity. It should not
33. In response to questions from local boards at the workshops staff note that you cannot buy or take ownership of a pest animal. If you already own a pest animal, you can keep it, but you cannot abandon it, give it to a new owner, or allow the pest animal to breed. The Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 classifies unowned cats as pests.

Requirements for identifying owned animals needs to be reviewed (Slide 17)

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

35. The draft findings report revealed that requiring animal identification would facilitate addressing animal nuisance issues. Most local boards viewed animal identification as helpful but impractical.

Table 6 - Local board informal views on identifying owned animals

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

36. In response to questions from local boards at the workshops, staff note that provided there is a valid purpose, the council has power to regulate animal registration. Any requirement would need to match the size and scale of the issue and would need to show it would effectively reduce harm and nuisance to people.

There is uncertainty about the council’s processes for managing animals (Slide 17)

37. The draft findings report identified that some Aucklanders are unclear about the council’s processes and protocols for managing animals, especially unowned animals. This confusion reduces people’s willingness to report nuisance, as they are unsure who is responsible. Only two per cent of surveyed respondents who experienced animal nuisance reported it to the council.

38. The draft findings report identified the bylaw could be strengthened by providing information about non-regulatory processes and protocols for managing animals, especially unowned animals. Most local boards viewed that the council’s processes could be clearer.

Table 7 - Local board informal views on council processes for managing animals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The bylaw should be clear on what the council does and does not do regarding animal management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The council should clarify the process for reporting unowned animals causing nuisance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bylaw’s animal management processes need to align with the Regional Pest Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The council should offer mediation services for disgruntled neighbours over animal nuisance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
39. In response to questions from local boards at the workshops, staff note the following.

- A property owner may trap and/or lawfully kill an animal on their property. It is a criminal offence to kill an owned animal or destroy the animal inhumanely.
- To prove a legal claim for damage to private property by an owned animal, the property owner would need to show the owner of the animal had failed to take reasonable care to avoid the damage.
- Culling is managed by central government laws and regulations, rather than the Animal Management Bylaw 2015.

**Views on existing controls for specific animals in the bylaw (Slide 22)**

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

41. The draft findings report showed council compliance response officers would find limits to urban beehives and more specific requirements for chicken coop locations easier to enforce than the current bylaw controls.

42. Local boards had a mix of views. Some had views on needing more controls, and some had views to keep the controls the same or less.

<table>
<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 able to set specific controls for horses for local parks and beaches. Horses are currently not allowed to be kept in urban areas without a licence from the council unless the premises is larger than 4,000 square metres.</td>
<td>• The same access rules for dogs on beaches should be applied to horses. • Do not prohibit horses on beaches but restrict them to off-peak times. • Should lobby central government to include the same powers that protect native fauna and wildlife from dogs for horses.</td>
<td>• Horse owners should be responsible for removing manure. The bylaw should encourage accountability and consider that picking up manure is not always practical, e.g. on busy roads. • Should be allowed to ride horses on berms. • Horses should not be banned from roads. There are few places to ride.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Informal 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>Horses</td>
<td>Horses are permitted in public spaces if:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase communication and awareness of current controls to horse owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses cont.</td>
<td>• manure is removed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Would rather have horses on the roads than scooters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• consideration is taken to not intimidate or cause a nuisance for other public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>space users</td>
<td></td>
<td></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</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>permitted by the bylaw in urban areas without a licence from the council. Any</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>other stock animal, including roosters, would require a licence from the council in</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>urban areas unless the premises is larger than 4,000 square metres.</td>
<td>The criteria for keeping goats and other herbivores should be defined by the amount of grassy area on</td>
<td>If you have a large property in an urban area, goats should be allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stock in urban areas must also be restrained within the boundaries of the premises</td>
<td>the property.</td>
<td>Make sure urban pet days are still allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on which they are kept, and chicken coops must not cause a nuisance and must be</td>
<td>There should be restrictions on how far a chicken coop should be from the property boundary.</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>regularly cleaned.</td>
<td>Fewer chickens should be allowed in urban areas.</td>
<td>There should not be a complete ban on roosters in urban areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In rural areas the above controls do not apply. Rural residents must ensure their</td>
<td>Roosters should not be allowed in rural lifestyle blocks in urban areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>animals do not cause a nuisance to any other person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Informal local board informal views on controls for cats |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The bylaw should limit the number of cats a person can own.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Should make sure extremes are restricted, such as having 30+ cats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bylaw should require the de-sexing of cats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The council should work closely with the SPCA in this matter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Make it compulsory for cat owners.
  - Local boards have varying support for requiring microchipping of cats including:
    - full compulsory microchipping across the region
    - limited microchipping only to cats living in eco-sensitive areas.
  - The bylaw should have the same registration process for cats as the council has for dogs.
  - There should be a curfew for cats.
  - There should be controls to dissuade people from feeding stray cats, as it reinforces the cats’ behaviour.
  - Publish best practices for tourists with cats and other animals visiting Hauraki Gulf Islands.
  - The council should restrict cats from wandering.
  - The council should restrict certain cat breeds, like Bengals.

Informal views on not introducing controls for cats
• Cat registration is difficult and has failed before. Auckland Council already has difficulty registering and enforcing dogs.
• Rely on the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 guidelines.
• Cats naturally wander. Containing them would be cruel.
• The council should invest in substantial long-term public education regarding cats.
• If the council restricts caring for stray cats, it could create animal welfare issues.
• Controlling cats is too trivial for the council to get involved.

Informal local board views on controls for other animals
• Rules are needed to restrict feeding wild animals in public, especially birds.
• How many animals a person can own should be restricted by section size.
• There should be a higher management expectation on animal owners in urban areas.
• The bylaw should address the health risks that animals can cause their owners.
• There should be a complete ban on snakes and ferrets.
• Rabbits are a major pest, especially in urban areas. The bylaw should restrict breeding.
• There should be controls on keeping birds in small cages.
• Unless there is a significant problem, neighbours should sort out their own problems.

46. In response to questions from local boards at the workshops, staff note the following,
• Any costs for managing stray cats would be investigated during the options development phase to respond to nuisance issues.
• The Local Government Act 2002 would give the council power to impose a curfew on cats if it was an appropriate response to the scale of the nuisance and would clearly show how the curfew would reduce harm and nuisance to humans.
• The council currently has more legal power to respond to dog nuisance than cat nuisance. The Dog Control Act 1996 gives the council wide-varying powers to address dog issues. There is no similar legislation for cats.
• Rat pest control is addressed through the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029.
• The Regional Pest Management Plan lists some tropical animals that can be treated as pests. These include eastern water dragons, Indian ring-necked parakeets, and snake-necked turtles.
• Chickens were not classified as pests in the Regional Pest Management Plan. The purpose of the plan is to protect the Auckland region’s important biodiversity assets.
There are no significant biodiversity benefits to managing feral chickens at a regional level. Feral chickens are primarily a human nuisance issue centred in the urban areas where people feed them.

Other views from local boards

*Rights of property owners and protection*

47. The bylaw does not explain what options property owners have to handle animal nuisance on their property themselves. It is unclear which animals property owners are allowed to trap and dispose of on their own and which animals are protected.

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

*Enforcement*

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

50. The Local Government Act 2002 does not give the power to issue an infringement notice under a bylaw. Compliance officers have said this inhibits their ability to address nuisance issues as their next step after trying to elicit voluntary compliance is prosecution. This can be costly to the council.

51. Some local boards provided views that the Local Government Act 2002 should be amended to allow for infringement fines. Some local boards viewed that the bylaw would already be fit for purpose if it could be enforced with infringements.

*Education*

52. Most local boards said the council needs to increase education and awareness about the current animal management rules. Some local boards viewed that the council should focus more on informing Aucklanders of responsible animal management than increasing regulation.

53. Some local boards also advised that any changes to the bylaw, if required, would need to have a strong communication and awareness plan.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

*Council group impacts and views*

54. The bylaw affects the operation of council units involved in animal management. These include biosecurity, animal management and compliance response officers. Staff held face-to-face meetings and a workshop with council officers. These views were provided in the draft findings report and workshops.

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

*Local impacts and local board views*

55. Staff captured informal local board views through cluster workshops in March 2019. The draft findings report was shared with all local boards in May 2019, and staff attended individual local board workshops through June and July 2019.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

*Māori impact statement*

56. Staff sought views from mana whenua at the Infrastructure and Environmental Services Forum in April 2019. The members present at the hui sought clarity that the bylaw’s reference of ‘public places’ does not extend to papakāinga (communal Māori land).
57. Members were also concerned with threats to estuaries, beaches, and waterways from unregulated coastal horse trails. These views were provided in the draft findings report and options development will consider these views.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
58. The cost of the bylaw review and implementation will be met within existing budgets.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamauratanga
Risks and mitigations
59. There is a risk that the public may perceive this report as formal local board views or an attempt to regulate cats without public engagement. This risk can be mitigated by replying to any emerging media or public concerns by saying that no additions or changes will be made to the Animal Management Bylaw 2015 without full public consultation.

60. Local boards will have an opportunity to provide formal resolutions on any changes proposed to the bylaw in early 2020 before a public consultative procedure.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
61. Following any additional formalised views from local boards, staff will generate and assess options to respond to identified animal nuisances. Staff will present these findings and options in a report to the relevant committee in the new council term in early 2020.

62. Staff will seek formal local board views when developing a statement of proposal once the committee gives direction on animal management.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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</table>
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What is the bylaw about?

The purpose of the bylaw is to provide for the ownership of animals in a way that:

- protects the public from nuisance
- maintains and promotes public health and safety
- minimises the potential for offensive behavior in public places
- manages animals in public places
- contains specific controls for: keeping of bees in an urban area, keeping of stock in an urban area, horses in public places.

Bylaw was adopted in 2015 and replaced 18 legacy bylaws.
What legislation gives the bylaw its power?

Section 145: General bylaw-making power for territorial authorities
A territorial authority may make bylaws for:
- protecting the public from nuisance
- protecting, promoting, and maintaining public health and safety
- minimising the potential for offensive behaviour in public places.

Section 146: Specific bylaw-making powers of territorial authorities
Without limiting section 145, a territorial authority may make bylaws for the purposes of:
- regulating the keeping of animals, bees and poultry
- managing and protecting reserves or other land under the control of the territorial authority from, damage, misuse, or loss.

Section 64: Bylaws
Every local authority may make bylaws for:
- improving, promoting, or protecting public health, and preventing or abating nuisances
- regulating, licensing, or prohibiting the keeping of any animals in the district
- preventing the outbreak or spread of disease by the agency of flies, mosquitoes, or other insects, or of rats, mice, or other vermin.
Bylaw must be reviewed within five years of being made

- The council must decide whether:
  - a bylaw is the most appropriate way of addressing the perceived problem
  - the bylaw is “fit for purpose”
  - the current bylaw gives rise to any Bill of Rights implications
  - to retain, amend, replace, or revoke the bylaw

Auckland Council Regulatory Committee
Most Aucklanders own animals
People’s Panel data on animal ownership

No animal ownership (pg. 9)

Overall (pg. 7)

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

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

Cat ownership rates:
- Male: 34%
- Female: 46%
- Other: 41%

Age:
- 18 years or older: 31%
- 19-44 years: 47%
- 45-64 years: 49%
- 65-74 years: 41%
- 75 years or older: 31%

Geography:
- Rural: 53%
- Urban: 47%

Cat ownership rates by local board area:
- Franklin: 34%
- Waitakere Ranges: 52%
- Rodney: 45%
- Auckland Council: 45%

Chicken and rooster ownership rates:
- Male: 6%
- Female: 7%
- Other: 25%

Age:
- 18 years or older: 3%
- 19-44 years: 3%
- 45-64 years: 10%
- 65-74 years: 8%
- 75 years or older: 6%

Geography:
- Rural: 25%
- Urban: 35%

Chicken and rooster ownership rates by local board area:
- Franklin: 65%
- Waitakere Ranges: 15%
- Waitakere: 45%
- Henderson-Massey: 44%
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 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animals getting into left out rubbish</td>
<td>107,374 (involving dogs) 10,227 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barking and crowing</td>
<td>86,657 (total) 1,500 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wandering animals leaving poop on property</td>
<td>2,206 (total) 411 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owners not picking up after their animals</td>
<td>1,795 (involving dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dead animals dumped on side of roads</td>
<td>1,266 (total) 595 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dead animals in ponds and storm water fields</td>
<td>671 (involving dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smell</td>
<td>1,244 (total) 408 (involving dogs) 836 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bad odours attracting mice and rats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decomposing animals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smelly chicken coops</td>
<td></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>2,350 (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhygienic behaviour</td>
<td>Animal faeces left in parks, walkways or on private property, especially vegetated gardens</td>
<td>1,380 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal wandering</td>
<td>Animals wandering onto neighbouring property</td>
<td>165 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbours harbouring rats in overgrown sections</td>
<td>865 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory nuisance</td>
<td>Odour from animal excreta</td>
<td>667 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loud animals, especially crowing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to property</td>
<td>Scratched deck furniture</td>
<td>531 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yard digging up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property damage from animal faeces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Animals attacking native wildlife</td>
<td>428 (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>Deerless animals in public areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad behaviour</td>
<td>Pets and people being attacked by aggressive animals</td>
<td>376 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter</td>
<td>Finding the practice of killing animals offensive</td>
<td>56 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Witnessing slaughter or leftover remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top nuisances (People’s Panel)

Overall nuisance rates (pg. 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nuisance rates</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owns animals</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owns no animals</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender diverse</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75 years or older</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-74 years</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44 years</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24 years</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- 22% Cats
- 15% Mice/rats
- 10% Other
- 5% Birds
- 4% Chickens/roosters
- 2% Bees
- 2% Ducks
- 2% Rab

Hot topics

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

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

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

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

- **Controls** (next slide)
**Bylaw structure (2/2)**

- **Controls**
  - Keeping of bees in urban areas
    - bee management
    - flight path management
    - provision of water
  - Keeping of stock in urban areas
    - the number of stock that may be kept
    - the conditions in which they are kept
  - Horses in public places
    - general conditions of use
    - places with additional conditions
    - places where prohibited
Attachment A

Item 26

Informal local board workshop views on the draft findings of the Animal Management Bylaw 2015

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

**Keeping of Bees Control - Flight path management**

(1) Every person keeping bees in an urban area must take all reasonable steps to ensure beehives are positioned and managed in a way that has minimal impact to any other person.

**Keeping of Bees Control - Bee management**

(2) Every person keeping bees in an urban area must maintain honey bee colonies with a calm temperament and must take all reasonable steps to control swarming.

**Keeping of Bees Control - Provision of water**

(3) Every person keeping bees in an urban area must ensure there is a suitable water source for the bees on the premises on which the beehives are kept.

**Keeping of Bees Control - Bee excreta management**

(4) Every person keeping bees in an urban area must take all reasonable steps to minimise nuisance to any other person from bee excreta.

### Horse riding in a public place

#### Horses in a Public Place Control – General conditions

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

#### Horses in a Public Place Control – Conditions for specified beaches

2. The following conditions apply to the presence of horses on Agies Beach, Hatfields Beach, Martins Bay Beach, Orewa Beach, Orewa Beach and Snells Beach—
   a. horses must only be ridden or lead along the beach between the times of mid and low tide. and must be ridden or lead along the beach below the high tide mark;
   b. between 1 December and 15 February (including weekends), horses are only allowed before 10:00 am and after 7:00 pm; 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 Karori Beach as shown in Schedule 1—
   a. during high use periods, horses are restricted to a walk within the 1km ZONE; at all other times horses are restricted to a walk within the Safe Zone;
   b. within the 1km ZONE, horses must remain within 10 metres of the water’s edge whenever possible;
   c. horse manure must be removed from the 1km ZONE; and
   d. the unloading of horses is only permitted in the Horse Unloading Area.
Current bylaw controls (2/3)

Keeping of stock in urban areas (1/2)

Table 1: Number of stock allowed to be kept in an urban area without a licence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stock</th>
<th>Premises smaller than 2000 square metres</th>
<th>Premises larger than 2000 square metres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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>6</td>
<td>0</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)

(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.

(3) The owner of any chicken must ensure that any chickens are confined on the premises in such a manner that the chicken cannot freely leave the premises. This can be achieved by providing either: (a) a fenced chicken coop with an attached run, or (b) an enclosed chicken coop and adequate fencing of the premises.

(4) The owner of any chicken must not allow their chicken coop to cause a nuisance to any other person.

(5) The owner of any chicken must regularly clean their chicken coop as appropriate to maintain the chicken coop in a dry, clean condition and state of good repair, free from any offensive smell, overflow and vermin.
Views on existing controls

- **Bees** (pg. 53) – restrict to rural, require urban licence, restrict number of hives in urban, excrement unenforceable

  ![Bar chart for People's Panel – Bee controls]

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

  ![Bar chart for People's Panel – Horse controls]

- **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 for People's Panel – Stock controls]
# Views on new controls

## People’s Panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should there be controls on other animals?</th>
<th>On which animals?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know 39%</td>
<td>Cats 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 35%</td>
<td>Birds 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 26%</td>
<td>Pigeons 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dogs 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rabbits 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goats 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferrets 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horses 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poultry 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rats 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pigs 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Other” includes sheep, snakes, guinea pigs, reptiles, mustelids, stoats, wasps and fish.

- **Cats** - registration, microchipping, de-sexing, more owner accountability, protection of native wildlife
- **Birds** – no birds in small cages, exotic birds should be monitored and licenced
Any other views?
Local board questions from the Animal Management Bylaw review workshops

**Local board questions on definition of ‘owner’**
- Who is responsible or the owner for cat colonies?
- What happens if someone says it is not my pet when it clearly is?
- Any case law on owner definition of ‘under that person’s care’?
- What happens if you trap an animal and keep the baby?
- If you trap a pest on your property and no one comes and picks it up do you become the “owner”?
- Do compliance officers who seize an animal then become its owner?
- Who owns animals in public spaces? The Crown? The council?
- Who is responsible for unowned animals in public spaces?
- What is council’s responsibility for unowned animals?
- If someone feeds unowned chickens every day are the chickens under their care? At what point do they become an owner?

**Local board questions on definition on companion animals**
- What is a “pest”?
- Can you keep pests as pets?

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

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

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

Other questions
• Does the Crematoria bylaw cover animal crematoria? If not, does the odour (and nuisance) from them therefore come under the scope of the Animal Management bylaw?
• How do stock rules apply in semi-urban areas?
• How should the bylaw address bees that make toxic honey from contaminated tutu flower pollen?
• Will housing intensification increase animal nuisance problems?
• Should the bylaw manage the behaviour of humans, not animals?
• What are the rules for slaughter outside a regulated space?
• Will the Tenancy Act allowing pets increase the problem?
• Can the landowner take action to destroy animals that come onto their property? What methods will be allowed?
• What are the controls in place for tropical animals?
• What is the definition of wildlife?
• What animal management powers do we have under the Reserves Act?
• Muslim community on views on slaughter? Any approved process?
• Is the question of culling managed under this bylaw or some other act?
• What rights do property owners have to deal with the problem themselves?
• What happens if you abandon a fish in your private stream 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 Ōtara-Papatoetoe 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) (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td>175</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>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<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**
<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>Waitakere and Gulf</td>
<td>Page 295 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windy Canyon Great Barrier Island</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitakere 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>Waitakere</td>
<td>Page 347 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingdale Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitakere</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</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Page 279 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 306 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupe Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 322 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liston Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 323 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maskell Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 328 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michaels Ave Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 329 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacock Street - Glendowie</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 336 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāmaki Yacht Club area</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 343 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Landing - Tāmaki Drive</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Page 345 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 - Wilijames 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>
<tr>
<td>Non-scheduled area</td>
<td>Restriction sought</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Link to summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae Reserve (Te Huruhu Bay Reserve) 53 Tahetai road, Waheke island and Lot 1, Te Huruhu Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitetūtā 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>Waitetūtā 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>Waitetūtā and Gulf</td>
<td>Page 344 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitetūtā Ranges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Seaview Road</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitetūtā</td>
<td>Page 289 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Road Car Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitetūtā</td>
<td>Page 309 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Pukematekeo Car Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitetūtā</td>
<td>Page 331 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spraggs Bush Car Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitetūtā</td>
<td>Page 341 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stedfast Park, Glenesk Road, Lograce Road</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitetūtā</td>
<td>Page 342 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitetūtā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitetūtā and Gulf</td>
<td>Page 291 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitetūtā 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>Seeking prohibited Page 333 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Temporary arrangements for urgent decisions and staff delegations during the election period

File No.: CP2019/16361

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 Ōtara-Papatoetoe 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>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. This report provides a summary of resolution responses and information reports for circulation to the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board.

Information reports for the local board:

2. The Pursuit of Excellence Awards Panel decisions made on 13 August 2019 are attached to this report in Attachment A.

Objections to Off-licence applications

3. The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Plan 2017 notes as one of its outcomes, ‘Empowered, inclusive and prosperous communities’. To this end the local board supports community action taken by groups to reduce alcohol harm and off-licence proliferation in the local area.

4. The local board made an objection to an application for a new liquor off-license at 159 Puhinui Road, Papatoetoe to trade as Puhinui Liquor Store in June this year.

5. The hearing is scheduled for 24 September 2019 at 9.30am in the Totara Room, Manukau Civic Building.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) note the Pursuit of Excellence Awards panel decisions made on 13 August 2019 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Conference/event</th>
<th>Amount applied for</th>
<th>Amount Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr Jagjit Singh</td>
<td>Oceania Masters’ Athletics Championship 2019</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathuria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) confirm its objection to an application for a new liquor off-licence at 159 Puhinui Road, Papatoetoe to trade as Puhinui Liquor Store and note the hearing scheduled for 24 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>Approved Pursuit of Excellence Grants</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Carol McGarry - Democracy Advisor Ōtara-Papatoetoe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager Mangere-Otahuhu and Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memo

To: Helen Taimarangai, Senior Grants Advisor
From: Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board
Subject: Pursuit of Excellence Awards panel decisions 13 August 2019

Purpose
1. To confirm the Pursuit of Excellence Awards Panel decisions made on 13 August 2019.

Pursuit of Excellence Panel
2. The panel met on the 13th August 2019 to discuss an application received for the Excellence awards.
3. Pursuant to local board resolution, OP/2018/144, the Excellence panel, under delegated authority from the local board, considered the applications and have decided to grant as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Conference/event</th>
<th>Amount applied for</th>
<th>Amount Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Jagjit Singh Kalhuia</td>
<td>Oceania Masters' Athletics Championship 2019</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further considerations
4. As discussed during the panel meeting, grantees are to be encouraged to share an update of their funded activities with the local board. It is the intention of the local board to also share these updates, where possible, with the community as part of their accountability process.

Delegation to the panel
5. The panel was delegated decision making to make these grants in August 2018 in the following resolution of the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board.

Pursuit of Excellence 2018/19
Resolution number OP/2018/144
That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:
c) delegate decision making to award grants up to $2,000 per grant, to a panel consisting of Chair Lotu Full and Deputy Chair Ross Robertson and member Ashraf Choudhary as alternate, and request that they report grants awarded under this delegation, at the following board meeting.
d) request all grant recipients to report to the board on how the money was spent and the outcomes.

6. The panel meeting on 13th August was attended by Chair Lotu Fuli and Deputy Chair Ross Robertson

7. These decisions will be reported to the full board for noting at the next meeting of the local board.

Lotu Fuli
Chairperson

Ross Robertson
Deputy Chair
Mr Jagjit Singh Kathuria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical address</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal status in NZ</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand citizenship</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interest</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Confidence/event information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of conference:</th>
<th>Oceania Masters’ Athletics Championship 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Mackay Queensland Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates:</td>
<td>31/08/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of conference:</td>
<td>Participation at the Oceania Masters’ Athletics Championship 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contribution to awards objectives**

**Identified objective(s)**

- Increase local profile and image, Serve the community

**How would this build leadership and contribute to identified objective(s)**

These championships are held every two years and Athletics Masters Members from the Oceania Federation Countries are invited to participate. In 2019 this is being held at Mackay Australia from 31 August to 7 September. I am a member of NZMA and am eligible to participate. I have registered myself for Triple Jump, Discus Throw, 60 m sprint and 3000m Track Race.

**Applicant achievements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/achievement</th>
<th>How this shows leadership skills or community contribution</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gold Medal Triple Jump at NZ Masters’ Games *</td>
<td>New Zealand Masters’ Games</td>
<td>02/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Medal 3Km Walk</td>
<td>New Zealand Masters’ Games</td>
<td>02/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth in 60m walk</td>
<td>New Zealand Masters’ Games</td>
<td>02/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Award</td>
<td>The Auckland Sikh Society</td>
<td>01/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial information**

- **Amount requested:** 2,000
- **Costs that will be covered:**
  - $1000 - airfares & travels costs
  - $200 - Accomodation
  - $100 - Registration Fees
  - $200 – Food and uniform

**Funding history**

- No funding history available for this applicant
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To present the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board with its updated governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The governance forward work calendar for the Ōtara-Papatoetoe 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 Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) note 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>A0</td>
<td>Governance Work Calendar</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Carol McGarry - Democracy Advisor Otara-Papatoetoe</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>Workshop or business meeting</td>
<td>Month/Quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>November/December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>Early December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports requested/pending</td>
<td>To Be Advised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 21 August 2018 | OP/201 8/133 | Deputation – Hemp growing prototype initiative  
  b) refer the Hemp growing prototype initiative presentation to Community Facilities and parks officers and seek advice and a report back on enabling a growing trial. | Meeting Action sent to Community Facilities and Parks officers                                    | TBA     |
| 21 August 2018 | OP/201 8/136 | b)request Auckland Transport and Auckland Council Stormwater resolve the flooding issues at the main Graeme Avenue entrance of Papatoetoe North School.  
  c) request Auckland Transport responds to the safety concerns of the Papatoetoe North regarding widening of the footpath, raising the crossing and installing a fence or guard rail to stop the children going on the road. | 3 September 2018 - Auckland Transport provided a written response. They also confirmed the local board has allocated funding to develop a 100m x 2.5metre footpath connection from Landon Avenue to the northern end of school boundary. This will help disperse students away from the existing entrances on Milton Road and Graeme Ave which are under pressure with parking issues during peak periods.  
  6 November 2018 – Healthywater advises - Improvements have been made to the existing catch pit and improved the back entry which will improve the flooding situation there. CCTV confirms the catch pit leads and drain to the stream are also clear.  
  10 June 2019 – Auckland Transport advised that the request for footpath improvements will be added to the 600 outstanding requests list and prioritised, if the score is high, it will qualify for funding. They also advised that the School Community Officer has been working with the road patrollers and that they will consider the request for changes to the pedestrian crossing as part of the zebra crossing upgrade project. | Ongoing |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>OP/2018/155</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-Sep-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 March 2019</td>
<td>OP/2019/26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Request officers to meet with the South Auckland Rangers Club and the Rongomai Sports Trust about their requests and report their findings on the capacity of Rongomai Park to meet the needs of its users, back to the local board at a workshop.
- Officers looking at options to upgrade the drainage and fields at Rongomai park.
- Auckland Council participation in Tuia Here Tangata 2019 d) request officers to provide a final update to the board on the completion of this year’s programme.
- Approval of Papatoetoe town square design Request to be updated as details of the Service Agreement are being negotiated with the owner and occupiers of the National Trading Company land.
- Maori naming of parks and places f) request officers to provide further discussions on the details for use of the names once gifted.
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. Attached are the notes for the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board workshops held on Tuesday, 13 and 27 August and 3 September 2019.

2. The workshop notes for Tuesday 10 September 2019 will be tabled at the meeting on 17 September 2019 and attached to the minutes.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) note the workshop notes from the workshops held on Tuesday 13 and 27 August and 3 September 2019 and the notes from 10 September 2019 tabled at the meeting.

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 - 13 August 2019</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Workshop Notes - 27 August 2019</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Workshop Notes - 3 September 2019</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Carol McGarry - Democracy Advisor Otara-Papatoetoe</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>
## Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Workshop Notes

**PRESENT:**
- Chairperson: Lotu Fuli
- Deputy Chairperson: Ross Robertson to 12.23pm
- Members: Apulu Reece Autagavaia, Ashraf Choudhary, Dawn Trenberth, Mary Gush

**ABSENT:**
- Donna Lee

**ALSO PRESENT:**
- Rina Tagore Senior Advisor
- Albert Scott (Local Board Advisor)
- Carol McKenzie-Rex (Relationship Manager)
- Carol McGarry (Democracy Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Road naming process
Emerald James, David Snowdon | Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions | The board discussed the newly updated Road naming guidelines with officers. ACTION: Factor using names from the Te Kete rukuruku project, significant heritage names and Pasifika names for roads as part of a future work programme. |
| Auckland Transport
Kenneth Tuai | | The board was updated on all Auckland Transport matters prior to the formal report to the 20 August 2019 business meeting. |
| Ngati Ōtara Marae
Tim Keat, Jenny Young | Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions | The board was updated on the Ngati Ōtara marae project. ACTIONS: Further advice to be provided to a workshop. Follow up meeting with the Ngati Ōtara Marae project representatives to be scheduled. |
| Fresh Gallery Signage project
Sarah Edwards | Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions | The board considered the detailed designs for the Fresh Gallery Signage Project and requested further consultation with the community on this project. ACTIONS: Future workshop to be scheduled to continue this discussion following consultation. An Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board policy on documenting our murals and celebrating them to be considered as a potential future work programme. Fresh Gallery programmer to attend the next workshop. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Otara Lake</strong>&lt;br&gt;Tom Mansell, Emma Cowie</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>The board was updated on the Healthy Waters plans for the Ōtara Lake.&lt;br&gt;ACTION: Future workshop in February 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building sustainable communities - EnviroSchools</strong>&lt;br&gt;Marisa Pene, Emma Cowie</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>The board was updated on year one of the EnviroSchools project funded as part of the boards local environment work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous items</strong>&lt;br&gt;Rina Tagore, Albert Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td>The board discussed the six-monthly graffiti vandalism prevention update.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 12.41pm
Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board Workshop Notes

Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board

Workshop record of the Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board held in the Woodside Room on Tuesday, 27 August 2019 at 9.30 am.

PRESENT:
Chairperson: Lotu Fuli
Deputy Chairperson: Ross Robertson
Members: Apulu Reece Autagavaia
          Ashraf Choudhary
          Dawn Trenberth – from 9.33 am
          Mary Gush and Donna Lee

ABSENT:

ALSO PRESENT: Rina Tagore (Senior Local Board Advisor)
               Albert Scott (Local Board Advisor)
               Carol McKenzie-Rex (Relationship Manager)
               Shoma Prasad (Engagement Advisor)
               Carol McGarry (Democracy Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panuku update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board was updated on the Papatoetoe Mall, the Food Hub and accessibility issues at the carpark.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Jody Jackson-Becerra, John Carter |                      | ACTIONS:  
|               |                          | 1. Panuku to advise the board when the remaining vacant shops will be opening.  
|               |                          | 2. Communications on this space prior to the elections. |
| One Local Initiative update and the Community Facilities - monthly update | Oversight and monitoring | 1. The board was updated on the one local initiative - Ngati Otara Park and discussed the monthly update of the Community Facilities 2018/19 work programme including leasing and maintenance delivery. |
| Roscoe Webb, Nichola Painter, Greg Hannah, Jenny Young, Shiva Dubey |                      | ACTIONS:  
|               |                          | 1. Ngati Otara MultiSport project updates every 3 to 4 months – next update December 2019.  
|               |                          | 2. Sod turning date to be advised.  
<p>|               |                          | 3. Leases - community outcome plans to be discussed at the workshop prior to the formal report. |
| Parks Sport and Recreation - monthly update | Oversight and monitoring | Monthly update of the Parks Sport and Recreation 2018/19 work programme |
| 1. Puhinui Reserve |                      | 1. Discussion and feedback on the service assessment scope for the Puhinui Reserve. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Assessment 2. Ngati Ōtara Park Service Assessment 2. Urban Ngahere - Knowing stage Steve Owens, Howell Davies</td>
<td>2. Discussion and feedback on the service assessment scope for the Ngati Ōtara Park 3. To present the findings of the Knowing stage of Urban Ngahere, prior to a formal report to the 17 September 2019 business meeting. ACTIONS: 1. The services assessments findings will be reported back to the board at a workshop in Quarter 3 2019/20 financial year. 2. Approval of the service assessments findings and funding for plan preparations will be presented to the board in Quarter 4 2019/20 financial year. 3. Ngahere Workshop date in late November/December 2019. 4. Letters to be drafted to CCO’s and outside organisations to encourage tree planning in the local board area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Festival 2020 Uita Sialii</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>The board discussed the 2020 Diversity festival including stakeholder engagement, communications and ways to accurately record visitor attendance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 12.48 pm
# Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Workshop Notes

**attachment C**

## Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board

Workshop record of the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board held in the Woodside Room on Tuesday, 3 September 2019 at 9.30am.

**PRESENT:**
- Chairperson: Lotu Fuli
- Members: Apulu Reece Autagavaia, Ashraf Choudhary, Dawn Trenberth
- ABSENT: Ross Robertson, Mary Gush, Donna Lee
- ALSO PRESENT: Rina Tagore (Senior Local Board Advisor), Albert Scott (Local Board Advisor), Carol McKenzie-Rex (Relationship Manager), Shoma Prasad (Engagement Advisor), Dale Sparks (Strategic Broker), Carol McGarry (Democracy Advisor), Jody McKay – (Quality Advice Senior Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts Community and Events update - Events - upcoming Civic Events for 2019/2020 Zella Morrison, Dale Sparks, Kareem Colmenares</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Monthly update of the Arts, Culture and Events - The board was introduced to the new Strategic Broker and discussed the new process for Local Civic events, categories and the proposed list of civic events to be delivered in FY 19/20. ACTIONS: 1. List of local civic events to be checked with Community facilities officers and the nature of the events to be followed up with the board. 2. PACT Building blessing proposed for end of Sept 2019. 3. Local Board Services team to check when the Tupu library project will be completed for an opening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puhinui Bridge - Land Owner Approval Raewyn Sendles</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The board discussed the Puhinui Bridge Landowner Approval report deferred from the 20 August 2019 business meeting and requested additional information be included in the report for the next meeting on 17 September 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayman Park - stormwater renewal project service outcomes Steve Owens, Willow Patterson-Kane, Suzanne Lange (Panuku)</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>The board discussed the service outcomes to be delivered as part of the stormwater renewals project in line with the adopted park concept plan and local board aspirations. ACTIONS: 1. The services assessments findings will be reported back to the board at a workshop in Quarter 3 2019/20 financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Governance role</td>
<td>Summary of discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Approval of the service assessments findings and funding for plan preparations will be presented to the board in Quarter 4 2019/20 financial year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Gallery and OMAC</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>The board was presented with the Fresh Gallery and the Ōtara Music and Arts Centre (OMAC) annual reports and annual action plans. ACTIONS: The board requested that all signage and communications for the facilities include the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board and Auckland Council logos and where appropriate acknowledgement of funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Edwards, Bobby Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The classification and reclassification of reserves in Ōtara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>The board discussed the classification and reclassification of reserves in Ōtara-Papatoetoe report deferred from the 20 August 2019 business meeting. ACTION: Further workshops with the board to provide quality advice on how the gardens are currently being used, evidence of community gardens, feedback and consultation with the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Barker, Paul Duffy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept design workshop – Barrowcliffe Bridge and Place Enhancement</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board discussed the concept design of the streetscape upgrade for the Barrowcliffe Bridge and Place Enhancement project, prior to a formal report to the 17 September 2019 business meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Patterson-Kane, Suzanne Lange, Steve Owens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 12.25 pm