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30 Consideration of Extraordinary Items
1 Welcome

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

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

4 Confirmation of Minutes
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
   a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Thursday, 15 August 2019, as a true and correct.

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

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

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

8 Deputations
Standing Order 7.7 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Puketāpapa 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 Deputations - Life Education Trust - Counties Manukau

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
   a) thank Life Education Trust for their presentation

Attachments
A 20190919 Life Education Trust Presentation.................................................................239

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.

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

10 Extraordinary Business

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the Puketāpapa Local Board (the Board) on transport-related matters in its area and an update on its local board transport capital fund (LBTCF). Relevant public consultations and any decisions of Auckland Transport’s (AT’s) Traffic Control Committee as relevant to the Board area are also included.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Board’s Greenways Route D is discussed and the Board is asked to consider the project moving forward through detailed design, procurement and possibly construction should the costs remain within the Board’s funding envelope of $600,000.
3. Progress on the Board’s Mt Roskill Streetscape upgrade is briefly discussed in the report. The project is due to begin in the first half of September 2019 and be completed by December 2019.
4. Information is given on the progress on the Board’s funded local board capital fund projects (LBTCF). The current balance is zero, as the Board has allocated all of its LBTCF for this electoral term. If any savings are made on projects, it will be credited back to the fund. The Board will receive another allocation on 1 July 2020.
5. A brief update on the Tāmaki Makaurau Vision Zero strategy is included as well as an update on the progress of AT’s Speed Management Bylaw.
6. The report provides a brief update to the Board on significant Auckland Transport (AT) projects in the Board area.
7. Relevant consultations and decisions of AT’s Transport Control Committee are noted, as they affect the Puketāpapa Local Board area.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) receive the Auckland Transport September 2019 report.

b) approve the Greenways Route D - Mount Roskill project (Britton Avenue to Hillsborough Road walking and cycling improvements) to move to detailed design, procurement and construction, providing the work remains within the Board’s $600,000 approved financial envelope.

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

9. AT is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. It reports on a monthly basis to local boards, as set out in its Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important engagement role local boards play within and on behalf of their local communities.
10. The LBTCF is a capital budget provided to all local boards by Auckland Council and delivered by Auckland Transport (AT). Local boards can use this fund to deliver transport infrastructure projects that they believe are important but are not part of AT’s work programme. Projects must also:

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

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Greenways Route D Mount Roskill – Britton Avenue to Monte Cecilia Park - Walking and Cycling Improvements

Background

11. A project to provide improved cycling and walking connections in Mount Roskill, instigated by the Board, was investigated by Auckland Transport. A rough order of costs was provided in 2018 and the Board subsequently resolved to proceed with the scheme design.

12. In the meantime, another project, Safer Communities designed a link on Frost Road to Britton Avenue linking both projects to the Roskill school campus. In addition, the Board has approved another project to provide a pedestrian refuge on Hillsborough Road to improve access to Monte Cecilia Park.

13. AT sought public feedback on the scheme design - Britton Avenue to Monte Cecilia Park which was largely supported.

14. Feedback on the proposal was invited from Monday 1 July to Friday 26 July 2019. In total, 36 feedback responses were received: 24 via the online survey and 12 by freepost feedback forms.

15. Submitters were asked:

- Do you have any issues or suggested changes regarding the specific measures used and/or locations of the measures?
- Do you have any other comments or suggestions on improving walking and cycling connections in Mount Roskill?

As a result of the feedback received on the proposal AT:

- Will make minor adjustments to the positions of the speed humps/side islands.
- Acknowledge the request for fewer speed humps. However, this suggestion cannot be accommodated in this instance because the speed humps need to be a certain distance apart to be effective in speed calming.
- Acknowledge the request for a wider footpath leading from the laneway to the raised crossing on Hayr Rd and note that this is already part of the proposed design.

Next Steps

16. The detailed design will be completed within 4-6 weeks following the release of the consultation report. This phase of the project may involve some further engagement with directly affected residents and property owners.

17. Once the final detailed design is completed, AT would like to go ahead with the tendering process. In order to avoid any delay due to the election process and the establishment of the new Board, AT is requesting that the Board approve the project proceeding through procurement to construction provided the final costs stay within the Board’s approved envelope.
18. If tenders exceed the Board’s approved financial envelope, AT will come back to the Board in February 2020 to seek direction.

**Mt Roskill Streetscape Upgrade**

19. The Board has been assisted by Auckland Council to design a streetscape upgrade project in the Mt Roskill Village area. The project will provide a discrete enhancement to the village and it will be delivered by Auckland Transport.

20. AT’s stakeholder manager has been active with the retailers in the area to ensure that everyone is fully aware of the upcoming work.

21. A letter advising of the upcoming work has been delivered and this will be followed up by a ‘notice of work’ letter which outlines the start date as 12 September 2019. It is expected that the work will be completed in December 2019.

22. AT is putting up corflute signs around the works to showcase the outcome of the project and to assure customers that the shops are still open.

**Update on Puketāpapa Local Board Transport Capital Funded Projects**

23. The table below reflects the status of projects which have been supported by resolution and are progressing using the LBTCF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Cycling Project – Route D (modified)</td>
<td>This route includes shared paths on Frost Road and then a combination of traffic calming measures, signs, markings along Britton and Dornwell Roads, shared paths through the laneways and then traffic calming on Hayr Road and Haughey Avenue through to, but not across Hillsborough Rd.</td>
<td>Public consultation closed on the 26 July 2019. AT has already responded to queries from our major stakeholders. The next step is to release the close-out report. The project can now move to detailed design.</td>
<td>$600,000 (allocated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Road Crossing (1)</td>
<td>The installation of a pedestrian refuge on Hillsborough Road, vicinity of Haughey Street/Delargey Avenue. This will support the greenway cycle route by aiding access to Monte Cecilia Park.</td>
<td>Scheme design work is in progress.</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Road (2) Signalised Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>The installation of a signalised crossing of Hillsborough Road in the vicinity of Goodall Street. Residents have reported that Hillsborough Road can be very difficult to cross as there is a considerable distance between pedestrian facilities.</td>
<td>Scheme design work is in progress.</td>
<td>$338,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Roskill Village Upgrade</td>
<td>The Board approved a small allocation from its local board transport capital fund to move this project forward. The aim is to create an improved environment for pedestrians, bus</td>
<td>Work on the upgrade will commence in September 2019 and is expected to be completed by December 2019.</td>
<td>$244,787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
passengers, shoppers and the business community at Mt Roskill village. Improved footpaths, seating and landscaping are proposed within the road corridor.

Community Safety Fund

| Project | Details | Status | Cost
|---------|---------|--------|-------|
| Hillsborough Road (2) Signalised Pedestrian Crossing | The installation of a signalised crossing off Hillsborough Road in the vicinity of Goodall Street. Residents have reported that Hillsborough Road can be very difficult to cross as there is a considerable distance between pedestrian facilities. | Scheme design work is in progress. | $338,000
| Mt Roskill Village Upgrade | The Board approved a small allocation from its local board transport capital fund to move this project forward. The aim is to create an improved environment for pedestrians, bus passengers, shoppers and the business community at Mt Roskill village. Improved footpaths, seating and landscaping are proposed within the road corridor. | Work on the upgrade will commence in September 2019 and is expected to be completed by December 2019. | $244,787

Progress being made on significant investigations and projects in the Board area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safer Communities 2018-21</td>
<td>This programme focuses on walking improvements in the Mount Roskill community. It aims to create safer walking environments for local people to get to and from key destinations such as schools, public transport hubs, shops, community centres and more, on foot.</td>
<td>AT will attend the Infrastructure and Heritage Cluster in September 2019 to report back on the recent consultation and next steps with the Three Kings Plaza section. The consultation close out report is to be released to the public in early September.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton Street</td>
<td>AT has reviewed the safety audit completed by consultants and provided responses to the matters raised at the May 2018 public meeting. AT has designed bus-friendly infrastructure designs that will ensure all vehicles travel slowly on Carlton Street.</td>
<td>The consultation results and report has now been sent out to submitters. The project now awaits Traffic Control Committee approval. Once this is obtained, changes to Carlton Street are expected to take place later in 2019 to allow the 68 bus route to use the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Road pedestrian crossings</td>
<td>AT is developing a design for two new signalised crossings on May Road, in the vicinity of Glynn Street and Roma</td>
<td>Board and public consultation was completed in May 2019. Some minor changes were made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Road. A pedestrian refuge is proposed close to Denny Avenue. to the design as a result of the consultation. The project will now move to detailed design. Construction is expected to be at the end of the current financial year.

**Connected Communities**

This project aims to make public transport, walking and cycling more attractive to Aucklanders, and provide safer, healthier streets. It brings together a range of bus, cycling, walking and road safety projects across 12 major routes and the CBD, to address traffic congestion in key parts of our growing city. AT will roll out the programme over 10-years, partially funded by the RFT and NZTA.

Progress on routes in the Puketāpapa area will be workshopped with the Board in February 2020.

---

**Community Safety Fund**

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

25. The fund has been named the Community Safety Fund (CSF) and Puketāpapa Local Board was allocated $604,664 over two years. The Board developed a list of safety projects which were prioritised after assessment and a rough order costs established.

26. Currently projects are being further assessed and design work is in progress. It is expected that the first year will see the projects largely in design with most not being delivered until year two of the programme.

---

**Puketāpapa Local Board Community Safety Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding Stream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>383 Hillsborough Road</td>
<td>Signalised crossing</td>
<td>In assessment/design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639 Richardson Road</td>
<td>Safety improvements to the existing crossing</td>
<td>RoC provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pah Road Crossing Awareness</td>
<td>Signage and road marking to highlight existing crossing</td>
<td>RoC provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Primary School</td>
<td>Replace existing kea crossing on Potter Avenue with a raised table.</td>
<td>RoC provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Stoddard Road</td>
<td>Improvements to the existing crossing</td>
<td>RoC provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melrose Rd Shops</td>
<td>Pedestrian Refuge</td>
<td>RoC provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Rd/Mt Eden Rd Crossing</td>
<td>Safety Improvements for pedestrians at this busy intersection</td>
<td>RoC provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arundel Street/Rogan St</td>
<td>Safety improvements which may include a roundabout</td>
<td>Discussion at September Infrastructure and Heritage cluster. Now likely to be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tāmaki Makaurau Vision Zero Strategy


28. This is a significant step in Auckland’s (and New Zealand’s) transport journey. Auckland is now a Vision Zero region with a goal of no deaths or serious injuries on our transport network by 2050.

29. The success of this goal will be built on strong partnerships across all AT departments as well as with our Tāmaki-Makaurau Road Safety Governance partners - Police, NZ Transport Agency, Ministry of Transport, Auckland Council, Auckland Regional Public Health Service and Accident Compensation Corporation (ACC).

30. As the custodian of our region’s transport systems, AT 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.

31. This new approach to Safety includes the development of new tools and guidance (Urban Streets and Road Design Guide and draft Safe System Assessment Framework) to make it happen. The Strategy’s 2019/21 Action Plan also refers to a range of tasks across all AT departments and we will be working to progress these.

32. The AT Board also approved the AT Road Safety Programme Business Case which recommends an investment of $700+ million over ten years to progress many of the actions in the Vision Zero Strategy.


Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

34. The impact of information in this report is confined to Auckland Transport and does not impact on other parts of the Council group. Any engagement with other parts of the Council group will be carried out on an individual project basis.

35. AT is delivering the Mt Roskill Streetscape project for the Board, who has been assisted to develop the project by Auckland Council’s Planning and Places team.

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

Local impacts and local board views

Infrastructure and Heritage Meeting – August 2019

36. AT provided a written update to the meeting on Carlton Street and a financial update on the local board transport capital fund and the community safety fund.

Auckland Transport Consultations

AT’s Speed Management Bylaw

37. Auckland Transport is taking more time to consider a proposal to reduce speeds on some of the highest high-risk roads in the region.

38. The AT Board today decided that more work needs to be done on the timing of any implementation - and more importantly the effects any changes to the original bylaw proposal. The AT Board will now reconsider the matter by 31 October 2019.

39. An extensive public consultation exercise proposed lower speeds on around 10% of the region’s high risk roads in order to cut the number of deaths and serious injuries which occur
daily across the region. AT also received requests from the public for an additional 876km of roads to be included in the proposal. Evaluating the implications and supporting evidence associated with a wide range of implementation options, including levels of community support, is being thoroughly considered prior to the matter being presented to the AT Board, says Chief Executive Shane Ellison.

40. Over 11,700 submissions were received in relation to the proposal.

Other Consultations

41. AT provides the Puketāpapa Local Board with the opportunity to comment on transport projects being delivered in their area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Avenue, Lynfield</td>
<td>AT is proposing Broken Yellow Lines (BYLs) parking restrictions on The Avenue in Lynfield. This proposal responds to a request from the PuketāpapaLocal Board to investigate the issue of parked vehicles blocking visibility for drivers entering and exiting the carpark to the shopping complex. The proposed restrictions are expected to make it easier and safer for those visiting the shops by preventing vehicles from parking near the carpark driveway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Control Committee resolutions

42. The Traffic Control Committee decisions that affected the Board area in July 2019 are reported below. There were no decisions affecting the PuketāpapaLocal Board area in August 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Griffen Park Road, Hillsborough Road, Commodore Drive, Orcades Place, Lynfield</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes Combined No Stopping At All Times, Bus Stop, Removal of Bus Stop, Lane Arrow Markings, Traffic Islands, Flush Median, Stop Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenstown Road, Onehunga</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes Combined Lane Arrow Markings, No Stopping At All Times, Clearway, Bus Stop, Traffic Signal Control, No Passing, Removal of Traffic Island</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

43. 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.

44. The Mt Roskill streetscape upgrade design was based on a cultural landscape report in 2013. Te ao Māori input was provided by iwi representatives for that report.

45. The final design was amended to implement changes requested at a hui in September 2018. Iwi, the construction company and local board members are invited to a karakia to mark the start of the construction in September 2019.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

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

47. Once the firm estimate of costs for the Greenways D project is established, if it exceeds the Board’s allocation, it will be reported back to the Board for direction.
48. Any savings from projects currently underway or recently completed will be credited back to the Board’s account.

**Local Board Transport Capital Fund Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Puketāpapa Local Board Transport Capital Fund Financial Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funds Available</strong> in current political term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount committed</strong> to date on projects approved for design and/or construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remaining Budget left</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

49. The Board is asked to approve the Greenways Route D project proceeding to procurement and possibly construction without formal approval of the detailed design. There is a small risk that some design details might have been altered with Board input.

50. To mitigate this risk, the Board may request that AT should seek to discuss the final detailed design with the chair-elect and/or deputy chair of the new Board at an informal meeting.

51. To delay the project for formal approval of the detailed design, may mean this is not achieved until February 2020, which poses a considerable delay in the project. AT would also prefer to work in with the Safer Communities project and that project is expected to begin construction over the school holiday period.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

AT will provide a further update report after the 2019 local body elections.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

There are no attachments for this report.

**Ngā kaihaina**
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Puketāpapa Youth Board Update

File No.: CP2019/12275

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. The purpose of this report is for the Puketāpapa Youth Board to provide a verbal update to the Board.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
a) thank the Puketāpapa Youth Board for their update.

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

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Authoriser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketapapa</td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Road Name Approval: Two New Public Roads and an Existing Public Road Extension

File No.: CP2019/16917

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Puketāpapa Local Board to name two new public roads, created by way of a subdivision development at the Roskill South development (Stage 2).
2. Approval is also sought to retain the existing name for a public road that has been extended within the Roskill South development, from what was originally a cul-de-sac, into an open-ended road.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
3. 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.
4. The applicant, HLC, has proposed the following names for consideration by the Local Board, noting that the two Te Reo Māori options having been suggested by mana whenua Te Aakitai Waiohua:
   • Road 1 (Extension) Proposed to retain existing name: Balfron Avenue
   • Road 2: Applicant's Preferred name: Kōtero Road
   • Road 3: Applicant's Preferred name: Huakaroro Road
   • Alternative name options (can be used for either road): Seismic Road, Thermal Road, Silica Road

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) approve the retention of the existing road name ‘Balfron Avenue' for public Road 1 to be extended within the Roskill South development (Stage 2), pursuant to section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974.

b) approve the following two names for the new public roads within the Roskill South development (Stage 2), in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974 (resource consent references BUN60327511 and SUB60327480):
   i. Road 2: Kōtero Road
   ii. Road 3: Huakaroro Road

Horopaki
Context
5. Resource consent reference BUN60327511 (including subdivision consent reference SUB60327480) was issued in February 2019 to create twelve residential super lots within 5 geographical areas in Mt Roskill, as well as one recreation reserve, two new public roads, two road extension/upgrades and two widened pedestrian accessways.
6. Only two new public roads and one public road extension are included in this report.

7. The Road 1 extension involves an existing public cul-de-sac road, currently named ‘Balfron Avenue’, that will become an extended open-ended roadway. Applicant HLC requests to retain this existing road name to avoid any confusion and avoid the need for changes to addressing for existing owners along the road.

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 Maori 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’s preferred road name options have been suggested by local iwi (Te Aakitai Waiohua) and link to the following background; Before European settlement, potatoes were a staple for crop for Māori (Māori acknowledge that some potato varieties arrived with early explorers, sealers and whalers during the 18th century). Māori did not make pottery, so their only means of boiling was to place a red-hot stone in a wooden bowl of liquid. They preserved large quantities of food by drying it, fermenting it, or sealing it in fat. The food was stored in pātaka (storehouses) or rua kūmara (underground pits).

12. The alternative name options reference volcanoes, in recognition of the local maunga in the neighbourhood.

13. In accordance with the above themes, the applicant’s proposed names and meanings are set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Proposed Name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road 2</td>
<td>Kōtero Road</td>
<td><em>(noun)</em> fermented potatoes, potatoes steeped in water. <strong>Suggested by Te Aakitai Waiohua</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Applicant Preferred)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road 3</td>
<td>Huakaroro Road</td>
<td><em>(noun)</em> a Māori potato cultivar, <em>Solanum tuberosum</em> - a white-skinned potato suitable for all cooking methods, which looks like a seagull’s egg. <strong>Suggested by Te Aakitai Waiohua</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Applicant Preferred)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternative options:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seismic Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silica Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminology related to volcanoes, in recognition of the local maunga in the neighbourhood.</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, therefore it is up to the local board to decide upon the thematic suitability of the names within the local context.
15. **Confirmation:** Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) has confirmed that all of the proposed names are acceptable and not duplicated elsewhere in the region.

16. **Road type:** ‘Road’ is an acceptable road type for the new public roads, suiting the form and layout of the road, as per the Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines.

17. **Iwi Consultation:** All relevant local iwi were written to (via email) and invited to comment. Te Aakitai Waiohua suggested three names: one name was a duplicate and therefore not accepted for use, and the remaining two acceptable name suggestions have been included in the table above for consideration by the Local Board. No other iwi provided responses or comments. It is therefore implied that no other iwi were opposed to the use of any of the proposed names in this location.

---

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

**Council group impacts and views**

18. 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**

19. 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**

20. The review sought from the Puketāpapa Local Board on this report is linked to the Auckland Plan Outcome “A Maori identity that is Auckland’s point of difference in the world”. The use of Maori names for roads, buildings and other public places is an opportunity to publicly demonstrate Maori identity. Two Maori road name options have been proposed.

---

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

21. 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**

22. 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**

23. Approved road names are notified to Land Information New Zealand which records them its their New Zealand wide land information database which includes street addresses issued by councils.
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Amendment to resolution - Hearing of submissions to the proposed lease to Three Kings United Football Club

File No.: CP2019/16908

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To amend resolution PKTPP/2012/225 of the Puketāpapa Local Board for the hearing of submissions and approval of the Agreement to Lease to Three Kings United Football Club.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. At the Puketāpapa Local Board meeting on 8 August 2012, the board resolved under PKTPP/2012/225 in part:

   *That the Puketāpapa Local Board delegate final approval of the Agreement to Lease to Board Member Michael Wood and Ella Kumar.*

3. It is requested resolution PKTPP/2012/225 c) be amended by the Puketāpapa Local Board so delegation can be exercised by current board members.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) amend resolution PKTPP/2012/225 c) made at the business meeting on 8 August 2012 to read –

   c) That the Puketāpapa Local Board delegate final approval of the Agreement to Lease to the Chair and the Deputy Chair.

Horopaki

Context

4. The purpose of resolution PKTPP/2012/225 c) (Attachment A) was to delegate authority to give final approval of the agreement to lease, to two named local board members (Michael Wood and Ella Kumar), and for that authority to be exercised jointly.

5. As Michael Wood is no longer a Puketāpapa Local Board member, the authority delegated by the board can no longer be exercised. As a result, final approval cannot be provided for the Agreement to Lease.

6. To progress the approval of the Agreement to Lease the Puketāpapa Local Board could also make the decision on the final approval of the agreement as they are the allocated decision-maker for this matter.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

7. So delegated authority can be exercised as originally envisaged it is recommended that resolution PKTPP/2012/225 c) be amended for the Puketāpapa Local Board to delegate final approval of the Agreement to Lease to the Chair and the Deputy Chair.

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

8. Staff obtained input from Legal Services.

9. Legal Services advised the delegated authority provided by resolution PKTPP/2012/225 c) cannot be used to give final approval of the Agreement to Lease as Mr. Wood is no longer a member of the local board.

10. No other concerns were raised regarding the amendment to resolution PKTPP/2012/225, as all other actions required by the resolution have been satisfied.

11. The amended resolution has no identified impact on other parts of the council group. The views of council-controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of this report’s advice.

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

12. The Puketāpapa Local Board is the allocated authority to approve the amendment to resolution.

13. The recommendation falls within the local board’s allocated authority relating to local, recreation, sport and community facilities.

14. At a workshop dated 5 September 2019, the Puketāpapa Local Board informally supported resolution PKTPP/2012/225 c) be amended so delegation can be exercised by current board members.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

15. The recommendation is procedural in nature and does not impact on Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

16. There are no financial implications.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

17. If the amendment to the resolution is not approved this will delay Three Kings United Football Club Incorporated being able to access funding approved for the proposed clubrooms.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

18. If the amendment to the resolution is approved, and the Agreement to lease is approved, council staff will send the Agreement to Lease to Three Kings United Football Club Incorporated for signing.
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Attachment A

5 Hearing of submissions to the proposed lease to Three Kings United Football Club

Annette Campion, Policy Advisor Project Coordinator and David Barker, Team Leader Parks Specialists and Programmes were in attendance to speak to this report. Documents were tabled in support of this item.

A copy of the tabled documents will be kept on file and made available on the Auckland Council website.

Resolution number PKTPP/2012/225

MOVED by Member RA Barter, seconded Member NJ Turnbull:

a) That the Hearing of submissions to the proposed lease to Three Kings United Football Club report be received.

b) That the Puketapapa Local Board request that officers enter into negotiation with the Three Kings United Football Club to prepare an Agreement to Lease. This will include, but is not limited to, the requirement to have the following in place prior to construction starting:

i) Detailed design plans, engineering plans and construction methodology for the new clubrooms,

ii) All necessary resource and building consents,

iii) Agreement on hours of operation and any other relevant conditions on the use of Keith Hay Park (including a licence to occupy for the area covered by spectator seating), taking into account the views and legitimate interests of neighbouring residents, and

iv) Sufficient funding to complete the proposed development.

c) That the Puketapapa Local Board delegate final approval of the Agreement to Lease to Board Member Michael Wood and Elia Kumar.

d) That subject to all conditions of the Agreement to Lease being met the Puketapapa Local Board grant approval for a new lease and a licence to occupy to be issued to the Three Kings United Football Club following the construction of the new building.

CARRIED

The Puketāpapa Local Board provided funding in the 2018/2019 financial year to undertake the ‘Knowing phase’ of the Urban Ngahere (Forest) program.

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

The report has established that urban tree coverage in the local board area is approximately 20.4 per cent of the overall land area in 2013. The total tree cover is good when compared to the averages across the region and 5.4 per cent above the minimum target that has been set by Auckland Council in the regional Urban Ngahere Strategy. The strategy sets a regional target to have no local board with a tree canopy coverage less than 15 per cent.

To maintain and increase the tree canopy cover, new specimen trees will need to be planted every year.

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

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) approve the draft Puketāpapa 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 Puketāpapa Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report that are required before public release.

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. Puketāpapa Local Board has allocated funding to begin the ‘Growing’ phase in the 2019/2020 financial year.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

11. The analysis report highlights good overall tree canopy coverage at 20.4 per cent for the Puketāpapa local board area.

The report provides a number of other statistics:

- 20.4 per cent of the local board area has tree canopy cover
- 38.1 per cent of parks and open space has tree canopy cover
- 7.8 per cent of local roads have tree canopy cover, which is low
- 44.8 per cent of urban tree cover is 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, noting that it takes several decades for trees planted now to develop to a size where their environmental values start to help these communities.

13. Funding for a 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 the local board funding and project manage the delivery of the new tree plantings in the 2020 planting season.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
17. The Puketāpapa Local Board has provided direction and support for the project at workshops in July 2018 and to complete the ‘Knowing’ phase. The board provided in-principle support to adopt the analysis report at the August 2019 workshop.

18. The board requested additional maps be included in the final report to clearly show the areas affected by Kauri Die Back in local parks and other public land.

19. 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
20. The urban ngahere is important to mana whenua and the use of native trees will take place as the first choice in alignment with the council’s Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy. New tree plantings will benefit local Māori and the wider community by providing increased opportunities for access to nature and providing shade in the local park network.

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

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

23. It is recommended the local board adopts an annual program of new tree planting in parks and along streets to increase the level of tree canopy coverage on public land across the entire local board area. The planting program should take place annually, into the future, to help increase tree canopy cover in local parks and reserves.

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

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

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

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

Next steps

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

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

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Puketapapa LB Draft Ngahere (Forest) Report</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Howell Davies - Senior Advisor - Urban Forest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Mace Ward - General Manager Parks, Sports and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Development Initiative – Urban Ngahere Programme

Year 1 Knowing Phase

Urban Ngahere Analysis report for the Puketāpapa Local Board
Preface

The Puketāpapa Local Board has provided funding support to enable the knowing phase of the programme, the findings of the research work is outlined in the following report. It is a detailed analysis of the data that was available on the tree cover within the extents of the local boards geographical area.

The findings in the report are based on results from the LiDAR work undertaken in 2013 by Auckland Council and has involved an in-depth analysis of data from this work, along with reviews of a range of other data sets. This work has enabled the development of this draft report which aims to give a detailed baseline view of the urban ngahere in the Puketāpapa local board area, along with the needs, gaps, risks, and possible opportunities that exist.

The report is key milestone for the Local boards Ngahere Knowing Programme. It is intended to provide fine-grained detail on the extent of tree cover, on public and private land in local suburbs. The detail is aimed to help inform, direct efforts towards improving, enhancing the extent and diversity of the Ngahere, tree cover on public and private land across the local boards geographical area.

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

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

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

This report outlines the distribution, ownership, and protection status of urban tree cover within the Puketāpapa Local Board (Auckland Council) area. The intent of the report is to provide an evidence-based approach to ensure decision-makers are well-informed on the scale, health and diversity of the urban trees in the Puketāpapa local board area.

The information is intended to help enable the development of a sound and structured approach to urban forest management for current and future decision makers on the Puketāpapa Local Board. Principally, the following draft report is seen as a baseline for the local board, and council parks staff, to refer to, inform and directing efforts on areas where tree cover is low or there are predicted future changes that require a longer term approach to plant trees now in advance and to provide for the next generation of tree cover.

The data presented in this report includes a snap-shot of urban forest cover from 2013, sourced through a measure of canopy distribution and height within the Puketāpapa Local Board area. The data presented is based on an analysis of 2013 LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) data captured jointly by NZ Aerial Mapping and Aerial Surveys Limited for Auckland Council. Auckland Council has undertaken a second aerial LiDAR survey of a similar nature, completed in 2018, which is currently being analysed to determine possible changes in urban forest cover and associated attributes. Results of this work are expected in September 2019, and once finalised, it will enable a thorough change detection comparison to be completed. The results of this work by council, will be included in an updated version of the final report once this has been completed.

Based on the 2013 dataset, urban forest covers approximately 20.4% of the Puketāpapa Local Board, including 10.6% of roads, 44.4% of public parks, and 16.8% of private land. The Local Board area has a relatively high urban forest cover compared to other urban local boards within the Auckland metropolitan area. Approximately one half of the urban forest cover has some form of statutory protection, and there are 130 Notable Trees or groups of Trees identified in the local board area.

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

There are some obvious gaps in tree cover throughout the Puketāpapa Local Board area, primarily related to large grassed park areas and land developed for industrial and commercial purposes. Increases in urban forest cover are currently being directed by the Puketāpapa Greenways Network Plan. This report identifies further opportunities for urban forest increases, particularly in relation to street trees and sports parks, and suburb areas with lower tree cover at present. Public land is identified as the most logical place to focus additional urban forest planting as this offers the best opportunities for long-term sustainable management, due to the lower chance of conflict with future housing intensification and infrastructure upgrades.
The benefits of taking a strategic Local Board-wide approach to increasing urban forest cover include more considered selection of appropriate species and location for plantings, better arboricultural management, and a coherent policy for ongoing planting of new and replacement trees. Public parks are also better able to accommodate the types of large trees which provide a disproportionate amount of many of urban forest benefits. The wider accessibility of trees on public parkland also means that the benefits they provide (e.g. better shade and increased emotional well-being for park users) apply to a larger number of people, which is a major positive in terms of overall cost-benefit outcomes for local communities. With this targeted study on tree cover within parks and around playgrounds, it is possible to obtain a clearer view on where to plant more trees that will in time benefit the local community and users of open spaces.

The data presented in this report gives a starting point to compare changes to urban forest cover over time, which can be tracked an analysed to direct trees planting efforts within the Puketāpapa area. A detailed analysis of the changes and trends that have occurred over the last 5 years will be possible when the latest data is finally processed and a QA (Quality Analysis) completed. Additional analysis of further LiDAR data will be used to forecast the possible future changes in urban forest cover and height as a result of increased population growth and intensification.

Other future areas for funding, research, and action on improving urban tree cover should look to focus on concentrating efforts in parts of the local board with greater population densities and higher numbers of children, with suggested actions included in the report. Moving forward this will ensure these groups have better access to urban trees and nature, and will adopt the approach to deliver a ngahere for a flourishing future.
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1.0 PREFACE

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

Fruit tree species such as olive, citrus, and a range of stone fruits were often commonly planted during settlement by Europeans. The north-western part of Auckland around the Kaipara Harbour still contains some of the earliest plantings of domestic plum and apple trees. The Morton Bay fig trees in Monte Cecelia Park in Hillsborough are the largest of their type in New Zealand, and another example of the history of Auckland’s diverse and unique tree cover.

When European settlers arrived to Auckland, the gullies of the isthmus were filled with raupō, edged with a varied growth of sedges and other moisture loving plants; and slopes of gullies covered with kāramu and cabbage trees. Numerous ferns and low-growing plants amongst blocks of scoria were described as having a luxuriance of growth (Kirk 1870)). By the late 19th century, nearly all the land within the Puketāpapa area was under cultivation with a large number of introduced plants. While some of this land has now been left to regenerate, the continuous forest in the local board area is largely confined to the southern coastline along the Manukau Harbour.

The Puketāpapa Local Board has provided funding to Auckland Council’s Urban Forest Advisor in the Parks, Sports and Recreation Department, to develop an analysis report on the tree cover in its area of responsibility. This report is the result of a program of work across Auckland Council to develop detailed analysis of urban forest cover on public and private land, identifying opportunities to nurture, grow and protect urban trees in the local board area. The analysis work is directed by the Council’s Urban Forest Strategy 2018, which has 18 key objectives to help Council and Local Boards to deliver a healthy ngahere for a flourishing future.
2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Overview

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

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

2.2 What is Urban Ngāhere (Forest)?

‘Urban forest’ comprises all the trees within a city – including parks, coastal cliffs, stream corridors, private gardens and streets – both native and naturalised exotic species. This comprehensive definition is sourced from the North American view of urban forest (Miller et al. 2015, Wilcox 2012), rather than the European one, which instead defines urban forest as natural enclaves of forest within the city limits (Cliffin 2005, Carreiro and Zipperer 2008).

For the purposes of this report, ‘Urban ngāhere’ is defined as all of the trees and other vegetation three metres or taller in stature within the Puketāpapa Local Board, and the soil and water systems that support these trees. This urban forest definition encompasses trees and shrubs in streets, parks, private gardens, stream embankments, coastal cliffs, rail corridors, and motorway margins and embankments. It also includes both planted and naturally established plants, of both exotic and native provenance.
The ngahere in the local board area may not represent a forest as an image of the kauri forests of Northland might. However, the scale of the tree and shrub cover across the area is sufficiently extensive on both public and private land to make a meaningful contribution to the liveability and sense of place for its residents.

2.3 Why do we want Urban Ngahere?

Scientific research and studies over the last three decades have shown how the urban forest provides a multitude of benefits for ecosystem, the economy, and community health and wellbeing. Trees are crucial from an ecological standpoint, and additional provide a wide range of landscape, environment, social, economic, climatic, cultural, and other practical benefits, including the points outlined below:

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

2. Urban forests provide critical ecosystem services such as production of oxygen, carbon sequestration, and nutrient cycling. Urban tree cover can help to reduce stormwater peak flows and improve stormwater treatment at source which, in turn, can help improve the region’s harbours and water quality. Stream water quality and habitat can be significantly improved by tree planting on stream banks.

3. Trees along streets and in urban town centres help to filter the air by trapping dust and particulate matter, acting to treat pollution from buildings and vehicles.

---

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

5. In a neighbourhood with more street trees, park trees, and other plants, people judge walking distances to be less, and are therefore more likely to travel on foot, which has health benefits.

6. Urban forest provides protection for residents from the sun while walking and playing, and from traffic by the physical barriers trees provide. The presence of street trees reduces the speed of drivers, and consequently reduces the frequency and severity of crashes.

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

8. Indigenous trees are culturally important, being historically representative of the Māori supermarket, the spiritual domain, and the medicine cabinet. Many native species still have cultural value and use for food, medicine, weaving, and carving, and planting around streams can improve the mauri (life essence) of the waterways.

The Auckland Council Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy tree values graphic is shown below.
In addition, many of the native ecosystems within Auckland’s urban boundary are unique in their own right, being representative examples of naturally rare or unique ecosystems that have largely been cleared to make way for urban growth. Urban forest also provides habitat for other biodiversity, including native birds, reptiles, and insects.

2.4 What is the Rationale Behind Studying Urban Ngahere?

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

Baseline information about Auckland’s urban forest is particularly important in light of the recent changes to the RMA which have removed the ability of Auckland Council to use general tree protection rules to protect urban forest over a certain size. Sections 76(4A) and 76(4B) of the RMA were inserted under the RMA (Simplifying and Streamlining) Amendment Act 2009 (RMAA09). This was amended under the RMA Act 2013 (RMAA13) to align with the original policy intent of prohibiting blanket tree protection rules in urban areas.

It was anticipated by the legislators that removal of general tree protection would occur in conjunction with a systematic program to identify and protect important trees through their incorporation onto the notable tree schedule, however in Auckland this has not been fully realised. Specifically, the current list in Schedule 10 of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) 2016 ("Unitary Plan") is not entirely accurate and contains multiple errors of various types including grammatical, location, and legal definitions. This Notable Tree list is therefore currently under review, with a Plan Change underway to fix some of the current errors. However, legislative requirements mean any changes to the current list will need to follow a public process of consultation and hearings to update and make any changes. This is a costly exercise for Council, both on time and resources.

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

In the last five years, resulting from these changes to the RMA, concerns have been expressed to the Council by local board members, urban forest researchers, councillors, and local community groups relating to the removal and loss of large trees in local suburbs. Dr Margaret Stanley from the University of Auckland has presented detail on urban forest cover change and highlighted the need for Auckland Council to look at better options for encouraging tree preservation (Stanley 2018). A number of articles have also been published in the media regarding tree loss in Auckland.
The Environmental Defence Society of New Zealand ("EDS") stated in 2015, "While other cities have targets of achieving 40% tree cover or more, Auckland is moving backwards with a minimalist approach reliant on a cumbersome and costly scheduling process" (EDS 2015).  

The recent changes to urban forest cover and the attention this has received highlight the need to consider future management issues that arise with major projects such as infrastructure upgrades, park redevelopments, and removal of aging stands of trees. The only viable method available to Council to track urban forest change is by LiDAR analysis, as outlined in this report.

### 3.0 RESEARCH THEMES

This report is framed around the key principles of Council’s Ngahere Strategy. The Puketāpapa Local Board has provided feedback on, and funding for, an urban forest work programme following a workshop in September 2018. The key deliverables of the knowing phase are to determine:

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. How the urban forest of the Puketāpapa Local Board is expected to change in the future, including future priority areas for investigation and research.

---

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

The Puketāpapa Local Board covers approximately 1,885 hectares (ha) in southern central Auckland, to the north of the Manukau Harbour. Development of the area commenced in the early 20th century, with most growth occurring after the second world war (Auckland Regional Council, 2010). The area is now connected to other parts of Auckland by the South-Western Motorway and has one of the highest rates of urban land cover at around 75%. The population is just over 60,000 residents (Puketāpapa Local Board Plan 2017).

The land use within the local board is primarily residential, including the suburbs of Three Kings, Mount Roskill, Hillsborough, Lynfield, Wesley, and Royal Oak. Small commercial and industrial areas occur around Mt Roskill, including the Foodstuffs North Island Support Centre. The balance of the urban land largely comprises native forest and shrubland along the coast (c. 9.3%), and parklands. Prominent parks include Puketāpapa-Mt Roskill, Te Tāua a Riukiuta-Three Kings, Monte Cecilia Park, and the sequence of reserves along the Manukau Harbour.

Puketāpapa’s southern coastal edge is well-vegetated and gains much of its character from the combination of strong landform and regenerating coastal forest. The coastal edge has been identified as regionally significant in the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal, and the coastline was rated as having ‘significant sensitivity’ in the Auckland Urban Area Landscape Assessment. The reserves located within this coastal corridor are predominantly natural in character and the integrity of them is largely due to their continuous and relatively undeveloped state. The coastal edge of the Mt Roskill Local Board thus acts as a valuable buffer between the harbour and the urban development beyond.

Overall, 71 local parks are present in the Puketāpapa Local Board. These include several large-scale sports parks such as Keith Hay Park, Fearon Park/Harold Long Reserve, and Margaret Griffen Park. Several of these parks are under redevelopment to improve facilities, upgrade play areas, and improve the natural environment with stream rehabilitation and indigenous tree planting (Puketāpapa Local Board Draft Urban (Forest) Report).
Board 2013), including naturalisation of concreted sections of Te Auaunga-Oakley Creek. Two private eighteen-hole golf courses are also present within the area, being Maungakiekie Golf Course and Akarana Golf Course.

In pre-human times, the majority of the Puketāpapa Local Board would have been cloaked in forest characterised by podocarp, broadleaved species, and kauri. Coastal forest dominated by pōhutukawa would have fringed the Manukau Harbour, while the northern part of the board would have included forest and shrubland that grew on the extensive Three Kings volcanic boulderfields (Lindsay et al., 2009). Due to a combination of tree clearance, firstly for farming, and later for settlement and urbanisation, much of the indigenous forest cover of the area has been lost.

At present the remaining indigenous forest cover is largely along the coast of the Manukau Harbour. Wattle Bay is one of the largest reserves, forming part of a highly significant strip of coastal forest that extends from Green Bay to White Bluff. The forest coastline creates an ecological corridor for a range of native flora and fauna, promoting natural processes such as seed dispersal and wildlife movement from the Waitakere Ranges along the Manukau cliffs and into the coastal reserves. Wattle Bay Reserve is of particular significance given it is one of the largest remaining remnants of native coastal forest on the Auckland isthmus, and it has been identified as Significant Ecological Area (SEA) under the Auckland Unitary Plan. Over 213 indigenous plant species occur in this coastal area (Pishief and Shirley 2015).
Coastal forest fringing Manukau Harbour, Waikowhai Reserve

Coastal forest fringing Manukau Harbour in southern Puketapapa

Large portions of the Local Board area are now zoned for development intensification under the Unitary Plan. The new zoning now allows for smaller sections including Mixed Housing Urban and Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings, particularly around Wesley and Three Kings.
Consequently, much of the urban forest is under threat from development, which could potentially lead to irreversible changes in urban forest cover (Brown et al., 2015).

5.0 METHODS

5.1 Methodology Overview

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

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

The term LiDAR stands for Light Detection and Ranging. It is an airborne optical remote sensing technology that measures scattered light to find a range and other information on a distant target. The range to the target is measured using the time delay between transmission of a pulse and detection of a reflected signal. This technology allows for the direct measurement of three-dimensional features and structures and the underlying terrain.

The ability to measure height of features on the ground or above the ground is the principle advantage over conventional optical remote sensing technologies such as aerial imagery.

LiDAR data that is suitable for urban forest analysis has been made available for the year 2013, and the processing of 2016 data is underway. Final 2016 results for the Puketāpapa Local Board were not available at the time when this report was being prepared, and the Local Board will be updated later this year when the results become available. It is expected that the final results will be available in September 2019 and after the release of this data further work will be undertaken to compare the data sets and establish what changes there have been in the extent and size of the tree cover.

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

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

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

5.2 Urban Forest Structure

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

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

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

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

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

5.4 Urban Forest Protection Status

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

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

---

3 Note that the motorway corridor is actually owned and managed by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA). The Council has no control over the motorway corridor greenspace and trees planted here are not covered by the street tree rules in the Auckland Unitary Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection zone</th>
<th>Detail on rules and restrictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – no protection</td>
<td>There is no statutory protection for urban forest and/or rules preventing tree or vegetation clearance in this location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – some protection</td>
<td>Within an open space active recreation zone or a road corridor. For both these areas restricted discretionary resource consents are required to clear trees &gt; 4m in height. However, development pressures are often high in these locations and trees are often regarded as incompatible with the main land uses. The proposed Auckland Unitary Plan rules for street trees are more permissive in terms of what utilities can do around and to trees – including pruning as permitted activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – low protection</td>
<td>Within a coastal natural character area, or an area zoned as ‘Open Space Informal Recreation’ (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove trees/vegetation 4m+ in height). The proposed Auckland Unitary Plan rules for park trees are more permissive in terms of what utilities can do around and to trees – including pruning as permitted activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 – moderate protection | Including the following:  
- Outstanding Natural Feature (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove 25m²+ of contiguous indigenous vegetation)\(^a\),  
- Outstanding Natural Landscape (restricted discretionary consent needed for alteration or removal of 50m\(^2\) of any contiguous indigenous vegetation)\(^a\),  
- Coastal yard (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove native trees/vegetation 3m+ in height)\(^a\)  
- Open Space Conservation (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove trees/vegetation 4m+ in height)  
- Historic heritage (discretionary consent needed to remove trees/vegetation 3m+ in height)  
- Riparian yard (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove any trees or shrubs)  
- Lake protection zone (restricted discretionary consent needed to remove any trees or shrubs) |
| 4 – high protection | Significant Ecological Areas ("SEA") (discretionary consent needed to remove any trees or vegetation), Notable trees (discretionary consent needed to remove any notable tree or shrub) |

Table 3: Level of protection assigned to urban forest based on Unitary Plan zone and overlay rules  
\(^a\) = vegetation protection in these areas is restricted to indigenous species and does not cover exotic plants. In some cases (e.g. coastal zone) the removal of exotic vegetation is specifically mentioned as a permitted activity. Exotic trees can provide many of the same benefits as native species so this is a negative in terms of protection of urban forest values.
Example of Significant Ecological Area, Waitākī Park

High rise & density development no protection exists for trees on land with this type of zoning
5.5 Urban Forest in Relation to Socio-Economic Factors

To further analyse the urban forest data and potential influencing factors, the data (including total canopy, tenure, size class distribution, and protection status) was categorised into Census Area Units (CAU) for the Puketāpapa Local Board. The CAU covered by the Local Board area are shown in Figure 1, with 12 units being present in total. Where CAU within the Puketāpapa area cross over the Local Board boundary (e.g. Royal Oak CAU shown below), they are covered in this report, unless the area of overlap is very small (e.g. Onehunga South West CAU).

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

Figure 1: Census Area Units (2013) of the Puketāpapa Local Board (highlighted in orange)

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

- Park selection and type of park maintenance (ie maintained or unmaintained)
  - All parks in the Puketāpapa Local Board were assessed. Parks were identified using the Auckland Council GeoMaps Geospatial Information System ("GIS"), which records whether the park is maintained or unmaintained under the Council facility maintenance contract. For reference, unmaintained parks are often stormwater ponds or narrow esplanade strips in areas that are no easily accessible, or unpopular, with little to no infrastructure.

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

- Number of trees present and percentage of canopy cover
  - Digital photo interpretation through visual estimate of high-resolution aerial imagery was used to estimate the number of trees and the percentage of canopy cover. If there were less than twenty trees an accurate figure could be obtained, while higher tree numbers were estimated\(^4\). For the tree to be counted, the majority of the tree needed to be within the park boundary. Visual estimations of the percentage of canopy cover extent versus land areas were also made, with an example shown in Figure 2.

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

- Amount of shade provided to playground, if present
  - Visual estimation of the amount of shade on playgrounds provided by trees was recorded within three different categories: ‘trees provide some shade to the playground’; ‘trees provide a little shade to the playground’; and ‘trees provide no shade to the playground’.

\(^4\) For consistency and validity, the same person carried out all estimations of tree numbers and the percentage of canopy cover.
5.6 Change in Urban Forest Cover 2013 – 2016

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

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

6.0 RESULTS

6.1 Urban Forest Cover 2013 Overview

Figure 3 shows urban forest cover within the Puketāpapa Local Board, as represented by 2013 LiDAR data. Overall, urban forest covers 20.4% of the Local Board area, including 10.6% of roads, 44.4% of public parks, and 16.8% of private land.

Public parks in total account for approximately 17.5% of the Local Board area. 71 parks are present within the Local Board, with most of these (all except four) being regularly maintained by Council contractors. All parks within the local board area contain some degree of urban forest.
Figure 3: Urban forest cover within the Puketāpapa Local Board boundary
Total urban forest cover within the Local Board is high when compared to other urban local boards within the Auckland metropolitan area, although there is a group of four local boards with a very similar total coverage of 19-20%, as shown in Table 4. Urban forest cover within public space is the second highest in Puketāpapa out of all the urban local boards.

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

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

* A number of local boards have been excluded from this table as they contain significant pockets of rural land (i.e. Hibiscus and Bays, Upper Harbour, Howick and Papakura local boards) or are largely rural in character (i.e. Waitakere, Franklin, Rodney, Great Barrier and Waiheke local boards)

6.2 Urban Forest Structure

The height class distribution of the urban forest canopy within Puketāpapa Local Board is displayed in Figure 4. As shown, approximately one quarter of the forest is between 3-5m tall, one half between 5-10m tall, and the remaining quarter represents trees taller than 10m.

This data shows only low presence of large trees within the local board area, with trees taller than 15m representing approximately 12% of the total urban forest assessed. When broken down into suburb areas (Figure 5), the same general trend is observed, with the exception of Royal Oak which has a slightly larger proportion of trees more than 10m tall than the remaining suburb areas.
Figure 4: Height class distribution of urban forest canopy within Puketāpapa Local Board

Figure 5: Height class distribution of urban forest canopy per suburb
6.3 Urban Forest Tenure

The tenure distribution of urban forest canopy within the Puketāpapa Local Board is displayed in Figures 6 and 7. Just less than half (44.8%) of the urban forest is located on private property, for example within private gardens and lawn areas. Public Parks also make up a large percentage of the canopy (38%). Publicly owned land (e.g. schools) and road reserves contain the lowest proportion of urban forest, with each having less than 10%. Public parks have the highest proportion of urban forest out of all the land tenures, as shown in Figure 8, with the total coverage being more than twice as much as any other land tenure.

Figure 9 displays the distribution of height classes by land tenure, in relation to the total urban forest in each tenure category. This figure shows public parks have the widest distribution of height classes out of all the land tenures, and the highest proportion of taller trees. Trees more than 20 metres tall are poorly represented in the Other Public Land and Street Tree land tenures.

There is little variation in tenure of urban forest throughout the Puketāpapa Local Board area, as shown in Figures 10 and 11. Mount Roskill and Hillsborough have overall the highest total urban forest, with the majority of this forest being either of private land or in public parks. Lynfield, Royal Oak, and Three Kings all have almost no urban forest on other publicly owned land, and Three Kings has a very small amount of urban forest overall.

To recognise that each suburb has different areas of land in each tenure, for example Mount Roskill has nearly 550ha of public parks, while Three Kings only has 5ha, the forest tenure proportions in Figure 11 are relative to land area. This figure shows a similar spread across the different land tenures between suburbs, with 9-17% of road reserves being covered in urban forest, 11-25% of private land, and 9-34% of other public land. For public parks, Hillsborough and Lynfield have a much higher urban forest cover than the other suburbs, being 69% and 77% respectively, compared to the 28-29% of the remaining suburbs. Hillsborough and Lynfield also have the highest urban forest cover overall relative to land area, with more than twice as much of the suburbs covered than in Mount Roskill, Royal Oak, and Three Kings.
Figure 6: Tenure of urban forest canopy within Puketāpapa Local Board

[INSERT GIS IMAGE OF LOCAL BOARD AND URBAN FOREST COVER BY LAND TENURE]

Figure 7: Urban forest cover within the Puketāpapa Local Board boundary showing the tenure/ownership of urban forest
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Figure 8: Percentage cover of urban forest within different land tenures of Puketapapa Local Board

Figure 9: Height class distribution of urban forest within different land tenures of Puketapapa Local Board
Attachment A

Figure 10: Tenure of urban forest within main suburbs of the Puketāpapa Local Board

Figure 11: Tenure of urban forest within main suburbs of the Puketāpapa Local Board relative to land area
6.4 Urban Forest Protection Status

In terms of protection status, analysis shows (Figure 12) that exactly half of the urban forest cover with the Local Board has no degree of protection. Approximately 30% of the urban forest cover has the highest degree of protection, which is largely reflective of the SEA overlay covering the majority of coastal indigenous vegetation. Less than a quarter of the urban forest has intermediary degrees of protection, with the next largest protection category being ‘some’ protection, which represents trees located in street corridors.

![Figure 12: Protection status of urban forest within the Puketāpapa Local Board](image)

6.4.1 Significant Ecological Areas

For SEAs (Protection Class 4), these have been identified in the Auckland Unitary Plan resulting from a specialist study assessing areas of vegetation against five significance criteria, including Representativeness, Threat Status and Rarity, Diversity, Stepping Stones, Migration Pathways and Buffers, and Uniqueness or Distinctiveness. The terrestrial SEA extent within the Puketāpapa Local Board is shown in Figure 13. Aside from one small area at Three Kings, all the SEA is within the southern half of the local board area and concentrated along the coast of the Manukau Harbour. The majority of this SEA is found in public parks, however there is a small area on private land in the Hillsborough area.

---

5 The current SEA overlay is based on the Operative Unitary Plan, whereas the data used in this study in relation to protection status is from the Proposed Unitary Plan (as of 2013). There is a slight variation between the two versions of the plan relating to submissions to the Proposed overlay and consequent removals/additions, however within the Puketāpapa Local Board there have been no changes between the two versions of the plan.
Figure 13: Map of Local Board showing Significant Ecological Areas
Notable Trees

For Notable trees (Protection Class 4), these have been identified by individual landowners as specimens with "exceptional arbicultural characteristics" (Schedule 10, Auckland Unitary Plan), with the data for this report having come from the current schedule, as outlined in the methods section\(^6\). The distribution of Notable trees within the Puketāpapa Local Board is shown in Figure 14, and in contrast to the SEA, all these trees are found in the north of the area, to the north of the motorway. The species information indicates a range of both native and exotic trees, with pōhutukawa being the most represented species (more than 30 identified), followed by pūriri and various oak specimens. In total there are approximately 130 tree records within the Puketāpapa Local Board and identified in the Unitary Plan Notable Tree Overlay.

\(^{6}\) There are several small errors within the current notable tree Schedule, including recognition that some trees are no longer present on the ground. However, these errors represent a very small proportion of the entire list and will not significantly alter the information represented in this report.
Figure 14b: Distribution of Notable trees within the Puketāpapa Local Board
6.4.2 Protection Status by Suburb

As observed in Figures 13 and 14, for SEA there is an increase in protection levels moving south through the Local Board, and for Notable Trees there is an increase in protection levels moving north. To gain an idea of further variability, the protection status of each of the main suburbs has been categorised and is represented in Figure 15. As previously observed, the suburbs of Mount Roskill and Hillsborough contain the majority of urban forest, while Three Kings contains the least. The protection distribution is generally relative to the total urban forest, aside from Hillsborough which has a clearly greater protection of high protection relative to both total forest and other suburbs. This is reflective of the larger tracts of SEA along the Hillsborough southern coastline.
6.5 Urban Forest in Relation to Socio-Economic Factors

6.5.1 Population

Across the urban areas of the Auckland Region, there is a wide spread of proportion of urban forest cover in relation to population (Figure 16). Overall the general trend is for urban forest cover to decrease as population increases, and the area covered by the Puketāpapa Local Board follows this trend. This is shown on a more local scale in Figure 17, which compares population density within the Census Area Units (CAU) of the Local Board area to density of urban forest, presented as a percentage of urban forest cover in relation to the total area of each CAU. A general decrease in forest cover is associated with increased population density, with three of the four CAUs with low population densities having the highest proportions of urban forest cover. These three CAUs (Hillsborough East, Lynfield South, and Waikōwhai West) also have the greatest area of urban forest per person (Figure 18), being more than four times more the cover per person in Walmsley and Wesley.
Figure 16: Total population compared to proportion of urban forest cover for the 2013 Census Area Units of urban Auckland

Figure 17: Urban forest cover of Puketāpapa Census Area Units in comparison to population density
Figure 18: Urban forest density in relation to population per Census Area Unit in Puketāpapa Local Board

6.5.2 Health

The proportion of urban forest per CAU within Puketāpapa is compared to number of children and number of cars in Figures 19 and 20, with the thinking that urban forest improves health in children, and in adults through encouragement of walking rather than driving.

While not a strong relationship, Figure 19 shows a general decrease in child population density as the canopy cover increases. This suggests the parts of the local board with more children, for example Walsley, do not have a high urban forest cover and consequently the potential benefits of this forest cover are not occurring. Waikōhai East, on the other hand, shows a relatively high canopy cover relative to the child population density.

Figure 20 highlights a range of car numbers corresponding to urban forest cover, with a general increase in number of cars occurring with increased urban forest cover, contrary to the idea that more urban forest encourages less use of cars.

In terms of health within local parks, Figure 21 displays canopy cover of parks featuring children’s play areas (playgrounds). Out of the 67 maintained local parks within the local board area, 18 of these have playgrounds. Less than a quarter of the parks with playgrounds have more than 50% canopy cover of urban forest, and half have less than 20%. However, the canopy cover that is present is generally located near the playground, with two thirds of the playgrounds having some or a little shade. The remaining third of playgrounds do not have any shade provided by trees.
Figure 19: Urban forest cover of Puketāpapa Census Area Units in comparison to number of children

Figure 20: Urban forest cover of Puketāpapa Census Area Units in comparison to number of cars per adult
6.5.3 Income

A comparison of urban forest cover in different CAU within the Local Board area as a function of median household income for the CAU is shown in Figure 22. Overall there appears to be a general increase in forest cover as the average income increases, however statistical analysis of this trend has indicated this relationship is not significant, as there are likely many other contributing factors such as the land tenure within each CAU. The figure identifies that Waikōwhai West and Lynfield South, in particular, have a relatively high urban forest cover compared to median income.

Figure 22: Relationship of urban forest cover within CAU and median household income of CAU
7.0 DISCUSSION

7.1 Urban Forest Cover 2013 Overview

Examination of the overall urban forest cover maps within the Puketāpapa Local Board shows that there are some obvious areas of urban forest concentration, while there are also areas that are lacking urban forest. The lowest cover tends to be in the northwest of the local board (Walmsley and Wesley) and around the motorway. Large areas of urban forest occur along the coast of the Manukau Harbour in the Hillsborough, Waikowhai, and Lynfield areas, contributing to an overall board area urban forest coverage of 20.4%, which is relatively high compared to other urban local boards in Auckland.

As an overview, this initial analysis shows where tree planting and/or incentives to retain existing trees could be concentrated, if increasing coverage of urban forest across the entire local board area is one of the aims of the community. On a local scale, these gaps are generally associated with two general categories, the first being areas of high density buildings and commercial areas. This is most noticeable in the commercial and industrial areas of Mt Roskill, particularly immediately north of the southwestern motorway. To a smaller degree, commercial land use along Richardson Road also has gaps in urban forest cover.

The second general category of urban forest gaps on a local scale is associated with extensive grasslands typical of sports grounds. In the Puketāpapa Local Board this includes Keith Hay Park, Margaret Griffen Park, the Maungakiekie and Akarana Golf Courses, and larger school complexes such as Mt Roskill Grammar School. Plans for improving many large local parks within the local board area are already underway, with long term concept plans having been produced by the Puketāpapa Local Board. In Keith Hay Park, for example, it is planned to naturalise Te Auaunga (Oakley Creek) by removing the concrete channel, re-establishing a natural stream bed, and planting the stream banks
with riparian vegetation (Puketāpapa Local Board 2012b). This will create a corridor of urban forest along the eastern side of Keith Hay Park (see Figure 23), extending onto adjacent parks where similar projects are planned.

![Figure 23: Artist's impression of Te Auaunga naturalisation and restoration planting (sourced from Keith Hay Park Concept Plan, Puketāpapa Local Board 2012)](image)

7.2 Urban Forest Structure

Research has shown that many of the benefits attributed to urban forest are disproportionately provided by larger trees (Davies et al. 2011, Novak et al. 2013, Moser et al. 2015). Large trees typically: create more shade per tree due to a larger and wider canopy spread (Moser et al. 2015); intercept larger amounts of particulate pollutants and rainfall due to significantly larger leaf areas; contain more carbon and have higher carbon sequestration rates (Beets et al. 2012, Schwendenmann and Mitchell 2014, Dahlhausen et al. 2016); are often less susceptible to careless or malicious vandalism by passers-by once established; can be pruned to provide higher canopy clearance over roadways, parking lots and pedestrian footpaths; typically contribute more to calming and slowing traffic on local streets than small trees; and absorb more gaseous pollutants. For example, Novak and Crane (2000) found that large trees greater than 80cm diameter remove 70 times more air pollution annually than small trees less than 8cm diameter.

In the Puketāpapa Local Board, only a quarter of trees are more than 10 metres tall, and large trees (i.e. >20m) cover only 6% of the entire urban forest. Royal Oak has a slightly larger proportion of tall trees than the remaining suburbs, presumably due to this area being the first part of the local board to be developed – the north-eastern local board area was developed between World War I and World War II, while the remaining local board development occurred in the later half of the 20th century. This has allowed a greater time period for trees planted on road reserves and private property in Royal Oak to grow, compared to the central and southern suburbs being converted at a later stage from agricultural land with no urban forest (Figure 24).
Figure 24: Early stages of residential development in southern Mt Roskill around Akarana Golf Course in 1955, with notable absence of urban forest (image sourced from retrolens.co.nz)

The remaining local board suburbs have less than 30% of trees taller than 10 metres, and are underrepresented in this sense. Larger trees in these suburb areas should be a priority for protection, to ensure they are not removed prior to younger trees being able to grow tall enough to replace them. The high proportion of smaller trees across the local board does indicate a relatively recent surge of tree planting, assuming the smaller stature trees correspond to younger trees, rather than shrubs which are limited at their mature height. Further analysis of more recent LiDAR data in comparison to the 2013 data covered in this report will highlight whether this trend is occurring. It is expected the portion of shorter trees may increase in future data sets due to restoration planting efforts, particularly around the south-western motorway extension west of Maioro Street, even if there is no loss of the total area of urban forest in taller height categories.
7.3 Urban Forest Tenure

Most of the urban forest within Puketāpapa Local Board is located on private land and within public parks. The parks comprise approximately 17.5% of the local board’s land area and contain 38.1% of the urban forest cover. This correlates to parks proportionately having more than twice as much urban forest cover as the other land tenures. This is likely due to public parks offering the best opportunities for long-term sustainable management of urban forest, as there is a lower chance of conflict with future housing intensification, less infrastructure conflicts (which is often an important negative associated with street tree plantings), more considered selection of appropriate species and location for plantings, better arboricultural management (provided this is adequately funded)\(^7\), and a coherent policy for ongoing planting of replacement trees.

In Puketāpapa, there are also multiple community groups dedicated to preserving the urban forest of public reserve land, such as Friends of Oakley Creek Te Auaunga and the Waikōwhai Forest Restoration Network. The latter group advocates for the protection and enhancement of the indigenous biodiversity within the reserves bordering the Manukau Harbour coastal boundary. This part of the local board contains a network of over 100 hectares of continuous urban forest, primarily located on public land. The high urban forest cover in the suburbs of Hillsborough and Lynfield is attributed largely to these forest stocks. Beyond these areas, improving and enjoying parks and the natural

\(^7\) As trees get bigger and older they need to be cared for more frequently. However, Council arborists are concerned that Auckland Council’s standard model for asset depreciation does not provide sufficient funding to achieve the level of maintenance necessary to manage very large trees to international standards. Therefore at time trees that could be retained through expensive maintenance are felled instead.
environment, including environmental enhancement, has been identified as a key priority in the Local Board Plan (Puketapapa Local Board 2017).

Among other benefits, public parks are better able to accommodate the types of large trees which provide many urban forest benefits, and which may not be suitable for streets or private land due to space limitations. The wider accessibility of trees on public parkland also means that the benefits they provide (e.g., better shade and increased emotional well-being for park users) apply to a larger number of people, which is a major positive in terms of overall cost-benefit outcomes. Moving forward, it will therefore be important to ensure any trees removed from public parks are replaced with new trees, so the public interaction with nature will still occur.

Street trees currently have a lesser role in the provision or urban forest in Puketapapa, with the coverage of this land tenure being low compared to other urban local boards. Protecting existing street trees and establishing new street tree plantings in areas where they have less prominence (e.g., Mt Roskill) therefore provides a good opportunity to increase urban forest cover within the local board. In the industrial areas particularly, establishing trees in road reserves will improve the urban forest where there is little to no space to establish trees on private land.

7.4 Urban Forest Protection Status

The protection status of urban forest outlined in this report has been derived from the planning provisions outlined in the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan, and now finalised in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part). The protection classes (Table 3) have been determined based on the likelihood of obtaining resource consent to clear vegetation, with approximately half of the urban forest within the Local Board area able to be cleared without resource consent, i.e., as a permitted activity (no protection class). In theory, this means over 190 ha of urban forest could be cleared within the Local Board without any assessment of the cumulative effects of this clearance.

In reality, it is highly unlikely that a level of clearance this drastic would occur, however, a study on urban forest loss in the Waitemata Local Board (Lawrence et al. 2018) did determine a higher rate of tree clearance within urban forest with no protection. There was little evidence in this study of increasing rates of tree canopy protection with increasing protection status, indicating perhaps that the protection classes outlined in this study do not reflect the ease (or difficulty) of obtaining resource consent for clearance.

In practice, there may be more pressure within the Local Board area for clearance of higher protection status urban forest, for example Significant Ecological Area, than for clearance of lower protection status forest, for example trees in road reserves. While the largest pockets of SEA and areas of contiguous urban forest are found on public reserve land, these urban forest tracts extend northwards onto residential properties. While the Single House zoning of many of these properties recognises the need to retain larger lot sizes, some of the land, particularly in Lynfield, is zoned Mixed Housing Urban. Clearance of urban forest in these areas to facilitate development may occur in future and it will be important to retain forest where possible, and to establish equivalent protected areas of urban forest where not possible. This will ensure the new residential developments receive the same urban forest benefits as the more established suburbs. The development of a retirement village at 11 Commodore Drive in Lynfield (Murray Halberg Retirement Village) is a good example of how urban forest has been
considered in the project design, with the majority of SEA on this parcel of land having been retained (Figure 25).

![Figure 25: Pre- and during aerial images of Murray Halberg Retirement Village, with SEA overlay shown in green cross-hatch on left-hand image (images sourced from Auckland Council GIS viewer and Google Earth)](image)

The Puketāpapa Local Board area overall has a relatively good proportion of protected vegetation, being slightly higher than average compared to other local boards. However, this study has highlighted a disparity in protection across the local board, particularly in regards to SEA which is significantly concentrated along the southern coastal boundary. Aside from these continuous reserve areas, which contribute to a high proportion of protected vegetation in Hillsborough, there are very few stands of vegetation identified in the SEA overlay. Only one SEA is identified in the northern part of the local board (north of the motorway), being a small stand of trees in the Te Tatua a Riuiki-Three Kings reserve.

The Notable Tree Overlay shows the opposite trend to the SEA overlay, with notable trees being concentrated in the northern parts of the local board. No notable trees are identified in the southern part of the local board (south of the motorway), corresponding to approximately 60% of the board area. Overall the local board is also severely under-represented in the Notable Tree Overlay, with only approximately 130 trees identified, or one tree per 14 hectares of land. In comparison, the Albert Eden Local Board has one notable tree identified per 3.7ha, which is almost four times the density. It is likely there are further trees in Puketāpapa that would qualify as notable, and have simply not been identified or nominated by the local residents. It may be a review of these areas is required to ensure there are no trees that would qualify as notable that have not been registered in the overlay.
7.5 Urban Forest in Relation to Socio-Economic Factors

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

To achieve the greatest benefit from the existing urban forest for people, it would be preferable to have higher levels of urban forest in areas with greater population density. However, this study showed a general decrease in forest cover with increased population. This is potentially due to urban forest being cleared in the past to facilitate further development allowing for increased population density, for example, remaining pockets of native bush being removed to build additional houses. It is also a reflection of parts of the local board dominated by public park land rather than residential land. For example, Waiākōwhai West Census Area Unit has 33% of land as parks and 56% privately owned, compared to Royal Oak which has 76% privately owned and only 1% as park land.

Parts of the Local Board which would benefit in an increase in urban forest to reflect higher population densities, including child population densities, are Walmsley, Wesley, and Hillsborough West. Walmsley, in particular, is a priority area for increasing forest cover for children. Analysis of aerial imagery from this part of the local board indicates urban forest is lacking on both private properties, particularly on O’Donnell and Potter Avenues, and on public parkland. The need for restoring urban forest on public parkland has been recognised in the past. For example, the upgrade of Walmsley and Underwood Reserves will incorporate approximately 3.5 hectares of restoration and amenity planting, focussed around the naturalised Te Auaunga-Oakley Creek, and the addition of approximately 1,000 specimen trees (AECOM and Boffa Miskell 2015). These urban forest increases will provide universal benefits as a large number of people are likely to utilise these reserves and encounter the forest.

Analysis of playground data suggests there is a need within the local board to provide more urban forest and taller urban forest around playgrounds, where benefits such as providing shade will make the playgrounds more attractive for families to bring their children. For example, there are several parks which contain trees, but where the trees are not near the playgrounds and do not provide shade, such as Taylors Bay Road Reserve, Fearon Park, and Keith Hay Park. The lack of shade trees across these play spaces also reduces opportunities for park users, who are visiting the parks for this purpose, to interact with trees and nature whilst in the parks. The results from the shade analysis study highlight further opportunities to develop work programmes to plant new specimen trees for playgrounds in local parks, and areas where low percentage tree cover exists.

In terms of income, previous studies suggest more affluent parts of Auckland are likely to have more urban forest. An example of this is shown in the Wyse et al. (2015) study which looked at distribution of Notable Trees within Auckland and determined that more socially deprived areas of Auckland contain fewer notable trees than less deprived areas. In Puketapapa, whilst not significant, there is a pattern of less urban forest in lower income areas, for example Walmsley and Wesley. This appears
to largely be due to less tree cover on private land, potentially because of less income available to plant trees or tend a garden. Some of the higher income areas, such as Waikōwhai West and Lynfield South, have more urban forest resulting from the large coastal reserves. Houses in these locations are likely to be more expensive, as they offer views of the harbour, suggesting the reasons for a correlation between urban forest coverage and income does not correspond to causation.

8.0 PROPOSED FUTURE INVESTIGATION AND FOCUS

8.1 Priority Areas for Increasing Urban Forest

At present, 11% of road reserves are covered in urban forest within the Local Board, 17% of private land, 44% of parks, and 14% of public open spaces. However, as outlined in the discussion, despite the having the already highest level of urban forest, public parks also represent the most strategic locations to establish further urban forest.

The type of planting that could be carried out within the existing public reserve network falls into two main categories. The first category is simply planting unused grassland in reserves, while the second is planting around the margins of sports parks where this does not conflict with the sports fields themselves. Examples of large public sports fields in the Puketāpapa Local Board include Keith Hay Park, Fearon Park/Harold Long Reserve, War Memorial Park, Margaret Griffen Park, Lynfield College, and Mt Roskill Grammar School. All these parks have grassy margins and/or odd shaped corners that are separated from the playing fields. Plans to upgrade many of the larger sports parks are already underway, for example the Fearon Park and Harold Long Reserve upgrades will include planting of additional shade trees, rain gardens, and native buffer planting at the reserve edges.
2015). Focussing further efforts on improving tree cover around school sports fields would have the additional benefit of providing shade, amenity, and health improvements for students utilising the grounds during school breaks.

While there are many benefits to establishing a higher density of trees – and large trees in particular – on public land, we acknowledge that there are some potential conflicts and costs in replacing extensive areas of grassland with urban forest and/or treeland. These include perceptions of public safety with areas of dense vegetation on public land (Jansson et al. 2013), the additional cost of managing more large trees for a parks department that struggles currently to meet the competing demands of different park users, and ensuring that urban forest plantings are compatible with existing use such as sports fields, open space for dog recreation etc. Nevertheless, many of these conflicts can be resolved through appropriate species selection, planting design and location, and good community consultation.

Some of the key points recommended for consideration in the growing phase of the ngahere programme, particularly for public parks, are:

- Where tree cover is either low or non-existent, consult with park users and develop a planting plan
- Confirm that the need for green space for recreation is not impacted by the placement or groupings of specimen tree plantings, and the tree plantings add value to the space
- Where the tree cover is less than 30%, look at the health condition and placement of the existing trees to determine if further planting opportunities exist
- Determine if the trees that are present are safe and in good condition, and identify any trees that need further management
Item 15

- Work with the local community to plant trees to help with natural shade provisions for future decades.
- Review the Urban Forest Strategy and implement, ensuring the right trees are planted in the right locations.

Through the restoration of urban forest, it will be essential to involve the community to invoke a sense of ownership and guardianship. Initiatives with different focuses could be targeted towards different members of the community. An example of this is the Trees for Babies programme, whereby new parents can plant trees to commemorate the birth of their new child. This programme commenced in Puketāpapa in at Hendry Avenue, an area chosen because it was able to accommodate the growth of tall forest trees (Puketāpapa Local Board 2013). Involving the community in tree planting days will also invoke a sense of community stewardship for the plantings and lead to greater likelihood of involvement in maintaining the urban forest cover. Auckland Council can provide technical support for community groups, rather than running them, to promote this sense of stewardship. A study by Austin (2002) found that tree planting and maintenance is more successful when the local community are involved, as they know and care about their local environment far more than outsiders would. A further advantage of community involvement is allowing people to develop practical skills that would not otherwise be obtained outside of a paid working environment.

To a lesser degree, there are also opportunities for establishing more urban forest on private land and within road reserves. Planting options in road reserves will be limited to some degree by overhead powerlines, berm width, and proximity to urban forest on adjacent private properties, however it is highly likely there are available options for street tree plantings within the local board. The primary focus for these plantings should be main commercial streets, for example Stoddard Road (Mt Roskill) and Richardson Road (Hillsborough), where street tree plantings would have a wider accessibility due to people visiting these areas for shopping. For residential streets, a targeted survey could be undertaken to assess the existing tree presence and discover gaps of streets or groups of streets when urban forest planting efforts should be focussed.

8.2 Utilising Native Species for Growing Urban Forest

The exotic component of the urban forest in Puketāpapa is representative of historical colonisation and development by European settlers, along with preference for exotics in garden planting due to larger or more colourful flowers. This has resulted in areas dominated by exotic species, some of which are now identified weeds. For example, a study by Stanley (2018) determined approximately 10% of the scheduled Notable Trees across Auckland are declared weed species, such as Phoenix palm. While many of the benefits of urban forest, for example stormwater and pollution filtration, shade, and contact with nature, can be achieved by both native and exotic species, other benefits, such as biodiversity, will be achieved to a greater degree by planting native species only. It is therefore important to convey, moving forward, a preference for selection of native species where possible.

At present, the urban forest data does not distinguish between native and exotic species, and such an analysis would be difficult to achieve with the LiDAR methods used. However, Auckland Council has undertaken a separate analysis of vegetation cover across the region, outlined in Singers et al. (2017) and presented on Auckland Council GeoMaps. This study has classified ecosystem types according to the dominant vegetation, with exotic dominated vegetation categorised separately from indigenous
ecosystem types. While not available at a tree level, this mapping provides a useful reference for larger patches of urban forest and how these could be improved and connected.

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

Ecological input into new planting projects will allow an assessment of suitability for restoring particular ecosystem types and species to be made, and ensure appropriate management of this special urban forest moving forward. Ecological input would also allow for the identification of urban forest stepping stones to be utilised by other native species such as birds. While Puketāpapa has a solid area of native bush providing habitat for indigenous fauna in the south of the local board, there are opportunities to strategically extend existing or plant new urban forest patches to extend ecological corridors to other local boards. For example, the urban forest connection across the Puketāpapa and Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Boards could be strengthened by improving urban forest linkages and enhancing the current numbers of specimen trees along road corridors in berm plantings, between the larger reserves of One Tree Hill and Monte Cecilia Park.

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

8.3 Analysis of Urban Forest Changes

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

1. How has the total area of urban forest in the board area changed following the removal of general tree protection?

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

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

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

Other methods examining change in urban forest cover, and future effectiveness of the Auckland Urban Ngahere Strategy, could also be utilised, such as biodiversity outcome monitoring and connectivity analysis. Connectivity analysis of urban forest cover would look to identify gaps between areas of forest, and how these could be improved with targeted planting. This has already been achieved in Puketāpapa to some extent by the Puketāpapa Greenways Plan (Puketāpapa Local Board 2012a). This plan analyses the presence of greenways across the local board area, which may follow land or water features, such as streams or coastlines, or human landscape features like streets, motorways, or rail corridors. The intent of developing greenways is to provide environmental, social, health, education, and economic benefits. To date the Puketāpapa Greenways Plan has focussed on providing walking and cycling routes, presenting an opportunity to examine the urban forest along these routes in subsequent reviews. Biodiversity outcome monitoring could include targeted fauna surveys, for example bird counts at specific locations, to determine whether improving urban forest cover is having follow on benefits for other species groups.

8.4 Safe-guarding Urban Forest during New Development

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

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

In Puketāpapa, much of the land is zoned for more intensive development, including ‘Residential – Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings’ zoning. Maps showing potential future growth areas, based on land supply and infrastructure upgrading, are included in the appendix of this report. This could lead to an even greater loss of urban ngahere, particularly in regards to trees that can be removed as a permitted activity (ie no protection status). For trees that do require consent for removal, while considered on an isolated basis the effects may be considered small, however on a cumulative basis the effects may be large, and these impacts are generally beyond the scope of what is assessed in an application.

As an example, Figure 26 shows the change in tree cover for one residential street (Roskill Way, Three Kings) over a seven year period. As shown, at least eight trees have been removed. Some of this removal appears to have been to facilitate development, while the remaining removal has no obvious cause. In the study by Lawrence et al. (2018) on tree loss in the Waitamata Local Board, it was determined that over half of the urban forest loss occurred for no obvious reason, with potential reasons being to improve light and remove shading, improve views, reduce nuisance litter fall, and to alleviate health and safety concerns with respect for falling trees and branches. With these commonplace reasons for urban tree removal, the additional threat of development could rapidly increase tree loss.

![Figure 26: Change in urban forest cover at Roskill Way, Three Kings, with removed vegetation outlined (images sourced from Auckland Council GIS viewer)](attachment:image)

Fortunately, the value of urban trees is increasingly being recognised, and new developments commonly include provision for tree planting initiatives, particularly along streets. One of the major new developments in Puketāpapa is the Mt Roskill South housing initiative, which plans on removing
260 old state houses and replacing these with around 900 new homes. Incorporated into the development (see mtroskilldevelopment.co.nz) are plans to upgrade existing and create new neighbourhood parks, and to prioritise replanting of native New Zealand trees, particularly where trees will be removed. The major recent development within the local board, being the extension of the southwestern (State Highway 20) motorway, also included significant replanting efforts of native species in the motorway corridor.

A changing landscape - Intensification in Mt Roskill South

Despite this, residential intensification of the Auckland urban area will further limit the space available for retaining and establishing medium- to large-sized trees on both public and private land in the future. To this end, the Puketāpapa Local Board is encouraged to work with Auckland Council to readdress the current rules for tree and vegetation protection. A recommended first step is to commence a programme to record noteworthy trees in the local area on a simple list to request inclusion in the Notable Tree Overlay in any future plan changes, with a particular focus in the southern parts of the local board required. Ideally, the process would be reviewed to allow the Notable Tree schedule to be updated every five years via submissions from individual local boards. Consideration could also be given to protecting trees and vegetation on private land via legal protection mechanisms such as Council registered covenants and covenants established through the Queen Elizabeth II Trust and Nga Whenua Rahui programmes.

9.0 FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR GROWING URBAN FOREST IN PUKEȚĀPAPA

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

The immediate actions that could be taken to improve Puketāpapa’s urban forest are:

- Complete upgrade works of Walmsley Park and Keith Hay Park, including tree planting around naturalised Oakley Creek.
- Initiate tree planting programmes in the commercial and industrial areas of Mt Roskill, particularly in locations of high public use, for example Stoddard Road.
- Identify unprotected large trees (>15 metres tall) in residential areas and assess whether the protection level of these can be increased (e.g. through Notable Tree Overlay or land covenant).
- Ensure all new residential developments contain street tree and park plantings, where possible, particularly where existing trees will be lost to facilitate this development.
- Undertake a review of the Notable Tree Overlay within the board area and consider nomination of further trees for inclusion, particularly south of the motorway.
- Identify parks containing playgrounds with no tree shading (e.g. Taylors Bay Road Reserve) and obtain funding for large grade specimen trees to plant.

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

- Advocate for new community groups and increased volunteers for Friends of Oakley Creek Te Auaunga to ensure regular maintenance of existing and new plantings is carried out.
- Carry out a localised study of urban forest on private land and road reserves in Walmsley and northern Wesley (Mt Roskill), and develop initiatives for funded tree planting within urban forest gaps.
- Consult with NZTA regarding ongoing management of native plantings in the south-western motorway corridor.
- Work with schools (e.g. Lynfield College, Mt Roskill Grammar School) to increase urban tree cover on school grounds.

Long term actions that could be taken to improve Puketāpapa’s urban forest include:

- Undertake connectivity analysis of native plantings (e.g. around Oakley Creek) and determine target locations for increasing urban forest cover in road reserves to create an ecological corridor.
- Extend study of trees in road reserves to further suburbs, identify streets with little or no urban forest cover, and initiate targeted planting programme for street trees.
- Set up long term study to monitor biodiversity improvements resulting from the growing phase of the urban forest strategy (e.g. regular bird count stations).

It is recommended a growing programme targeted to the Puketāpapa Local Board is produced to guide efforts in restoring the urban forest, including ongoing monitoring of existing and future initiatives to ensure the Local Board goals for each growing stage are achieved.
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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 Puketāpapa Local Board:

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

b) provides any formal views on the draft findings of the Animal Management Bylaw 2015 review.
Horopaki

Context


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

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

Figure 1 – Animal Management Bylaw 2015 framework

The bylaw does not address dogs


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

The bylaw does not regulate animal welfare

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 - Local board informal views on animal nuisances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bees leaving excrement on cars is a minor nuisance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some people, especially those with bee allergies, are fearful of bees coming onto their property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Types of nuisance caused by birds is very subjective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People are abandoning geese and ducks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Breeding parrots is a nuisance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Turkeys and peacocks are causing a nuisance in rural areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 16

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Companion animals should not have their own rules as some neighbours are not familiar or okay with stock animals being kept as pets.

- Having a specific definition increases complexity and introduces subjectivity. It should not matter what a person says about their animal.

- People should not be allowed to have livestock as pets in urban areas.

- An animal is an animal no matter how it is kept. Since the nuisance effects on neighbours are the same, there should be no distinctions.

33. In response to questions from local boards at the workshops staff note that you cannot buy or take ownership of a pest animal. If you already own a pest animal, you can keep it, but you cannot abandon it, give it to a new owner, or allow the pest animal to breed. The Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 classifies unowned cats as pests.

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

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

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

Table 6 - Local board informal views on identifying owned animals

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The bylaw should be clear on what the council does and does not do regarding animal
management.
- The council should clarify the process for reporting unowned animals causing nuisance.
- The bylaw’s animal management processes need to align with the Regional Pest Management Plan.
- The council should offer mediation services for disgruntled neighbours over animal nuisance.

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

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

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

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

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

Table 8 - Local board informal views on the current controls in the bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Current control</th>
<th>Views on more control</th>
<th>Views on same or less control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bees</td>
<td>Any properties, urban or rural, can keep any number of bees. Beekeepers must manage the flight path and temperament of their bees. Beekeepers must ensure nuisance from their bees' excrement is minimised, and the bees have a suitable water source on the premises.</td>
<td>• The council should restrict beekeeping if people have bee-sting allergies. • Limit the number of beehives in an area to prevent colony competition. • Increase awareness and visibility of who keeps bees in an area. • Restrict beekeeping to rural areas. • Restrict the number of beehives a person can have in urban areas. • Restrict bee hive ownership by size of property. • There should be minimum training or qualification to own bees. You need experience. • Amateur beekeepers should be treated differently to commercial beekeepers.</td>
<td>• Bees are not causing much nuisance, so there is no need for more regulation. • We should be encouraging beekeeping. Should regulate rather than over regulate. • Do not restrict bees to just urban areas. • Bees should be unregulated. • Would be concerned if licensing costs for beekeeping were introduced. • Should be careful about restricting bees as they are important to the ecosystem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>Local boards are able to set specific controls for horses for local parks and beaches.</td>
<td>• The same access rules for dogs on beaches should be applied to horses.</td>
<td>• Horse owners should be responsible for removing manure. The bylaw should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>Current control</td>
<td>Views on more control</td>
<td>Views on same or less control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Horses cont. | Horses are permitted in public spaces if:  
- manure is removed  
- consideration is taken to not intimidate or cause a nuisance for other public space users  
- beach dune damage is minimised. | • Increase communication and awareness of current controls to horse owners.  
• Would rather have horses on the roads than scooters. |  |
| Stock | Chickens, ducks, geese, pheasants and quail are the only stock animals currently permitted by the bylaw in urban areas without a licence from the council. Any other stock animal, including roosters, would require a licence from the council in urban areas unless the premises is larger than 4,000 square metres.  
Stock in urban areas must also be restrained within the boundaries of the premises on which they are kept, and chicken coops must not cause a nuisance and must be regularly cleaned.  
In rural areas the above controls do not apply. Rural residents must ensure their animals do not cause a nuisance to any other person. | • Stock should not be kept in urban areas. This is also humane for the animal.  
• There should be penalties for poor stock-fencing by roads in rural areas.  
• The bylaw needs a mechanism to deal with repeat ‘wandering stock’ offenders.  
• The criteria for keeping goats and other herbivores should be defined by the amount of grassy area on the property.  
• There should be restrictions on how far a chicken coop should be from the property boundary.  
• Fewer chickens should be allowed in urban areas.  
• Roosters should not be allowed in rural lifestyle blocks in urban areas. | • The current stock controls are adequate.  
• Support allowing pheasants in urban areas.  
• There are already legal consequences for not fencing your stock. The bylaw does not need to address.  
• If you have a large property in an urban area, goats should be allowed.  
• Make sure urban pet days are still allowed.  
• It does not matter where the chicken coop sits on the property if it is cleaned regularly.  
• There should not be a complete ban on roosters in urban areas. |

Views on new controls for specific animals *(Slide 23)*

43. A quarter of surveyed Aucklanders (26 per cent) said the bylaw should introduce controls for other animals. Of those wanting controls for other animals, over half (57 per cent) wanted controls introduced for cats.

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

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

**Informal views on introducing controls for cats**

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

**Informal views on not introducing controls for cats**

- Cat registration is difficult and has failed before. Auckland Council already has difficulty registering and enforcing dogs.
- Cats naturally wander. Containing them would be cruel.
- The council should invest in substantial long-term public education regarding cats.
- If the council restricts caring for stray cats, it could create animal welfare issues.
- Controlling cats is too trivial for the council to get involved.

### Informal local board views on controls for other animals

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

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

- Any costs for managing stray cats would be investigated during the options development phase to respond to nuisance issues.
- The Local Government Act 2002 would give the council power to impose a curfew on cats if it was an appropriate response to the scale of the nuisance and would clearly show how the curfew would reduce harm and nuisance to humans.
Item 16

- The council currently has more legal power to respond to dog nuisance than cat nuisance. The Dog Control Act 1996 gives the council wide-varying powers to address dog issues. There is no similar legislation for cats.
- Rat pest control is addressed through the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029.
- The Regional Pest Management Plan lists some tropical animals that can be treated as pests. These include eastern water dragons, Indian ring-necked parakeets, and snake-necked turtles.
- Chickens were not classified as pests in the Regional Pest Management Plan. The purpose of the plan is to protect the Auckland region’s important biodiversity assets. There are no significant biodiversity benefits to managing feral chickens at a regional level. Feral chickens are primarily a human nuisance issue centred in the urban areas where people feed them.

Other views from local boards

Rights of property owners and protection

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

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

Enforcement

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

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

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

Education

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

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

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

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

Local impacts and local board views

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

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

56. Staff sought views from mana whenua at the Infrastructure and Environmental Services Forum in April 2019. The members present at the hui sought clarity that the bylaw’s reference of ‘public places’ does not extend to papakāinga (communal Māori land).

57. Members were also concerned with threats to estuaries, beaches, and waterways from unregulated coastal horse trails. These views were provided in the draft findings report and options development will consider these views.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

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

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

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

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

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

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

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

Dogs

out of scope

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

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

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

Section 64: Bylaws
Every local authority may make bylaws for:
• improving, promoting, or protecting public health, and preventing or abating nuisances
• regulating, licensing, or prohibiting the keeping of any animals in the district
• preventing the outbreak or spread of disease by the agency of flies, mosquitoes, or other insects, or of rats, mice, or other vermin.
Why is the council reviewing the bylaw?

Local Government Act 2002 – Statutory review

- Bylaw must be reviewed within five years of being made
- The council must decide whether:
  - a bylaw is the most appropriate way of addressing the perceived problem
  - the bylaw is ‘fit for purpose’
  - the current bylaw gives rise to any Bill of Rights implications
  - to retain, amend, replace, or revoke the bylaw
- Auckland Council Regulatory Committee
Most Aucklanders own animals
### No animal ownership

#### People’s Panel data on animal ownership

#### Overall

<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>1.3 (1-15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens / coops</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1.3 (1-15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish (indoor/or outdoor)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1.2 (1-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.2 (1-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bees</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.2 (1-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cows</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.2 (1-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbits</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1.2 (1-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>(1-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses / ponies</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(1-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(1-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea pigs</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(1-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mice / rats</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(1-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(1-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owns no animals</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Rates of not owning an animal by local board area

- Great East (2 esp): 45%
- Tamaki: 40%
- Whau: 35%
- Manukau Central: 30%
- Henderson-Manukau: 25%
- Papakura: 20%
- Ardmore: 15%
- Pukekawa: 10%
- Franklin: 5%
- Howick: 5%
- Beachlands: 5%
People’s Panel data on animal ownership

Cats (pg. 8)

Chickens and roosters (pg. 10)
Many Aucklanders are experiencing animal nuisance
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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (without dogs)</td>
<td>10,227 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>• Barking and crowing</td>
<td>88,187 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (involving dogs)</td>
<td>86,657 (involving dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (without dogs)</td>
<td>1,530 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faeces</td>
<td>• Wandering animals leaving poop on property</td>
<td>2,206 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Owners not picking up after their animals</td>
<td>1,795 (involving dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (without dogs)</td>
<td>411 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead animals</td>
<td>• Dead animals dumped on side of roads</td>
<td>1,266 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dead animals in ponds and storm water fields</td>
<td>671 (involving dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (without dogs)</td>
<td>595 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smell</td>
<td>• Bad odours attracting mice and rats</td>
<td>1,244 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decomposing animals</td>
<td>408 (involving dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Smelly chicken coops</td>
<td>836 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People’s Panel April 2019 (pg. 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Examples of nuisance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Animal faeces left in parks, walkways or on private property, especially vegetable gardens</td>
<td>2,350 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhygienic behaviour</td>
<td>Animates wandering onto neighbouring property</td>
<td>1,350 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal wandering</td>
<td>Neighbours harbouring rats in overgrown sections</td>
<td>865 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scentry nuisance</td>
<td>Odour from animal excreta</td>
<td>607 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to property</td>
<td>Scratched deck furniture</td>
<td>531 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yard dig up</td>
<td>420 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property damage from animal faeces</td>
<td>370 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed behaviour</td>
<td>Pets and people being attacked by aggressive animals</td>
<td>250 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter</td>
<td>Finding the practice of killing animals offensive</td>
<td>59 (total)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Top nuisances (People’s Panel)**

**Overall nuisance rates (pg. 17)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nuisance rates by local board area</th>
<th>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</th>
<th>Howick and Rays</th>
<th>Manurewa</th>
<th>Papakura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier (2 resp.)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crakākā</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**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)**
3 bylaw structure (2/2)

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

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

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

- **Animal management** — animal management officers mostly enforce dogs. AMOs not responsible for cats, wildlife, animal pests, birds, marine mammals or urban poultry, bees or stock.
  - **Stock** — “cattle, deer...poultry and any other animal kept in captivity, or farmed, an dependent on humans for their care and sustenance.”
  - **Poultry** — “means any live bird that is kept or raised for the purpose of producing eggs, hatching eggs or poultry products and includes chickens, ducks... roosters and swans.”
Uncertainty on processes and identifying owned animals
Processes and identifying animal owners

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

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

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

**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 Agnes Beach, Hataitai Beach, Martins Bay 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 Karioitahi Beach as shown in Schedule 1—
(a) during high use periods, horses are restricted to a walk within the 1 km ZONE, at all other times horses are restricted to a walk within the Safe Zone;
(b) within the 1 km ZONE, horses must remain within 10 metres of the water’s edge wherever possible;
(c) horse manure must be removed from the 1 km ZONE; and
(d) the unloading of horses is only permitted in the Horse Unloading Area.
Current bylaw controls (2/3)

Keeping of stock in urban areas (1/2)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stock</th>
<th>Premises smaller than 2000 square metres</th>
<th>Premises larger than 2000 square metres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donkeys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llamas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacocks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peahens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pones</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quail</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current bylaw controls (3/3)

Keeping of stock in urban areas (2/2)

Keeping of Stock Control – Prevention of wandering stock
(2) The owner of any stock in an urban area must ensure their stock is restrained within the boundaries of the premises on which they are kept.

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

Keeping of stock control - Location of chicken coops
(4) The owner of any chicken must not allow their chicken coop to cause a nuisance to any other person.

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

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

  ![Bar chart for Bees](chart)

  - 65% About right
  - 24% No view/don't know
  - 7% Less control
  - 4% More control

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

  ![Bar chart for Horses](chart)

  - 64% About right
  - 27% No view/don't know
  - 6% More control
  - 3% Less control

- **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 Stock](chart)

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

People’s Panel

Should there be controls on other animals?

- I don’t know: 39%
- No: 35%
- Yes: 26%

On which animals?

- Cats: 57%
- Birds: 4%
- Pigeons: 2%
- Dogs: 44%
- Rabbits: 4%
- Goats: 2%
- Other: 21%
- Ferrets: 3%
- Horses: 2%
- Poultry: 7%
- Rats: 2%
- Pigs: 2%

“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
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 of 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 streams 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. This report provides the Puketāpapa Local Board with highlights of ATEED’s activities in the Puketāpapa Local Board area as well as ATEED’s regional activities for the six months 1 January to 30 June 2019.

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

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

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

4. Further detail on these activities is listed under Analysis and Advice.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) receive ATEED’s update to the Puketāpapa Local Board – September 2019.
Horopaki

Context

5. ATEED has two areas of focus:

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

- **Destination** - supporting sustainable growth of the visitor economy with a focus on destination marketing and management, major events, business events (meetings and conventions) and international student attraction and retention.

6. These two portfolios also share a common platform relating to the promotion of the city globally to ensure that Auckland competes effectively with other mid-tier high quality of life cities.

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

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

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

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

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

11. As at 30 June\(^2\), 3,303 businesses had been through an ATEED intervention or programme. Of these, 42 businesses were in the Puketāpapa Local Board area – 14 businesses went through Destination-related programmes and 28 businesses went through Economic Development-related programmes.

Economic Development

**Locally Driven Initiatives:**

12. Puketāpapa business engagement: During Q3, the Local Board agreed to reallocate $7,500 to support a Pop-up Business School event. The Pop-up Business School ran from 29 April to 10 May 2019 in partnership with the Whau and Henderson-Massey Local Boards and the Ministry of Social Development.

13. Young Enterprise Scheme: The Auckland Chamber of Commerce has delivered the Lion Foundation Young Enterprise Scheme (YES) since January 2018. ATEED maintains a strategic role. During the period, there were 58 schools participating in the Auckland YES programme, representing 1,376 students completing the programme. Marcellin College and Mt Roskill Grammar are the two schools from the Puketāpapa Local Board area participating in the YES programme.

---

\(^1\) This activity is subject to local boards prioritising local economic development, and subsequently allocating funding to local economic development through their local board agreements.

\(^2\) FY 2018/19 result for ATEED’s SOI KPI2
Supporting Local Business Growth

14. This area is serviced by the Business and Enterprise team in the South hub, based in Te Haako Manukau. The team comprises of Business and Innovation Advisors and administration support. The role of this team is to support the growth of Auckland’s key internationally competitive sectors and to support to provide quality jobs.

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

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

17. Where businesses qualify (meet the programme criteria and/or align to ATEED’s purpose as defined in the SOI) the advisors facilitate government support to qualifying businesses, in the form of:

- Callaghan Innovation R&D grants (including Getting Started, project and student grants (https://www.callaghaninnovation.govt.nz/grants)
- Callaghan Innovation subsidised innovation programmes (https://www.callaghaninnovation.govt.nz/innovation-skills)
- RBPN business capability vouchers (NZTE), where the business owner may be issued co-funding up to $5,000 per annum for business training via registered service providers. Voucher co-funding is prioritised to businesses accessing this service for the first time, in order to encourage more businesses to engage with experts to assist their management and growth.
- NZTE services such as Export Essentials (https://workshop.exportessentials.nz/register/)
- Referrals to NZ Business Mentors via The Chamber of Commerce.

18. During the reporting period, ATEED Business and Innovation Advisors met with nine businesses in the Puketāpapa Local Board area, one for innovation advice and services and eight for business growth and capability advice and services (one was a returning client). From these engagements:

- Four RBPN vouchers were issued to assist with business capability training
- Seven connections were made to Callaghan Innovation services and programmes
- Six referrals were made to Business Mentors New Zealand
- Seven connections were made to ATEED staff and programmes
- More than 40 connections were made to other businesses or programmes

Other support for new businesses

19. During the period, ATEED also ran workshops and events aimed at establishing or growing a new business and building capability. Eleven people from the Puketāpapa Local Board area attended an event below:

- Starting off Right workshop - 2
- Business clinic – 8
- Innovation clinic - 1.

Filming activity within the Puketāpapa Local Board area

20. ATEED’s Screen Auckland team provides film facilitation services as part of ATEED’s support for the screen and digital sector of Auckland’s economy. Screen Auckland facilitates, processes and issues film permits for filming activity in public open space. This activity supports local businesses and employment, as well as providing a revenue stream to local boards for the use of local parks.
21. Between 1 January and 30 June 2019, 305 film permits were issued in the Auckland region across 379 locations and 404 days of filming. Of these, eight permits were issued in the Puketāpapa Local Board area. Feature film, *The Legend of Baron To’a* was filmed in the Local Board area. The Puketāpapa Local Board area’s share of film permit revenue was $1,704.35 for the period (total for all boards combined was $51,191.30).

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

23. Auckland is becoming a popular destination for international television networks to pilot an episode of a new TV series to allow them to gauge if a series will be successful. Permits were issued for locations across the Auckland region earlier this year for two new US pilots.

**Youth employment pathways**

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

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

**Local Jobs and Skills Hubs**

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

**Offshore talent attraction**

27. The Auckland. *We’re Hiring* campaign ran from January to March 2019. The campaign is designed to attract high-skilled offshore construction and technology talent to Auckland. The campaign resulted in 2,295 job applications.

**Destination**

**Regional destination management and marketing activity**

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

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

Delivered, funded and facilitated events

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

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

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

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

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

34. ATEED assesses and manages our initiatives on a case-by-case basis and engages with the Council group where required.

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

35. Local Board views are not sought for the purposes of this report. Local Board views were sought for some of the initiatives described in this report.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

36. The proposed decision to receive the six-monthly report has no impact on Māori. ATEED assesses and responds to any impact that our initiatives may have on Māori on a case-by-case basis.
Ngā ritengā ā-pūtea
Financial implications
37. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no financial implications.

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

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
39. ATEED will provide the next six-monthly report to the Local Board in February 2020 and will cover the period 1 July to 31 December 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Samantha-Jane Miranda, Operational Strategy Advisor (ATEED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Quanita Khan - Manager Operational Strategy and Planning (ATEED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To enable the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward Councillors to verbally update the Board.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) thank Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward Councillors Cathy Casey and Christine Fletcher for their update.

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

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketapapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Temporary arrangements for urgent decisions and staff delegations during the election period

File No.: CP2019/16106

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 Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) utilise the board’s existing urgent decision-making process between the final local board business meeting and the commencement of the term of office of new local board members] OR [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
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<tr>
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<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
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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 Puketāpapa Local Board:

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

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

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Freedom Camping in Vehicles – Managing freedom camping in Auckland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Statement of Proposal) (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Areas proposed by submitters during public consultation and not</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>included within the statement of proposal (Attachment E of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hearings Panel Report)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Michael Sinclair – Policy Manager, Community and Social Policy</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>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Areas by ward not included in the statement of proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-scheduled area</th>
<th>Restriction sought</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Link to summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Albert-Eden</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 293 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferndale Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 281 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gribblehirst Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 312 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 313 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbutt Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 315 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kukuwai Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 321 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Halberg Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 332 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōwairaka Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 333 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Reserve - Mt Albert</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 337 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 340 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterview Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 350 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Road - Mt Eden</td>
<td>Seeking restricted freedom camping</td>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>Page 353 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Devonport-Takapuna</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castor Bay Beach Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>North Shore</td>
<td>Page 298 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham Beach</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>North Shore</td>
<td>Page 300 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Franklin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āwhitu Peninsula: Cochrane’s Road, Pollok</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Page 296 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookout; Pollock Beach; Big bay Boat Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Lawrie Fields</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Page 304 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halls Beach Access, Clarks Beach</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Page 314 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaka Sports Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Page 318 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karioitahi Beach</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Page 319 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patumahoe Sports Reserve</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Page 335 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukekohe Train Station and Pukekohe Hill</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Page 338 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wattle Bay - Āwhitu Peninsula</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Page 282 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
</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</td>
<td>Page 295 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windy Canyon Great Barrier Island</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>Page 352 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</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>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkles Bay</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Page 275 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside Reserve (also known as Maygrove Reserve)</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Page 279 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matakatia 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>Howick</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>Maskel 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>Grasped Reserve - Willjames Avenue</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Page 311 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moari Bay Car Park at Muriwhai 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,</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitematā and Gulf</td>
<td>Page 326 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taihei island and Lot 1, Te Huruhu Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Wilson Reserve and Rocky Bay</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitematā 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>Waitematā and Gulf</td>
<td>Page 344 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Ranges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Seaview Road</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>Page 289 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Road Car Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>Page 309 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Pukematekeo Car Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>Page 331 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spraggs Bush Car Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>Page 341 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stedfast Park, Glensk Road, Lograce Road</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>Page 342 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitematā and Gulf</td>
<td>Page 291 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque Park</td>
<td>Seeking prohibited</td>
<td>Waitematā and Gulf</td>
<td>Page 297 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>Page 333 of Attachment C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Council’s submission on the government’s ‘Proposed priority products and priority product stewardship scheme guidelines’

File No.: CP2019/15989

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To seek formal input from the Puketāpapa Local Board to Auckland Council’s submission on the Ministry for the Environment’s ‘Proposed priority products and priority product stewardship scheme guidelines’.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The Ministry for the Environment is proposing using several tools under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 to increase incentives for people and businesses to take responsibility for the life-cycle impacts of their products.

3. The proposal seeks feedback on both:
   - the proposed process for developing product stewardship schemes
   - the priority products identified for potential inclusion in this scheme.

4. Product stewardship is the responsible management of the environmental impact of a product. It aims to reduce the impact of manufactured products at all stages of its lifecycle. It shifts the main responsibility for recovery, recycling and disposal from local government to private industry, incorporating costs into the product price.

5. A two-stage process is proposed:
   - In stage one the Ministry is consulting on the proposed declaration of six priority products.
   - In stage two, the Ministry will consult progressively from 2019 to 2021 on proposed Waste Minimisation Act 2008 regulations for each priority product group.

6. Proposed priority products are:
   - tyres
   - electrical and electronic products
   - agrichemicals and their containers
   - refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases
   - farm plastics
   - packaging (beverage containers are specifically mentioned).

7. The board received a memo from Council staff on 21 August detailing the proposed content of the draft Council submission.

8. Auckland Council’s draft submission supports:
   - the six priority products identified by the Ministry for the Environment.
   - the proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship scheme design
   - the two-stage consultation process proposed in the consultation document.
9. Three of the six products identified by the Ministry (beverage containers, electrical waste and tyres) are products that Auckland Council have included in the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 for product stewardship advocacy.

10. Auckland Council's draft submission also includes some:
   - feedback and recommendations regarding the technical details of how product stewardship schemes should run, as set out in Table 3 of the consultation document.
   - suggestions of other products that should be considered for priority product declaration.

11. The local board provided strong support for product stewardship when commenting on Auckland Council's draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 (10 May 2018 Resolution number PKTPP/2018/1). This highlighted the importance of product stewardship schemes and, in particular, the need to reduce plastic shopping bags. It also noted the need for community deposit schemes to return deposits to the community and that consideration is needed for unintended consequences of recycling e.g. energy use.

12. The due date for submissions to the Ministry for the Environment is 4 October 2019. Staff will present the draft Auckland Council submission to the Environment and Community Committee for its approval on 10 September 2019. Any local board submissions received after 9 September will be appended to the regional submission.

13. A copy of the draft Auckland Council submission, is appended as Attachment A.

14. A copy of the board's draft feedback is appended as Attachment B.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) provide the feedback in Attachment B on Auckland Council’s draft submission to the Ministry for the Environment’s ‘Proposed priority products and priority product stewardship scheme guidelines’.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20190919 Auckland Council draft priority product consultation submission Attachment A</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20190909 Feedback on Product Stewardship Attachment B</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Mary Hay - Local Board Advisor - Puketapapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Sir/Madam

Please find attached Auckland Council’s submission in response to the Proposed Priority Products and Priority product stewardship Scheme Guidelines consultation document.

Auckland Council welcomes the Ministry for the Environment’s proposal to designate the six identified product groups as Priority Products by the end of 2019 and suggest the inclusion of two additional product categories.

We support the product scope for each priority product as outlined, and the proposed guidelines for accredited scheme design.

The products identified, and the scope for each priority product outlined, align with the vision and objectives of the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018.

We would like to thank the Ministry for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important issue and look forward to future discussion.

If you require any clarification on our submission please contact me by phone on 021 832 427 or by email at Parul.Sood@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz.

Nāku noa, nā

Parul Sood
General Manager Waste Solutions
Mihi

I te timātatanga ko Te Kore
i takea mai ai ko te ao tūroa
e nohoa nei e tātou.
I hua mai i reira
ko Ranginui e tū lho nei,
ko Papatūānuku e takoto ake nei.
Ko te korowai ahurei o te rangi
me te takapau horanui o te whenua
e tāwharau nei i a tāua
i te tangata i te wā o te ora.
Engari, ko tō raua oranga tonu anō hoki
kei roto i ngā ringaringa
O tēna me tēnā o tātou.
Kāhore he mea i hua ake
i a Papatūānuku
e kore e kōpakina
ki tōna uma i te otinga.
He ao para kore tēnei
i tōna orokohanga mai.
Nā tāua, nā te tangata i a huri
hei tukunga parahanga.
Me hoki anō i a tātou
hei ao para kore i te mutunga.
E te iwi toko ake rā tātou.
Whāriki ko te maro Ope Tāua
O Papatūānuku,
ko Kaupapa-Rua te tikanga,
kimihia he mahi hōu te whai,
ko hangarau te whakamataara,
ko para kore te taumata whakaaro nui.
Tūturu whakamaua kia tīna!
Mā wai rā a Papatūānuku e tiaki
mei kore māku,
mei kore māu?

In the beginning there was The Void
and from it, came the world
that we now inhabit.
From there came
Ranginui, Father Sky who dwells above
and Papatūānuku, Mother Earth here
below.
The fine cloak of Heaven
and the outstretched rug of Earth
who have sheltered you and I –
humankind through this life.
Their own survival however,
rests in the hands
of each and every one of us.
There is nothing borne
of the natural world
that doesn't, in the end
return to the bosom of Papatūānuku.
This was a world of zero waste
in the beginning.
We, humankind alone turned it
into a dumping ground.
We must make her
waste-free once more.
So, take a stand as a people.
Let us gird ourselves as Warriors
of the Earth, and assent to
Re-purpose being the plan,
Re-use being the driver,
Recycle being the catch-cry
and zero waste – the bold goal.
Let us set ourselves to the task, till it is
done!
Who else will care for Mother Earth
if it isn't me,
and it isn't you?

Auckland Waste Management and
Minimisation Plan 2018
Responses to consultation questions

Priority products

Do you agree with the proposed scope for priority product declarations for the following six product groups?

**Q1: End-of-life tyres**

(a) All pneumatic (air-filled) tyres and certain solid tyres for use on motorised vehicles (for cars, trucks, buses, motorcycles, all-terrain vehicles, tractors, forklifts, aircraft and off-road vehicles).

(b) All pneumatic and solid tyres for use on bicycles (manual or motorised) and non-motorised equipment.

Yes. We consider that the proposed scope for end-of-life tyres is likely to capture all tyre types capable of creating harm to the environment.

Each year, Auckland Council collects around 6700 illegally dumped tyres, costing close to $70,000 per year of ratepayer funds.

The Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 says that council will advocate to central government for the introduction of mandatory product stewardship schemes for tyres.

In our submission to the Ministry for the Environment’s 2014 discussion document we supported tyres being declared a priority product under the Waste Minimisation Act.

Auckland Council also contributed to the Local Government Waste Management Manifesto (developed by the WasteMINZ territorial Authority Forum in January 2018) which proposed that mandatory schemes be set up for tyres.

**Q2: Electrical and electronic products**

(a) Large rechargeable batteries designed for use in electric vehicles, household-scale and industrial renewable energy power systems, including but not limited to lithium-ion batteries.

(b) All other batteries (eg, batteries designed for use in hand-held tools and devices).

(c) All categories of waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE defined in Annex II of European Directive 2012/19/EU (eg, ‘anything that requires a plug or a battery to operate’).

Yes. We consider that the proposed scope for electrical and electronic products will capture all products with the potential to create harm to the environment.

We suggest that when a scheme is established, a fuller definition of e-waste, which is compatible with Annex II of the European Directive 2012/19/EU, is published.
Auckland Council currently collects e-waste from the inorganic collection provided to annually to households.

Since July 2017 Auckland Council has collected and processed approximately 12,700 items of e-waste through the inorganic collection, at a cost of $105,000 to ratepayers.

The Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 says that council will advocate to central government for the introduction of mandatory product stewardship schemes for e-waste.

Auckland Council also supported the introduction of a mandatory product stewardship scheme for e-waste through the Local Government Waste Management Manifesto (developed by the WasteMINZ territorial Authority Forum in January 2018).

We also supported e-waste being declared a priority product under the Waste Minimisation Act in our submission to the Ministry for the Environment's 2014 discussion document.

Q3: **Agricultural chemicals and their containers**

Chemicals in plastic containers up to and including 1000 litres in size that are used for:

(a) any horticulture, agricultural and livestock production, including veterinary medicines

(b) industrial, utility, infrastructure and recreational pest and weed control

(c) forestry

(d) household pest and weed control operations

(e) similar activities conducted by or contracted by local and central government authorities.

This includes but is not limited to all substances that require registration under the Agricultural Compounds and Veterinary Medicines Act 1997, whether current or expired, and their containers (packaging), which are deemed hazardous until such time as triple-rinsed.

Packaging for veterinary medicines, which includes syringes, tubes and flexible bags, must be phased in under the accredited scheme.

Yes. We consider that the inclusion of these agrichemicals and containers captures the products and packaging of concern.

Auckland Council supported the introduction of a mandatory product stewardship scheme for agricultural chemicals and plastics through the Local Government Waste Management Manifesto (developed by the WasteMINZ Territorial Authority Forum in January 2018).

Although the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 does not specifically advocate for a mandatory product stewardship scheme for agrichemicals and containers, it does note the need to find solutions for household hazardous waste and rural waste. Auckland Council is therefore, supportive of a mandatory product stewardship scheme for this product category.

The inclusion of household pest and weed control products is a welcome addition to this scope. Household chemicals often use the same base preparations as
commercial products and therefore, present the same risk to people and the environment, so should be handled in the same way.

The Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 expresses Auckland Council’s intention to develop and implement a strategy for household hazardous waste, consistent with national strategy, to address collection systems, data requirements and public education.

Q4: Refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases
(a) Refrigerants: all gases used for heating, cooling and air conditioning that are ozone-depleting substances under the Ozone Layer Protection Act 1996 and/or synthetic greenhouse gases under the Climate Change Response Act 2002, and products containing these gases.
(b) Methyl bromide and products containing this gas.

Yes. We consider that the proposed scope for refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases will capture the substances capable of creating harm to the environment.

Auckland Council supported refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases being declared a priority product under the Waste Minimisation Act in our submission to the Ministry for the Environment’s 2014 discussion document.

Although the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 does not specifically advocate for mandatory product stewardship for this product category, our plan is guided by the Climate Change Response Act 2002. We have committed to reporting on Council’s greenhouse gas emissions and informing the public about the linkages between waste-generated emissions and climate change. Auckland Council has also recently adopted the draft Auckland Climate Action Framework for consultation which aims to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. Auckland Council is therefore, supportive of a mandatory product stewardship scheme for this product category.

Q5: Packaging
(a) Beverage packaging: used to hold any beverage for retail sale that has more than 50 millilitres and less than 4 litres of capacity, made of any material singly or in combination with other materials (eg, plastic, glass, metal, paperboard or mixed laminated materials).
(b) Single-use plastic consumer goods packaging: used for consumer goods at retail or wholesale level made of plastic resin codes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7, singly or in combination with one or more of these plastics or any non-plastic material, and not designed to be refilled.

We consider that the proposed scope for packaging will capture the major components creating harm to the environment.

However, we suggest that compostable plastic is considered for inclusion in the scope. There is a risk that product manufacturers could opt to package their goods in materials that are not included in a product stewardship scheme, for which there are currently limited recycling options.
The Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 says that council will advocate to central government for a national Container Deposit Scheme (CDS) in collaboration with other local authorities.

Auckland Council also supported the introduction of a CDS through the Local Government Waste Management Manifesto (developed by the WasteMINZ Territorial Authority Forum in January 2018).

We also suggested that packaging be included for regulatory intervention in our submission to the Ministry for the Environment’s 2014 discussion document – with a particular focus on beverage containers.

To support our advocacy for a CDS, we commissioned an independent study on the costs and benefits of introducing a national CDS (Cost-benefit analysis of a container deposit scheme, Sapere 2018). This analysis of the potential of a New Zealand CDS found that society would be significantly better off with a scheme in place\(^1\).

---

**Q6:** Farm plastics

(a) Plastic wrapping materials used for silage or hay, including but not limited to baleage wrap, hay bale netting, baling twine, and covers for silage pits.

(b) Plastic packaging used for agricultural and horticultural commodities including but not limited to fertiliser sacks, feed sacks, and bulk tonne bags made from woven polypropylene and/or polyethylene.

(c) Other plastic packaging and products used for agriculture and horticulture including, but not limited to, protective nets, reflective ground covers, and rigid plastic containers other than containers for agrichemicals, detergents, lubricants or solvents.

Yes. We consider that the proposed scope for farm plastics will capture the items capable of creating harm to the environment.

Although the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 does not specifically advocate for mandatory product stewardship for farm plastics, it does note that solutions need to be developed for rural waste streams. Auckland Council is therefore, supportive of a mandatory product stewardship scheme for this product category.

---

\(^1\) Davies, P. 2017. *Cost Benefit Analysis of a Container Deposit Scheme* (report for Auckland Council). Sapere Research Group
Ministerial guidelines for priority product stewardship schemes

Q7: Proposed guidelines
Do you agree with the proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship schemes outlined in table 3?

Yes, Auckland Council agrees in principle with the guidelines. We are looking forward to being part of the process to develop aspects of the guidelines when this work begins.

Q8: Changes/additions to guidelines
What changes would you make to the proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship schemes?

We support the guidelines as documented.

Other comments

Māori Responsiveness

Through development of the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018, Auckland Council engaged in extensive consultation with mana whenua and mataawaka on resource use and waste management. During the consultation process it was clear that for Auckland’s whānau, hapū and iwi, they have a specific kaitiakitanga role and obligation to people, the environment, and the next generation, ensuring cultural knowledge and practices continue.

Te Ao Māori recognises the traditional system in which nothing was wasted – everything was able to be returned back to Papatūānuku without detriment to the whenua, awa or moana. Recognising and incorporating values such as kaitiakitanga and manaakitanga into the ongoing product stewardship discussion is essential to achieving successful outcomes and upholding Aotearoa’s Te Tiriti o Waitangi obligations.

Incorporating mātauranga and tikanga Māori into solutions and decision-making regarding product stewardship, by partnering with whānau, hapū, iwi, and communities will create change and facilitate the transfer of knowledge and actions to and for future generations.

Auckland Council strongly recommends that the Ministry for the Environment undertake ongoing discussions directly with iwi and mana whenua to ensure that Te Ao Māori is incorporated early on in this process and that obligations under Aotearoa’s Te Tiriti o Waitangi are upheld.

Balance of stakeholder views

We consider it essential that a fair balance of stakeholder views is taken into account when developing product stewardship schemes. This includes, but is not limited to, Māori, community, industry and local government.

While the business community generally has the resources to participate, in this work, some sectors do not. We suggest that resources are made available to ensure that the community and not for profit sectors will be able to participate fully.
Additional product categories for inclusion

1. Commercial sources of plastic packaging

Auckland Council is concerned about the lack of diversion opportunities for plastic packaging from business/commercial sources and recommends that an additional product category is included to address this material. Our nine-point action plan laid out in the 2018 WMMP includes working with industry to find ways of reducing commercial plastic waste.

One example is the large volume of plastic packaging generated on building and construction projects. We will be undertaking work to quantify the amount of this material, but initial estimates suggest that around 200,000 tonnes\(^2\) of plastic is entering landfill each year from construction activity.

One of the most significant individual sources is LDPE building wrap which is generated in large volumes during urban building restoration but is not currently recycled, even though it is made of the same resin type as silage wrap.

Including products produced in large volumes with similar recycling methodologies may increase the scale and feasibility for on-shore reprocessing and lead to significant reductions in waste to landfill.

2. Paper and cardboard packaging

Auckland Council would also like to see paper and cardboard packaging included as an additional product category.

The recent restrictions on export of paper and cardboard to China has put local authorities and recyclers across the country under severe pressure. Alternate markets and uses for this material are being sought but a long-term solution is required. A mandatory product stewardship scheme, such as that operating in British Columbia, would ensure manufacturers design paper and cardboard packaging to be part of the circular economy, and would help to support local processing capacity.

\(^2\) Auckland Council Construction and Demolition Waste Cost Benefit Analysis 2019
Feedback on:
The Ministry for the Environment’s Proposed Priority Products and Priority product stewardship Scheme Guidelines
3 September 2019

For clarifications and questions, please contact:
Mary Hay
Senior Local Board Advisor – Puketāpapa Local Board

Context
2. The Deputy Chair of the Puketāpapa Local Board, Julie Fairey, has been identified as the board lead on this feedback and has provided this submission. Board views will be incorporated into the Auckland Council submission, at the direction of the Environment and Community Committee.

Relevance to the Local board
3. Local boards are responsible for decision-making on local issues, activities and services and providing input into regional strategies, policies and plans. Local boards also have a role in representing the views of their communities on issues of local importance.
4. Every three years local boards set their strategic direction through a local board plan. The Proposed Priority Products and Priority Product Stewardship Scheme Guidelines have relevance to the following outcomes and objectives the 2017 Puketāpapa Local Board Plan.
   - Treasured and enhanced natural environment
   - The mana of our harbour, waterways and maunga is recognised
   - People and business adopt sustainable practices
5. The Puketāpapa Local Board has a number of plans that are relevant to this matter:
   - Low carbon action plan
   - Healthy Puketapapa - strategic health and wellbeing framework
   - Open Space Network Plan
   - Te Auaungas Oakley Creek vision and restoration strategy

Puketapapa Local Board feedback:
The Puketāpapa Local Board supports product stewardship schemes as a way of encouraging lifecycle thinking and shared responsibility of both producer and consumer through the design, production and waste management stages.
The board supports the goals of a sustainable and low emissions economy. The current system of disposal for products in New Zealand means that the people who design and sell products are not responsible for the disposal of the waste resulting from their products. These economic and environmental costs usually fall to the wider community to manage.

It is vital that waste is designed out of the system by considering the need for disposal at the very beginning of the product lifecycle. This will assist with the transition from a linear ‘throw-away culture’ (take–make–dispose) to a ‘life-cycle’ way of thinking (make–use–return), where products have multiple uses and therefore use less resources.

Consultation questions:

a) Do you agree with the proposed scope for priority product declarations for the following six product groups?

Q1: End-of-life tyres –
Yes, illegal dumping is a significant issue in parts of Puketapapa Local Board. This creates a range of issues, including health, environmental and aesthetic.

Q2: Electrical and electronic products –
Yes, electronic waste is a contributor to illegal dumping.

Q3: Agricultural chemicals and their containers –
Yes, supportive of the product stewardship approach across all areas of the waste stream.

Q4: Refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases –
Yes, the board recognises the importance of climate change and the need to take local action to ensure that we meet our regional, national and global climate change targets. The board provided strong support for the recent Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill proposal.

Q5: Packaging –
Yes, agree that single-use plastic consumer goods packaging; used for consumer goods at retail or wholesale level made of plastic resin codes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 (singly or in combination with one or more of these plastics or any non-plastic material, and not designed to be refilled) should be included in the product stewardship scheme. It also seeks the inclusion of the following additional components included:

- compostable plastic
- straws

The board supports a national Container Deposit Scheme (CDS) as one of the mechanisms to extend the life of a product.

Q6: Farm plastics –
Priority 6 is not an issue in the Puketapapa Local Board.

Additional priorities –
The board would like clothing to be considered as an additional priority. It notes that this industry creates a range of detrimental environmental impacts, such as pesticides and ocean pollution, but also generates social impacts through the low-wage economy.
Q7: Proposed guidelines

Do you agree with the proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship schemes outlined in table 3?

Yes, agree in principle with the guidelines.

Q8: Changes/additions to guidelines

What changes would you make to the proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship schemes?

- Design Feature 2 addresses Fees, funding and cost effectiveness. The board would like consideration to be given to cost recovery for container deposit schemes to be returned to the local communities. This is a model that is used in California.

- Design Feature 7 and 16 address Compliance. The board highlighted the importance of effective, well-resourced enforcement of product stewardship schemes. It supports this guideline “the scheme will have a clear means of enforcing compliance of all participants and reporting liable non-participants to the government enforcement agency.”

- Design Feature 8 addresses Targets. The board would like consideration to be given to a stepped design scheme that attracts higher levels of voluntary participation for businesses. For example, there could be different levels of target, such as ‘Starter, Upgrade, the Flagship’. A high level of product stewardship could be something that a business aspires to and promotes.

- Design Feature 17 addresses Accessible collection networks. The board acknowledges that local resource recovery centres may be more practical than regional ones.

End.
Feedback on the government’s discussion document on a biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand

File No.: CP2019/16000

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To provide members with the board’s formal feedback, from the Chair and member Holm, on the Auckland Council submission to the government’s discussion document on a biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The Government is seeking submissions on Te Koiroa o te Koiora. This is a discussion document for proposals for a biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand. The new strategy will replace the current strategy Our chance to turn the tide.

3. At the Puketāpapa Local Board business meeting of 15 August the board resolved the following, via Extraordinary Business.

29.1 Local board feedback on biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand

A copy will be placed on the official minutes and made available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Resolution number PKTTP/2019/1

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson J Fairey, seconded by Member S Kaushal:

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) delegate authority to the Chair and member D Holm to provide input into Auckland Council’s submission on the Government’s discussion document on a biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand

CARRIED

Attachments

A 20190815 Item 29 Consideration of Extraordinary Item Opportunity for local boards to contribute to an Auckland Council submission on the Government’s discussion document on a biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand

4. The board held a workshop session on 29 August where members had the opportunity to consider their feedback.

5. The Chair and member Holm finalised the feedback on the draft Auckland Council submission, which was then approved by the Environment and Community Committee.

6. A copy of the draft Auckland Council submission, is appended as Attachment A.

7. A copy of the board’s submitted feedback is appended as Attachment B.
Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) note the board’s formal feedback in Attachment B on the Auckland Council submission to the government’s discussion document on a biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20190919 Auckland Council biodiversity strategy key themes Attachment A</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20190903 Feedback on national biodiversity strategy Attachment B</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Auckland Council Submission on Te Kiloa o te Kolora – our shared vision for living with nature. A discussion document on proposals for a biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand

Key themes for submission

Auckland Council has organised its submission in response to the key elements, and questions, of the discussion document proposals for a biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand.

Overall comments

- Auckland Council supports the proposed vision, values and principles and need for a new biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand. However, the discussion document and proposed strategy framework lacks logic in how all the various parts of the framework fit.
- Auckland Council considers there are several missed opportunities in the discussion document proposals including:
  - the need to express urgency for restoring nature and support priorities and actions that will implement this urgency;
  - the failure of the discussion document to link well with other government initiatives such as urban development, freshwater, resource management system review and biosecurity 2025. All these initiatives have impacts on biodiversity;
  - stronger links with climate change impacts on biodiversity, picking up on the urgency expressed through recent public support for change, and urban biodiversity opportunities;
  - the five proposed key system shifts are not considered to be transformative. They rely on existing DOC work programmes or are already being undertaken across New Zealand, including by Auckland Council.
- Auckland Council as a unitary authority plays a key role in the biodiversity system for the Auckland region.

Part 1 of Strategy

How well does Part 1 of the discussion document set out the problem and consider the challenges and opportunities facing nature now and in the future?

- Auckland Council support the focus on ‘nature’, and the use of the term, in the discussion document proposals. Nature is a broader term that more people can connect with and respond to.
- Auckland Council does not consider that the key drivers and pressures related to biodiversity loss have been fully articulated, or the challenges in addressing these existing pressures particularly when combined with future pressures from climate change. Greater consideration should be given to the key pressures of agriculture,
urban development, legislation and regulatory barriers like the Resource Management Act on biodiversity loss.

- Auckland Council suggests that some reflection on the current biodiversity strategy, *Our chance to turn the tide*, would be useful particularly a discussion around aspects of the current strategy that worked well and what areas needed improvement.
- Auckland Council as a unitary authority plays a key role in the biodiversity system for the Auckland region. The discussion document does not fully recognise the full range of responsibilities that regional councils and unitary authorities have.

**Poutama strategy framework**

*What do you think of the proposed strategy framework? Does it provide a useful way of linking the elements of the strategy together?*

- Auckland Council support the overall framework and consider it is useful from a visual perspective. However, the framework is confusing as to how the values, tools and principles link together, and how it links with other parts of the discussion document such as the key system shifts and goals. Auckland Council suggest that the strategy framework, and wider discussion document, would benefit from a logic framework that clearly shows the direct links between different parts of the framework necessary to achieve the vision.

**Vision, values and principles**

*What do you think about the proposed values and principles?*

- Auckland Council supports the proposed matapopore/vision, values and principles outlined. The proposed values could be strengthened to ensure collaboration is a key value, as currently it is not mentioned while it is mentioned across the discussion document.
- Auckland Council is supportive of the 2070 timeframe for the new strategy. It is recognised that a lot can change over 50 years. A set of measurable goals that are regularly monitored and reviewed can ensure this timeframe is manageable.
- Auckland Council is generally supportive of the principles identified and particularly support the ‘Knowledge’ principles which support evidence-based decision making, along with the ‘courage’ to take innovative approaches to restoring nature and to not delay action due to a lack of complete information. Such a principle is necessary given the urgency of the nature crisis.
- Auckland Council supports the *in-situ* management principle on the basis that it is easier to conserve ecosystems and ecological processes in-situ, compared to other means.

**Long-term outcomes**

*What do you think about the proposed long-term outcomes?*

- Auckland Council are largely supportive of the eight long term outcomes identified in the strategy. It is suggested that some wording could be strengthened or clarified for
some of the outcomes. For example, the global outcome should be more aspirational such that New Zealand is seen as a global leader in biodiversity conservation and management, rather than making a meaningful contribution.

- Auckland Council support the focus on restoration in the long-term outcomes (i.e. Tiaki) and throughout the discussion document proposals. This recognises the growing interest in restoration and the need to continue to scale this up into the future.

- Auckland Council supports the outcome acknowledging the role that non-indigenous species and ecosystems play in biodiversity management, and the benefits they offer in providing suitable habitat to indigenous species. This reflects the interconnected and complex interactions of nature, particularly for a large urban area like Auckland.

Is there anything you would add or change?

- Auckland Council suggests a need to provide clearer direction on how a new biodiversity strategy intends to achieve these long-term outcomes. The discussion document does not provide clear linkages between the goals, targets, principles, actions, key-shifts, and how they will move towards the long-term outcomes. Clarity could be provided through a logic framework demonstrating how all these parts of any new strategy are connected.

Goals

What do you think of the proposed set of goals?

- Auckland Council support having goals in the new biodiversity strategy that are realistic, targeted and measurable. The goals proposed in the discussion document do not all meet these criteria and require further clarification. It is unclear in some proposed goals as to what the baseline will be measured from, and who will determine details such as 'ten key freshwater pest species'.

- Auckland Council supports identifying goals for different timeframes but suggest that there needs to be additional goals between 2030 and 2050, and potentially between 2050 and 2070. Otherwise there is potential that the goals and vision may not be achieved if there are no opportunities to measure progress at regular intervals.

- As commented earlier, it is unclear how the goals fit into the poutama strategy framework. It is suggested that this be clarified in any strategy document. It would also be useful to map any goals to the long-term outcome areas, if possible.

Implementation

What do you think about the proposed plan for implementation planning? What do you think are the requirements for a governance structure to oversee implementation planning and delivery?

- Auckland Council considers that the discussion document lacks detail and discussion around funding and resourcing, including being innovative in how restoration of nature can be funded. It is important that any discussion on funding recognises that
regional councils across New Zealand are a critical part of the biodiversity system but vary in terms of how well they are resourced.

- Auckland Council suggest that any governance structure for the new biodiversity strategy should have representation across the biodiversity system, especially from regional and unitary councils given their role in the biodiversity system.
- Clarity needs to be provided as to how any governance structures for the new biodiversity strategy will link with other governance structures (i.e. Predator Free 2050). Auckland Council suggest that these structures need to speak to each other and not operate in isolation, as many of the actions are interconnected and overlapping.
- Auckland Council acknowledge the intention to develop a detailed implementation plan once the new biodiversity strategy is in place.

What do you think about the proposal for progress reporting and review of the strategy? How do you think this reporting should take place to ensure it is useful, transparent, inclusive, and drives accountability?

- Auckland Council support the five-yearly reporting and review process of the new strategy as this will promote accountability and enable an adaptive strategy.
- Auckland Council suggest that any review process for the new strategy is conducted independently, potentially by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, to ensure an honest and transparent appraisal of the progress and implementation of the strategy.

Key shifts and Priority Actions

What do you think about the five system shifts? Are they the right areas to focus on in the near term? Are there other areas that should be included?

- Auckland Council suggest that the five system shifts are good initiatives on their own and should be encouraged. However, Auckland Council does not consider the proposed shifts are transformational enough to significantly tackle and alleviate the current and future, pressures facing nature. It is suggested that they are not ‘shifts’ but rather ‘improvements’ to the current biodiversity system, some of which are already underway.
- Auckland Council support key Shift 1: Getting the System Right and suggest that this should be a key focus of the new strategy as parts of the system are a significant road-block to achieving effective outcomes for nature. It is encouraged that a greater focus on tackling legislative barriers and development pressures is included as part of this shift.
- Auckland Council supports Shift 4: Connecting ecosystems from the mountain tops to the ocean depths, which highlights the importance of landscape-scale restoration activities which is essential to restoring nature. This shift is embedded in the landscape scale approaches to Predator Free 2050 programmes.
- Auckland Council suggest that another shift could be based around better embedding restoration of nature into urban development, economic development and planning
considerations. These are some of the key drivers of biodiversity loss and changing how these pressures consider and value nature would lead to a fundamental shift in behaviour and outcomes. Such a shift would also highlight the interconnections between social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing.

*Do you agree with the proposed first steps? What other actions should be included?*

- Auckland Council generally support the proposed first steps and actions to be undertaken. However, short-term actions should indicate responsibilities, and whether they are funded or would require additional funding. This would improve transparency and delivery of the actions.

- Auckland Council note that many of the proposed actions in the discussion document are already captured in existing strategies, programmes and national directions. It is suggested that if these are carried through to the new strategy that new actions, and those already underway, are clearly identified along with how the actions connect with other strategies or programmes.

*General Comments / Improvements*

- There should be a mention of NZ’s international obligations to the Global Strategy for Plant conservation, and how this strategy supports them.

- A greater emphasis on threatened species and legislation to support them should be included. For instance, there is currently no legal protection for threatened plants in New Zealand, along with incomplete knowledge of all the threatened species, and their distribution.
Feedback on:
The Ministry of Conservation’s Te Kioiroa o te Koiora Our shared vision for living with nature proposal
5 September 2019

Context
1. The Government is seeking feedback on Te Kioiroa o te Koiora Our shared vision for living with nature, a discussion document for a biodiversity strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand. The due date for submissions to the Ministry of Conservation is 22 September 2019.
2. The Chair of the Puketāpapa Local Board, Harry Doig, and member Holm have been identified as the board lead on this feedback and have provided this submission. Board views will be incorporated into the Auckland Council submission, at the direction of the Environment and Community Committee.

Relevance to the Local board
3. Local boards are responsible for decision-making on local issues, activities and services and providing input into regional strategies, policies and plans. Local boards also have a role in representing the views of their communities on issues of local importance.
4. Every three years local boards set their strategic direction through a local board plan. The Te Kioiroa o te Koiora Our shared vision for living with nature proposal has relevance to the following outcomes and objectives the 2017 Puketāpapa Local Board Plan.
   - Urban development meets community needs
     - Well-planned, connected neighbourhoods that are appealing and sustainable
   - Vibrant and popular parks and facilities
     - The Waikowhai coast is enhanced and accessible
   - Treasured and enhanced natural environment
     - Mana whenua are valued partners on key environmental projects
     - The community has the skills and knowledge to undertake pest management to protect the local environment
     - The mana of our harbour, waterways and maunga is recognised
     - Biodiversity and significant trees are protected
5. The Puketāpapa Local Board has a number of plans that are relevant to this matter:
   - Open Space Network Plan
   - Te Auaungas/ Oakley Creek vision and restoration strategy
   - Waikowhai walkways network plan
Puketāpapa Local Board feedback on the Te Koiroa o te Koiroa Our shared vision for living with nature:

- The Puketāpapa Local Board supports the proposed matapopore/vision for 2070:
  - Nature in Aotearoa is healthy, abundant, and thriving. Current and future generations connect with nature, restore it, and are restored by it.
  
  However, this could be amended to communicate the urgent need to restore biodiversity and prevent permanent loss of biodiversity.

- The Board supports the long-term outcomes, in particular:
  - Whakahou – empower category.
    - All New Zealanders can connect with nature and recognize its value in supporting intergenerational wellbeing
    - Tangata whenua are exercising their role as kaitiaki
  
  These long-term outcomes echo objectives in the 2017 Puketāpapa Local Board plan

  - Tiaki – protect and restore
    - A full range of ecosystems on land and in water are healthy and functioning
  
  This is the most fundamental long-term outcome. The Board welcomes the equal status of water with land given our experience with restoration of Te Auaungas/Oakley Creek and the Manukau Harbour. It also welcomes the inclusion of a case study on the Kaipara Harbour which references links between catchment, harbour and coast, long-term visioning and innovative farming methods. This outcome seeks comprehensive protection and restoration of habitats and ecological communities which requires more than focusing on individual animals and plants.

  - Wānanga – systems and behavior
    - Non-indigenous species and ecosystems are managed to maintain or enhance indigenous biodiversity, while providing for the cultural, economic and recreational values that nonindigenous species provide.

  The Board is also interested in this outcome, due to its experience in funding pine tree removals on the Manukau Harbour foreshore and the resultant restoration of native forest. It is valid for the strategy to recognise that non-indigenous species can be beneficial, but the Board has been pleased with the results of this programme, which it hopes could lead to an ecological corridor on the Cape Horn Peninsula.

  - Aotearoa New Zealand’s economic activity provides for the restoration and protection of indigenous biodiversity

  This outcome is also important but appears limited in its goals. The strategy speaks of “an opportunity” to do this but does not identify a range of opportunities and emphasise the many benefits which could follow.
The board has the following comments on the system shifts:

Shift 2: Empowering kaitiakitanga and mātauranga Māori
- Agree that Te Ao Māori perspectives should be embedded throughout the biodiversity system and tangata whenua should be supported in their kaitiaki role.

Shift 3: Communities are empowered to take action
- The Puketāpapa Local Board area has a high level of cultural diversity with high number of new migrants living here. It may be that there are different attitudes to, and relationships with, nature in the communities that migrants come from. There needs to be education about the importance of biodiversity in Aotearoa/New Zealand. This may require investment to reduce the barriers, such as language or isolation, which limit understanding and empowerment to be stewards of nature.
- The strategy recognises that many businesses are increasingly aware of New Zealand’s biggest environmental challenges and opportunities and the benefits of working together on solutions. The Board is also aware of the upsurge in Auckland in community groups engaging in pest control, planting and beach and park clean-ups. The strategy needs to make best use of these by encouraging focus on habitat and ecological community protection and restoration ahead of the more glamorous campaigns to boost work on individual animals and plants.

Shift 4: Connecting ecosystems from the mountain tops to the ocean depths
- Endorse the importance of a biodiversity strategy that includes the ocean/harbour. The Board is concerned about the Manukau harbour that has been degraded over many decades by many pollutants which continue to restrict its biodiversity. This includes recent concerns about diminishing shellfish numbers, non-indigenous seaweeds, flounder with abnormalities and threats to whitebait. The near complete hydrodynamic study will provide an invaluable tool for monitoring trends but a national strategy on harbour biodiversity should provide more equitable treatment with the resources being provided to restore the Hauraki Gulf and Kaipara Harbour.
- The board would like to see the inclusion of freshwater in the strategy. The health of Te Auauanga/Oakley Creek, and people’s connection to this awa, is of key importance.

Shift 5: Innovating for the future
- The board is cautious about an approach that relies on technology to transform the way biodiversity is managed. We cannot rely on technology to save us, what is needed is behavioural change.
- But the Board does recognise that innovation has a key role to play in biodiversity monitoring. The co-ordination of professional and citizen science can achieve a lot. Monitoring of harbours, which are ever changing, has particular challenges. Drones may be of particular value here.

Additional shift
- The local board plan speaks to the urban pressure facing Auckland and the pressure that this will bring on communities and on nature. The board supports another shift about embedding restoration of nature into urban development and planning.
considerations. These are some of the key drivers of biodiversity loss. The board acknowledges that there may need to be different strategies put in place that deal with brown field vs green field development.

End.
Feedback on Proposed National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land

File No.: CP2019/17099

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek formal input from the Puketāpapa Local Board on the proposed National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land to be appended to the final Auckland Council submission.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. On 22 August 2019 local boards were provided with an update (via memorandum) on the proposed National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land. This memo outlined opportunities for local board input into the Auckland Council submission on this National Policy Statement (NPS). The update contained the information outlined below.

3. The Ministry for Primary Industries and the Ministry for the Environment have released a discussion document on national direction for protecting Highly Productive Land, including proposed wording for a National Policy Statement.

4. The need for the national direction has arisen from concerns over the loss of New Zealand’s elite soils through urban encroachment and rural lifestyle development.

5. The proposed NPS will direct councils to protect Highly Productive Land from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and maintain their availability for primary production.

6. Highly Productive Land will need to be defined by councils for their regions. In the interim, the NPS will use the Land Use Classification (LUC) system classes 1-3 as a ‘placeholder’ for Highly Productive Land. A map of the Auckland region showing the areas of ‘Elite’ and ‘Prime’ land as defined by the Unitary Plan (Land Use Capability classes 1-3) is shown in Attachment A of this report.

7. The proposed wording of the NPS states that Highly Productive Land does not include existing urban areas or areas zoned Future Urban in a District Plan. This means that for Auckland, the next 30 years of planned urban expansion (into the Future Urban zone) is not impacted by this NPS. A summary of the Proposed NPS is contained in Attachment B.

8. Outside this Proposed National Policy Statement further work by central government is expected to progress in 2020 to address declining soil health as a result of past and present agricultural practices. This work is likely to focus on soil contamination, soil compaction, and erosion. The government will also be releasing related updated national direction on Urban Development and Freshwater which may have crossovers with protecting Highly Productive Land.

9. Some questions that the Local Boards may wish to consider when providing feedback are:
   - is there support in principle for national direction on highly productive land?
   - is a National Policy Statement the best tool?
   - should any National Policy Statement apply to existing urban zoned land / Future Urban zoned land / Countryside Living zoned land?
   - is there support for some scope for the council to enable urban and/or lifestyle development on highly productive land or do you prefer an absolute protection of it?
• is there support for the process of Auckland Council identifying highly productive land for Auckland (based on criteria) or do you prefer the approach of using the interim LUC1-3 method being made permanent?

• what other areas outside LUC1-3 would you consider might be worthy of being covered by the National Policy Statement (i.e. what criteria would you use to define highly productive land)?

• what sort of buffers might be necessary around identified highly productive land?

10. Public submissions to the Ministry for the Environment and the Ministry for Primary Industries are open from 14 August to 10 October 2019.

11. Auckland Council will make a submission that will be signed off by delegated councillors by 7 October 2019 (resolution GB/2019/75).

12. The final deadline for local board feedback to be considered in the formulation of the council submission is 12 September 2019. Local board feedback provided after this date, and up until 20 September 2019, will be appended to the final council submission.

Ngā tūtōhunga
Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) provide feedback on the proposed National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land to be appended to the final Auckland Council submission

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
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<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>Map of LUC 1-3 land in the Auckland Region</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Valuing highly productive land: a summary</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Ben Moimoi - Local Board Advisor - Puketapapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment A – Map of LUC 1-3 land in the Auckland Region
Valuing highly productive land: a summary

A summary of the proposed national policy statement for highly productive land
Our land is a precious taonga – an irreplaceable treasure and a source of life and wellness for our country. Our economy depends on our land, and our history and culture are tied to it.

However, our productive land is under threat and we have a duty to cherish and protect it for future generations. We have already lost a lot of this precious resource. What we give up today is lost forever, which is why we need to act with urgency.

The Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) and the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) are proposing a National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL) as the most effective way to improve the way highly productive land is managed under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

The NPS-HPL proposes that councils will be required to consider the availability of highly productive land within their region or district for primary production now and for future generations.

What is highly productive land and why does it matter?

Our survival depends on land - from providing our life support systems to supporting the expression of our culture, spirituality and identity through the connections to place and history. Highly productive land provides significant economic and employment benefits to communities and underpins the value of New Zealand’s primary sector.

Local authorities decide what land is classified as highly productive. Most use the Land Use Capability (LUC) system, which categorises land into eight classes according to its long-term capability to sustain one or more productive uses. Class 1 is for the most versatile land, with the fewest limitations on its use. For this proposed National Policy Statement (NPS), highly productive land means it has been designated Class 1, 2 or 3 by default. Councils will then be able to consider a number of other factors to exclude some of this land, or to identify other highly productive land. Examples of these other factors are: the suitability of the climate for primary production; the size of land properties to support primary production; water availability; and access to transport routes and appropriate labour markets.

Problems facing highly productive land

In April 2018, MPI and Stats NZ published the Our land 2016 report, which is a comprehensive assessment of how human activity is affecting the state of New Zealand’s land to date. The report identified two main pressures facing highly productive land on the edge of towns and cities:

How to have your say

We’ve prepared a summary of the key issues we would like your feedback on. We have included references in the discussion document where you can find more information.

We appreciate the input and expertise that many organisations and individuals have already contributed to the development of the proposed NPS-HPL. We now invite you to share your views. Continuing this inclusive approach will help us create effective, enduring solutions.

All New Zealanders have a stake in the protection of our land and we want to hear from you.

The discussion document and information about the consultation process can be found at www.mpi.govt.nz/HighlyProductiveLand
• expansion of urban areas, and the accompanying loss of productive land; and
• change of land-use on the fringes of urban areas, in particular the increase in lifestyle blocks.

The RMA provides the regulatory framework to sustainably manage the use of land, soil, fresh water and the coastal marine area, but there is a lack of clarity on how highly productive land should be managed, with more weight generally being given to the value of other matters and priorities.

The absence of considered decision-making is contributing to urban expansion over, and fragmentation of, highly productive land when alternative locations and approaches may be available. This is precluding the best use of this finite resource for primary production for the benefit of New Zealand and future generations.
**Overall purpose of the proposed NPS**

The overall purpose is to improve the way highly productive land is managed under the RMA to:

- recognise the full range of values and benefits associated with its use for primary production;
- maintain its availability for primary production for future generations; and
- protect it from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

The NPS’s objective is not to provide absolute protection for highly productive land.

**Options considered**

Under the RMA, national direction can be provided on a particular problem or matter of national significance, and other options outside the RMA can also be used for this purpose.

Three options were considered as the most appropriate to address the identified problems:

1. A National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (option one);
2. National Environmental Standards for Highly Productive Land (option two); and
3. Amendments to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (option three).

Option one is considered the best option as it could provide clear direction to local authorities on how to identify and manage highly productive land while still allowing some flexibility to respond to local pressures and priorities. It would elevate the importance of highly productive land within the RMA planning hierarchy, and help ensure the benefits and value of highly productive land are given more weight in land-use planning and decision-making.

Option two was not chosen as it provides limited flexibility to respond to different local priorities and pressures. A National Environment Standard would also need to be carefully designed to ensure it was appropriate in all locations it applied to and did not have unintended consequences from “locking in” certain land-uses on highly productive land.

Option three could be effective in dealing with urban encroachment on to highly productive lands, but it could not address other concerns. It would have limited ability to address the fragmentation of highly productive land, which is a key problem this proposed national direction seeks to address.
How a National Policy Statement would work

National Policy Statements set out objectives and policies for matters of national significance that are relevant to achieving the purpose of the RMA.

The proposed NPS would require local authorities to identify highly productive land based on a set of defined criteria (soil capability, climate, water availability, size, etc) with LUC Classes 1-3 being the default criteria to determine highly productive land until this process has been undertaken.

The proposed NPS focuses on maintaining highly productive land for “primary production” into the future to ensure a particular primary sector is not favoured at the expense of others. Generally, the conversion of highly productive land to urban land uses results in the irreversible loss of that land for primary production. While the conversion may not be strictly irreversible, higher land prices and smaller economic units mean that a return to primary production is generally very unlikely.

A key focus of the NPS is to protect highly productive land from “inappropriate” use and development. What is appropriate or not will depend on the local context and actual impacts of development on highly productive land.

The proposed NPS includes a definition for “sensitive activities” based on existing practice. The expectation is that district plans will use this definition as part of a rule framework to manage certain sensitive or incompatible activities (e.g. schools) on or adjacent to highly productive land used for primary production. The intent is to encourage setbacks and buffers between area of highly productive land and adjacent residential and rural residential areas.

Recognising that identifying highly productive land will take substantial effort from local authorities, it is proposed that the Government provides guidance and technical assistance, focusing on those regions with the greatest pressures on their highly productive land.

Wider national direction

The proposed National Policy Statement has been developed alongside several other government priorities for national direction. In light of this, MPI and MF have worked closely with other agencies to ensure all the national direction goals, both existing and proposed, are aligned and work well together. This is particularly important for the current proposals the Government is consulting on for urban development and for freshwater.

Proposed National Policy Statement for Urban Development

The proposed NPS on urban development would direct councils to be more future-focused about planning how and where development should occur, including identifying areas where evidence shows that urban development may not be appropriate through future development strategies.

The Government considers that the requirement to identify highly productive land will support councils in identifying “no-go” areas through their future development strategies while allowing for new urban areas on highly productive land in appropriate circumstances.

The Essential Freshwater work programme

This work programme proposes amendments to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014, as well as new National Environmental Standards for Freshwater Management. The objectives of this work programme include:

- stopping further degradation and loss of freshwater resources;
- reversing past damage; and
- addressing water allocation issues.

Councils will need to take into account the above objectives when identifying highly productive land.
Have your say

Your input will help achieve the best outcome for New Zealand. We want to hear from interested organisations and individuals by 5.00pm on 10 October 2019.

- An online submission tool is available at [www.mpi.govt.nz/HighlyProductiveLand](http://www.mpi.govt.nz/HighlyProductiveLand)
- Submissions can also be emailed to soils@mpi.govt.nz
- Or posted to: Ministry for Primary Industries
  PO Box 2526
  Wellington 6140
  New Zealand.

You can also share your views and have questions answered at workshops being held around the country.

Check out the full discussion document for the proposal at [www.mpi.govt.nz/HighlyProductiveLand](http://www.mpi.govt.nz/HighlyProductiveLand) and find out how to make a submission or attend a workshop.

Your input may address any aspect of the proposed National Policy Statement.

Any questions or for further information, please email soils@mpi.govt.nz.
Feedback on the Proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development

File No.: CP2019/17104

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To seek formal input from the Puketāpapa Local Board on the proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development to be appended to the final Auckland Council submission.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. On 30 August 2019, local boards were provided with an update (via memorandum) on the proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development. This memo outlined opportunities for local board input into the Auckland Council submission on this National Policy Statement. The update included the information outlined below.


4. This will replace the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (NPS UDC).

5. The NPS UD broadens the focus of the NPS UDC 2016 beyond urban development capacity, to include other matters that contribute to well-functioning urban environments. It will build on many of the existing requirements to provide greater development capacity, but will broaden its focus and add significant new content.

6. The NPS UD is part of a package that will work with other initiatives from central government including a National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (NPS HPL).

7. The Planning Committee and Local Board chairs will be invited to attend a workshop on 19 September where all three draft documents will be considered together.

8. Submissions to the NPS UD discussion document close on Thursday, 10 October 2019.

9. Auckland Council will make a submission that will be signed off by delegated councillors (GB/2019/75).

10. Local board feedback is due by Monday, 16 September 2019 to be considered within the Auckland Council submission. However, local board feedback provided after this date will be appended to the final council submission.

11. For additional information, an ‘at a glance’ summary of the discussion document on a proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development is attached to this report (Attachment A).

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) provide feedback on the proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development to be appended to the final Auckland Council submission.
### Ngā tāpirihanga
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<tbody>
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<td>Planning for successful cities summary - An ‘at a glance’ summary of the discussion document on a proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ngā kaihaina

**Signatories**
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</thead>
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<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning for successful cities

summary

An ‘at a glance’ summary of the discussion document on a proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development

MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

New Zealand Government
Everyone in New Zealand deserves healthy, secure and affordable homes that provide access to jobs, education, amenities and services.

As New Zealand moves to a more sustainable, productive and inclusive economy, cities will play an increasingly important role in the well-being of our communities. Our cities need to be able to adapt and respond to the diverse and changing needs of all people, whānau, communities and future generations, and function within environmental limits. When performing well our cities can raise living standards for all.

The Government is looking at ways to make our cities perform better by making room for growth, investing in transport to drive more efficient and liveable urban forms, and ensuring active travel that provides health benefits is a more attractive and accessible choice.

The Government’s Urban Growth Agenda takes a new approach to planning, based on the idea of making room for growth. The aim is to remove unnecessary restrictions on development, to allow for growth ‘up’ and out in locations that have good access to existing services and infrastructure. This will require change in how land use is regulated in our towns and cities.

### A new National Policy Statement on Urban Development

As part of the Urban Growth Agenda, the Government is consulting on a proposal for a new National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD).

The NPS-UD will provide clear direction to local government about how to enable opportunities for development in New Zealand’s urban areas in a way that delivers quality urban environments for people now and in the future.

The NPS-UD will replace the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016. It will work alongside other government initiatives that will see central government working more closely with major cities to respond to growth pressures.

### Wider national direction

The proposed National Policy Statement has been developed alongside several other government priorities for national direction. In light of this, the Ministry for the Environment and the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development have worked closely with other agencies to ensure all the national direction tools, both existing and proposed, are aligned. This is particularly important for the current proposal as the Government is consulting on for highly productive land and for freshwater.

### Essential Freshwater

This work programme proposes amendments to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014, as well as new National Environmental Standards for Freshwater Management. The objectives of the work programme include:

- stopping further degradation and loss of freshwater resources
- reversing past damage
- addressing water allocation issues

### National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land

The Government is proposing a new National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land to improve the way highly productive land is managed under the Resource Management Act 1991, to:

- recognise the full range of values and benefits associated with its use for primary production
- maintain its availability for primary production for future generations
- protect it from inappropriate subdivision, use and development

### Our cities, your say

We’ve heard from a range of organisations and individuals on their ideas for improving urban development activity in New Zealand. We now invite you to share your views.

The discussion document and information about the consultation process, including how to make a submission and attend a workshop around the country, can be found at [www.mfe.govt.nz/consultations/nps-urbandevelopment](http://www.mfe.govt.nz/consultations/nps-urbandevelopment).

We want to hear from interested organisations and individuals by 5pm on 10 October 2019.

- Submissions can also be emailed to npsurbandevelopment@mfe.govt.nz.
- Or posted to: Ministry for the Environment, PO Box 10362, Wellington 6143.

You can also share your views and have questions answered at workshops being held around the country. If you have any questions or need more information, email npsurbandevelopment@mfe.govt.nz.
How the parts of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development fit together

Future development strategy
Councils carry out long-term planning for how to accommodate growth and ensure quality urban environments

Making room for growth
Council plans make room for growth, both "up" and "out" in a way that meets the changing needs of people, whānau, communities, and future generations

Planning decisions promote quality urban environments
Urban environments provide for diverse and changing amenity values

Planning rules do not unnecessarily constrain growth
Plans do not regulate car parking
Plans provide for expected levels of development

Plans enable development opportunities
Plans promote intensification where benefits have the most impact
Plans allow for greenfield development provided that it promotes quality environments

Evidence for good decision-making
Evidence about housing and development markets inform planning decisions

Engagement in planning
Planning aligns and coordinates across urban areas
Concerns of iwi and hapū are taken into account in urban planning
## Summary of proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>What it would mean for our cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future development strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires councils to carry out long-term planning about how their cities will grow in the future</td>
<td>Growth is coordinated and is responsive to demand, and regional and district plans protect areas unsuitable for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making room for growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describes the kinds of features that make a quality urban environment</td>
<td>Cities provide a range of housing types, with good access to transport, services and amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifies what is meant by amenity in urban environments</td>
<td>Councils consider the types of amenity that benefit the whole community, not just individual property owners, when making decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires councils to provide enough opportunities to meet demand for development</td>
<td>More land is identified and zoned for housing across a range of types and prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires councils to describe the type of development they expect and ensure their plans allow for expected levels of development</td>
<td>People have a good understanding of what their community is intended to look like in the future and planning rules align with that vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires councils to enable more dense housing development in certain areas</td>
<td>More compact, multi-unit dwellings are built close to public transport, services and amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows consideration of urban development where land has not yet been released or not identified for urban development</td>
<td>Greenfield development can be considered when it doesn’t align with planned growth, provided costs (economic, social, cultural and environmental) can be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits the ability of councils to regulate the number of car parks required for a development</td>
<td>Reduction in unnecessary carparks so the space can be used more efficiently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General proposals to require, preclude the use of, or replace particular rules in district plans</td>
<td>Planning rules don’t get in the way of good development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence for good decision-making</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New requirements for councils to gather evidence about the housing market to inform their planning decisions</td>
<td>Planning decisions are informed by good information about housing and business demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engaging in urban planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides opportunities for iwi and hapū to identify aspirations and issues of concern, and ensures these are considered</td>
<td>The way our cities grow better reflects the aspirations of iwi and hapū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages councils to work together on implementing the NPS-UD and on engaging with iwi/hapū and infrastructure providers</td>
<td>When councils talk to iwi/hapū and infrastructure providers about urban development, they do it in a streamlined and efficient way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairperson's Report
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Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide the Chairperson, Harry Doig, with an opportunity to update board members on the activities he has been involved with since the last meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. It is anticipated that the Chairperson will speak to the report at the meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
a) receive Chair Harry Doig's report for September 2019.
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<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</table>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
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</table>
Report Name: Chair's report
Report covering the period 01 August to 04 September 2019

Auckland Council workshops, meetings and briefings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 August</td>
<td>Board Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 August</td>
<td>Meet with Albert-Eden-Puketapapa ward candidate Mark Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 August</td>
<td>Attend WaterCare Central Interceptor information event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 August</td>
<td>Accompany UK Shadow First secretary of State on tour of Walmsley/Underwood reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 August</td>
<td>Chair/PA catch up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 August</td>
<td>Meet with Pastor Paul Allen-Baines regarding Christmas event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 August</td>
<td>Attend Pursuit Church Bricks and Business event (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 August</td>
<td>Chair/Deputy Chair catch up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 August</td>
<td>Chair/Deputy Chair meeting with advisors and relationship manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 August</td>
<td>Board Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 August</td>
<td>Memorial Trees and Plaque - Walmsley Reserve (6 month Christchurch Event Commemoration) with Deputy Chair Fairey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 August</td>
<td>Attend India Independence Day event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 August</td>
<td>Local Board Chairs’ Forum Agenda Run Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 August</td>
<td>Chair Local Board Chairs - Chairs only session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 August</td>
<td>Chair Local Board Chairs’ Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 August</td>
<td>Chair/Deputy Chair catch up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 August</td>
<td>Catch-up with member Kumar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 August</td>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Heritage cluster meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 August</td>
<td>Chair/Deputy Chair meeting with advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 August</td>
<td>Draft minutes meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 August</td>
<td>Meeting with Fletchers re Three Kings Reserve remediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 August</td>
<td>Meeting with NZ Muslim Association President - Ikhlaoq Kashkari and Vice President Br. Mohammad Fazal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 August</td>
<td>Monthly Comms meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 August</td>
<td>Memorial planting discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 August</td>
<td>Board Business Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 August</td>
<td>Discussion about memorial planting at Walmsley Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 August</td>
<td>Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 August</td>
<td>Chair/PA catch up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 August</td>
<td>Attend Margaret Griffen park Concept Plan HYS event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 August</td>
<td>Chair/Deputy Chair catch up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 August</td>
<td>Members cluster meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 August</td>
<td>Chair/Deputy Chair meeting with advisors and relationship manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 August</td>
<td>Board Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 August</td>
<td>Board Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 August</td>
<td>Catch-up with Cr Casey and AE LB chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 August</td>
<td>Catch-up with PLB advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 August</td>
<td>Attend workshop on Local Board input into review of existing work practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 August</td>
<td>Chair/PA catch up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 August</td>
<td>Met with Wesley CC manager and Global Lighthouse re upcoming events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
03 September  Hui about Mt Roskill village streetscapes pre-start blessing
03 September  Catch-up with UDG community liaison
03 September  Meet with member Holm re feedback on Bio-diversity strategy
04 September  Chair / Deputy Chair catch up
04 September  Chair/ Deputy Chair meeting with advisors and relationship manager

Other meetings, events
20 August  With Deputy Chair Fairey meet with DIA officials scoping possible VIP visit to Puketapapa
30 August  Meet with Global Lighthouse and Wesley CC manager re DIA visit
01 September  Attend Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-day Saints - Stake Conference
04 September  Meet with DIA official re VIP visit
04 September  Meet with Manager of Wesley CC and Global Lighthouse re visit

Other Issues/challenges
Nil

Disclosures
Nil

Recommendation/s
a) That the report be received.

Signatories
| Author | H Doig |
Board Member Reports

File No.: CP2019/16078

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the local board members on the activities they have been involved with since the last meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. It is anticipated that Board members will speak to their reports at the meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
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  a) receive the member reports for September 2019.
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Anne-Marie Coury’s monthly report
Report covering the period 1st to 31st August 2019

Auckland Council workshops, meetings and briefings

Date
1st August attended Board workshop
7th August attended Community Forum
8th August attended Board Workshop
14th August attended Infrastructure Cluster meeting
15th August attended Board Business Meeting
16th August attended Wesley Market dropping in to discuss local issues
21st August Chaired Members Cluster meeting
22nd August attended Board workshop
23rd August dropped into Wesley Market to link with local women
28th August attended Green Cluster meeting
29th August attended Board workshop meeting

Other meetings
13th August Informal phone call from Liston residents to discuss the report coming to the Board Business meeting about the future of the village.
21st August dropped into Fruen Centre to meet with Somali Women
24th August participated in the Roskill Climate Restart ride through the Walmsley Park and Underwood Park along the Te Auaunga – Oakley Creek. Attended the Climate Change hui following the ride, involving ten Puketapapa groups, who were participating at the event on the panels, on stalls and had pride in their focus on low carbon initiatives, and education on the issues.
31st August attended election education meeting of Somali Development Group at the Fickling Centre, with MP Michael Wood.
Other issues/challenges

Concerns about the absence of seniors’ voices collated into feedback on a range of matters Council is deliberating on. These relate to the Governing Body decisions rather than the Local Board itself.

Looking at plans for traffic calming in Frost Rd, Dormwall Rd and Carr Rd, there appears to be no “slowing down” raised crossing near the Brittain Rd intersection, and traffic coming down from Mt Albert Rd is often gathering speed. Frost Rd carries more traffic than Dormwall, so it appears strange there is not a slowing down raised zone in this street considering the cycleway crosses this road. This matter will be reported back through David Holm to the AT representative.

Traffic safety concerns are being raised by locals in and around the corner of Margaret Griffin Road, Hillsborough and Donavan Roads. Heavy traffic flows, two lanes approaching Donavan St, traffic crossing over from Margaret Griffin often workers at the Ryman site, and these will be passed on via David Holm to the AT representative.

Planning is underway for the International Day of the Older Person celebration of ageing well. This will be a walk for seniors, in Walmsley Park, with invited community leaders, starting at Wesley Community Centre around 10 am on 1st October. Bikes, trikes and teenagers and pre-school children will be encouraged as this event will have an inter-generational flavour.

Disclosures

My on-going focus when I am advocating on behalf of seniors in community forums reflects the evidence and best practice examples for seniors’ wellbeing, endorsing the current proposed “Better Later Life Strategy”. I make sure to clarify I am not representing the Board in any community or public arenas.

Being associated closely with the Access Alliance, I currently work on strategy and policy matters with the Steering Committee for the up-coming International Conference in March 2020.

In continuing to support the programmes of the Auckland Women’s Centre, I am active in furthering the work of preventing family violence and supporting women moving through the Family Court system.

This year I am renewing my membership of the Auckland Art Gallery, enjoying attending a number of exhibitions.

In supporting Migrant Action Trust, I volunteer with mentoring as and when needed at the Puketapapa Community Driving School.
I make weekly radio programme on social issues related to seniors 50 plus at Planet FM 104.6 FM which are broadcast Sundays at 5.25 pm to provide interviews and information on what’s happening for seniors.

Recommendation/s

a. That the report be received.
b. That the report on the Local Government Conference be received.

Signatories

| Author     | Anne-Marie Coury |
Report on Local Government NZ Conference 2019

By Local Board Member Anne-Marie Coury

The Conference was held in Wellington on the waterfront, in the flagship placemaking location, where opportunities to enjoy harbourside walks daily were a part of the conference experience.

The theme of the Conference “Riding the localism wave: Putting communities in charge”, was aiming to refocus the Local Government sector towards community led development. After the concentration of energy put on infrastructure issues, especially water in recent years, it was a welcome change to have disruptors as lead speakers, challenging top down approaches to taking action.

At a time when recovery from disasters and social cohesion issues surrounding refugees and migrants needs and risks are emerging issues, and homelessness is still the major concern in most urban environments, community-led action has become central to best practice in ways of with engaging our communities.

Dame Tariana Turia at the start was blunt, stating “Things must change.” The mood of the Conference was accurately reflected in her statement right on day one. It seemed that the ground swell of opinion was we faced huge issues with climate change, the housing crisis and the growing diversity of our population, and business as usual would not solve these issues.

The “disrupters” that stood out for me were those who had high profiles and were media savvy, but honest and refreshing ones, rather than show ponies. From Lance O’Sullivan’s model of health care funded through a just in time, support worker trained to make assessments of conditions using IT support, to a District Council’s communications advisor, explaining the ins and outs of engaging with communities, this conference tackled the social issues of the day, the things some would put into the too hard basket and say “it’s not council business”.

On day two, in the afternoon we had choices about what projects to visit, and I went for Housing developments, getting to hear from the CEO of Housing NZ and visit the outside of a new complex on Hopper Street and another on Arlington Street. Wellington Council arranged a lease back with HNZ, on these apartment blocks, making the loan funding arrangements practical. The designs were pleasing aesthetically, with courtyards and even some public art. Past behavioural issues that kept Police visiting the previous complex on those sites, were addressed by security
swipe card arrangements specific to each small group of apartments, within the complex, reducing and isolating incidents and problems. It was clearly a flagship success model, quite a cut above recent developments in Auckland. But still more intensity of development on each site compared with what had been there previously.

Unfortunately, we didn’t get to learn about others experiences in what they visited, only perhaps from those we ate meals with.

There were no breakout sessions only the morning and afternoon teas, during which many of us went to stands to discover what resources were being given away.

It was exciting to see the new toilets in our Walmsley Park shown on the front of a key booklet by one firm. Within the Housing sector, booklets by the National Science Challenge on a kaumatua housing project, and on urban Maori design were collected, while discussing with others what was innovative in the housing sector in their communities. The new direction within the Justice Ministry, the Haapaitia Te Orange Tangata programme, “Safe and Effective Justice”, was presented on one stand and they were interested in coming to Wesley, given the rich diversity of our communities in Roskill.

At the awards dinner, Councillor Penny Hulse was honoured and a large group of Auckland delegates rose to waiata following Glen Wilcox’s tribute in Te Reo, showcasing our city’s embracing of Maori protocol. Following her twenty-seven years of service, Penny has been a key player in Local Govt NZ and is widely respected by colleagues up and down the country, so it was timely and appropriate to see her dedicated leadership valued.

It was the enthusiastic and earnest speaking of the youth presenters on Climate Change, e.g. Sophie Handforth from the Kapiti Coast, planning to seek election to the District Council, and leading the Climate Change march, who delivered both an energetic and extremely well-argued position on what we need to be doing.

Colin McNeil, as provocateur on leadership was the final presenter, illustrating how he when about engaging with staff, and things he would not recommend, all with fantastic wit and dramatic highlights. His web page will be well visited for sure.

Dave Cull as president of Local Govt NZ presided over this conference and was determined that “localism” become the face of Local Government. The survey Local Government NZ has out open till December 2019 for feedback, asks the question should NZ shift more funding resources and decision making away from Parliament.

The paper presents a chart that compares NZ to other OECD countries. It illustrates how our centralisation of funding and decision making is an extreme level, with 90% of all tax spending being decided upon by our Parliament, while we increasing face the impact of our world leading negative stats on housing issues, prison population,
teenage suicides etc, with inadequate funding and support to meet the expectations put on us by Government.

Those countries that devolve 40 – 60% of their funding and decision making to the local level, like Germany, Holland, Denmark, Japan, provide integrated health and wellbeing support services in with Local Govt that meets local needs.

Overall, Local Government NZ, has as it’s goal to drive development towards a vibrant and prosperous NZ. It’s championing of Councils’ role in preparing for Climate Change both reducing emissions and resilience is both strategic and practical.

In appreciation of the opportunity the Conference presented, I have collated resources to share with colleagues as opportunities arise.

Recommendation/s

a. That the report be received.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Anne-Marie Coursy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Auckland Council workshops, meetings and briefings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Aug</td>
<td>Catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Aug</td>
<td>Regular advisor catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Aug</td>
<td>Attended regular local board workshop with Chair, Member Holm, and Members Kaushal from 9.45am, Coury from 10am, Kumar from 10.34am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Aug</td>
<td>Meeting with officers and Chair regards Walmsley memorial trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Aug</td>
<td>Attended Chairs Forum, with Chair, as observer from 12.15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Aug</td>
<td>Brief catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Aug</td>
<td>Attended Infrastructure and Heritage Cluster with Member Holm (facilitating first part), Members Kaushal, Doig, Kumar and Member Coury from 1.09pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Aug</td>
<td>Catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Aug</td>
<td>Regular advisor catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Aug</td>
<td>Attended extra workshop session with Chair, Members Holm and Kaushal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Aug</td>
<td>Monthly business meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Aug</td>
<td>Meeting with officers and DIA with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Aug</td>
<td>Attended public consultation session on the draft Margaret Griffen Park concept plan, from 6.40pm, also attended by Chair, Members Coury, Holm and Kumar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Aug</td>
<td>Regular catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Aug</td>
<td>Attended Members' Cluster facilitated by Member Coury, with Chair and Member Holm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Aug</td>
<td>Regular advisor catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Aug</td>
<td>Attended regular local board workshop with Chair, Member Holm, Members Kumar from 9.36am, Coury from 9.38am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Aug</td>
<td>Facilitated monthly Green Cluster meeting with Chair, Members Coury, Holm, Kaushal and Kumar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Aug</td>
<td>Regular advisor catch-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Aug</td>
<td>Attended regular local board workshop with Chair, Member Holm, Members Kaushal and Coury from 9.37am, Member Kumar from 9.45am. I chaired from 12.30pm to 2pm while the Chair skyped in to another meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Sep</td>
<td>Regular catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Sep</td>
<td>Regular advisor catch-up with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Sep</td>
<td>Meeting with Chair and DIA, including site visit to Wesley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Sep  
Attended regular local board workshop with Chair, Member Holm, Member Coury from 9.36am, Member Kumar from 9.41am

Other meetings, events

7 Aug  
Attended Keith Hay Park Users Group from 10.10am, with Member Kumar

12 Aug  
Meeting with PhD researcher regarding local boards

24 Aug  
Attended Friends of Wairaki Stream planting event at Lynfield Reserve
24 Aug  
Attended Roskill Climate Restart hui with Members Holm and Coury, Michael Wood MP, Minister James Shaw.

2 Sept  
Attended Wallace Art Awards 2019 at Pah Homestead, with Chair Coom, Deputy Chair Fryer, Chair Handley, and Michael Wood MP, amongst many others.

Other issues/challenges

Over the reporting period I have worked on issues in response to constituent queries or my own observations in regard to the following list of areas. This has usually involved seeking and supplying information, a request for service, and/or forwarding to relevant Board members/officers for their action/information. Often these are conversations on social media (Facebook and Twitter, sometimes Neighbourly).

- Illegal dumping
- Local resource consent applications and alcohol licences monitoring
- Keith Hay Park sports fields, clubroom development, parking enforcement
- Noton Rd and Richardson Rd carpark projects (part of Keith Hay Park)
- Arthur Faulkner Reserve concept plan implementation for central courts
- Fearn and Harold Long Park park upgrade – current project and future possibilities, including liaison with Mt Roskill Rugby Club and Winstone Park Tennis Club.
- Faded parking lines, particularly mobility parks at Denny Ave’s carpark for Mt Roskill War Memorial Park, outside small block of shops on Hillsborough Rd
- Mowing and overgrowth issues in Ernie Pinches area, on Housing NZ property
- Mt Roskill Village upgrade works
- Dog off-leash areas signage
- Te Auaunga Project – including outstanding issues around signage, slippery boardwalks
- Playground upgrade queries for Waikowhai Park and Keith Hay Park south
- 68 bus timetable changes and 68- associated roadworks on Carlton St
- The Avenue bus stop changes and issues with visibility and bus driver behaviour
- Freedom camping bylaw changes
- Sandringham Rd Extn pedestrian crossing maintenance
- Repeated flooding at Molley Green Place
- Graffiti on public assets
- Benches at The Avenue Reserve
- Lynfield College accessway on Kimberhall Ave
- Contractors (including for council and CCOs) parking on footpaths
- Privet in local park
- Broken yellow lines request for Kihimia St
- Noise issue at West Park
- Lighting at the local board office
• Hillsborough Cemetery maintenance and planting
• Possible illegal tree pruning along coast
• Progress on private retail/apartment development in Roskill South
• Orange leaching substance at Wattle Bay
• Playground gate at Wesley Community Centre
• Broken street signs
• Staples and bollards for walkway connections
• Possum trapping
• Retail activities in area not zoned for it
• Park signage
• Auckland Transport’s Vision Zero strategy

Thank you to our PA Liaison and other officers and elected members, including AT, for their assistance with these and other matters

Disclosures
I am an individual member of the Auckland branch of the National Council of Women. During the reporting period I attended the regular branch meeting on 12th August, and participated in the first day of their national conference as their procedural advisor, on 31st August. I paid for my own travel costs and conference attendance fees. www.ncwnz.org.nz

I am a trustee, and board secretary, for The Aunties, a charity established to expand and make sustainable work done to meet the needs of families dealing with domestic violence. During the reporting period I attended most of a monthly trust board meeting on 26th August. www.aunties.co.nz

I am also a trustee on the HE Fairey Family Trust, which gives grants to people with disabilities through CCS/Disability Action, and am now one of the two “active” trustees from this August 2019, which means myself and another family member assess the applications against the criteria and decide if they meet them.

Recommendation/s

a) That the report be received.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Julie Fairey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Board Member Report – David Holm
1 August to 20 September 2019

Board Workshops and Meetings

1 August  Announced Multi Board Workshop on Te Auaunga with representatives of Albert-Eden and Whau Local Boards.
8 August  Attended Board Workshop.
15 August  Attended Board Special Workshop on Memorial Planting.
15 August  Attended Board Business Meeting.
20 August  Have Your Say event on Margaret Griffen Park Concept Plan.
22 August  Attended Board Workshop including Integrated Area Plan with Albert-Eden Board members.
29 August  Attended Board Workshop.
5 September  Attended Board Workshop.
12 September  Scheduled to attend final Board Workshop of term.
19 September  Scheduled to attend final Board Business Meeting.

Transport Meetings and Issues

14 August  Infrastructure and Heritage Cluster Meeting.
12 September  Scheduled to attend Council Regulatory Committee to present on Footpath Safety.
13 September  Scheduled to attend Quarterly meeting with police.
19 September  Scheduled to attend Infrastructure and Heritage Cluster Meeting.

Constituent concerns have included visibility and parking on Stamford Park and John Davis Roads, crashes around the Sandringham Road entrance to Wesley Intermediate School and a collision between a mobility scooter and car near the Griffen Park Road/Commodore Drive/Hillsborough Road intersection.

Environmental Meetings and Issues

3 August  Manukau Harbour Forum Symposium.
12 August  Manukau Harbour Forum Agenda Run Through.
16 August  Manukau Harbour Forum Workshop and Business Meeting.
28 August  Green Cluster.
30 August  Manukau Harbour Forum special end of term meeting.
2 September  Aircraft Noise Community Consulting Group meeting.
3 September  Met Chair Doig to prepare Board contribution to Council submission on Government’s Biodiversity Strategy Discussion document.
10 September  Scheduled to attend Council Environment and Community Committee to report on Manukau Harbour Forum Governance Review.
20 September  Scheduled to attend Watercare Community Liaison Group.
Board Member Report – David Holm

1 August to 20 September 2019

Other Meetings/Functions

21 August  Members cluster working group

Other organisations

13 August  Roskill Together Board meeting.
10 September  Scheduled to attend Roskill Together Board meeting

Declaration of interest, I am Treasurer of Roskill Together.

Recommendation
That the Puketapapa Local Board:-
receive the report from Member Holm.
Report Name: Board Member Ella Kumar report
Report covering the period 1st August 2019 to 5th September 2019

Auckland Council Workshops, meetings and briefings

1st August
- Current and upcoming regional /central govt feedback
- Weekly 5
- Quarter 4 Work Programme Update
- Community Facilities Update
  - Smart Procurement Update
  - Sports Park Update
  - Project delivery programme, Fearon Park
  - Operational Maintenance Update
- Accountability for 2015/2016
- Strategic Partnership Grants
- Joint Workshop with Whau and Albert Eden Board

8th August
- Mural @ Molley Green
- HNZ development
- 2019 Local area plan monitoring progress report
- Agenda Run Through
- Quick Response Grant Multiboard
- Local Board Engagement

15th August
Puketapapa Business Meeting

19th August
Citizenship Ceremony

22nd August
- Developing of integrated Area Plan for part of Albert Eden and Puketapapa Local Board Areas
- Puketapapa Local Board area in response to the development of a Spatial Delivery Strategy by the Urban Development Group formerly HLC for part of Mt Roskill
- Watercare Update
- Taste of Puketapapa

29th August
- Strategic Relationship Grant Accountability Update 18/19 final report
- ACE events
- Currant Upcoming Regional/Central govt feedback
- Out and About Programme
- Park Sports Recreation Work Programme Project
- Mt Roskill War Memorial Park, concept plan and open space services provision
- Planning re storytelling

5th September
- Youth Connections allocations options
- Local Board Engagement
- Community Leasing
- Project Delivery Work programme Update Operational Maintenance Update
- ACE events movies in the park
- Freeland Reserve Update
- Weekly 5
- Healthy Puketapapa Action Plan

Other meetings
KHPUG meeting

20th August
Concept Plan Margaret Griffin YMCA

Disclosures:
Contractor for YMCA as an aerobics instructor to deliver fitness classes. (Cameron Pools Leisure Centre and Lynfield Leisure and Recreation Centre is situated in PLB area who own the buildings)

Roskill Together Committee Member.

I volunteered for many years before being on the local board and will continue with community as requested in my personal capacity in various ways like events, support, fitness or as required at many organisations where the board may have funded or will fund in the future and will declare these situations as they arise and applications come to the local board and when local board engages and funds groups.

Recommendations
a) That the report be received.

Signatories

| Author | Ella Kumar |
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To present the Puketāpapa Local Board with its updated governance forward work programme calendar (the calendar).

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. The calendar for the Puketāpapa Local Board is in Attachment A. The calendar is updated monthly, reported to business meetings and distributed to council staff.

3. The calendar was introduced in 2016 as part of Auckland Council’s quality advice programme and aims 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 Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) receive the governance forward work programme calendar for September 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Programme Calendar, September</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

Author: Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketapapa

Authoriser: Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager
## Business Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 December 2018</td>
<td>RMA First Quarter Report 2018-2019</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takanini, Sand Lagoon Budget Allocation</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>Confirm budget allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 December 2018</td>
<td>Annual Plan 2019/2020 Local Consultation Context</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports Facilities Investment Plan</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATEDO six monthly report 1 July – 31 December 2018</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 April 2019</td>
<td>Local Board Agreement – Advocacy and Finance</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMA Second Quarter Performance Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 May 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 June 2019 Local Board Agreement – adoption</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council Policy on Dogs and Dog Management Below</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Puketapapa Youth Board Update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Check in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 June 2019</td>
<td>Local Government Regulatory Systems Amendment Act (changes to standing orders)</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt Local Board Work Programme P210</td>
<td>Local decision-making</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AT Community Safety Fund</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Puketapapa Youth Board Update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Check in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 July 2019</td>
<td>Skate Under Report</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt Griff Rodent Recovery Strategy</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lase - Lyndfield Tennis Club</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Relationships Grant FY19/20</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 August 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Monthly Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healthy Puketapapa Action Plan</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poultry Health and Safetyplan</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of Auckland Film protocols</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Local Initiative</td>
<td>Local decision-making</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 September 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Board Update</td>
<td>Accountability to the public</td>
<td>Informal dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Business Meeting Reports (deliberations for election period)</td>
<td>Local decision-making</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Management Bylaw</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATEDO six monthly report 1 January to 30 June 2019</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vegetables Strategy</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pukekohe Beach and Recreational Centre (FFG)</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Te-Rangimarie Park/Te-Papatahi Park/Te-Tihi Park/Te-Huru Puna Park/Te-Te-Tauru Park</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Climate Change Action Plan</td>
<td>Local decision-making</td>
<td>Informal discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex New York City Māori Meeting Angae Consultation material</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Confirm priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 September 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Board Update</td>
<td>Accountability to the public</td>
<td>Informal dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Business Meeting Reports (deliberations for election period)</td>
<td>Local decision-making</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Management Bylaw</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATEDO six monthly report 1 January to 30 June 2019</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vegetables Strategy</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pukekohe Beach and Recreational Centre (FFG)</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Climate Change Action Plan</td>
<td>Local decision-making</td>
<td>Informal discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex New York City Māori Meeting Angae Consultation material</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Confirm priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 September 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Board Update</td>
<td>Accountability to the public</td>
<td>Informal discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Business Meeting Reports (deliberations for election period)</td>
<td>Local decision-making</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Management Bylaw</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATEDO six monthly report 1 January to 30 June 2019</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vegetables Strategy</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pukekohe Beach and Recreational Centre (FFG)</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Climate Change Action Plan</td>
<td>Local decision-making</td>
<td>Informal discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex New York City Māori Meeting Angae Consultation material</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Confirm priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 September 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Board Update</td>
<td>Accountability to the public</td>
<td>Informal discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Business Meeting Reports (deliberations for election period)</td>
<td>Local decision-making</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Management Bylaw</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATEDO six monthly report 1 January to 30 June 2019</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vegetables Strategy</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pukekohe Beach and Recreational Centre (FFG)</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Climate Change Action Plan</td>
<td>Local decision-making</td>
<td>Informal discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex New York City Māori Meeting Angae Consultation material</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Confirm priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 September 2019</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Report</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Board Update</td>
<td>Accountability to the public</td>
<td>Informal discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Business Meeting Reports (deliberations for election period)</td>
<td>Local decision-making</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Management Bylaw</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATEDO six monthly report 1 January to 30 June 2019</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Review update progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vegetables Strategy</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pukekohe Beach and Recreational Centre (FFG)</td>
<td>Local initiative/preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Formal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Climate Change Action Plan</td>
<td>Local decision-making</td>
<td>Informal discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex New York City Māori Meeting Angae Consultation material</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Confirm priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Record of Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Notes

File No.: CP2019/16081
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Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
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Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketapapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Thursday, 08 August 2019 commencing at 9.30 am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Harry Doig
Members: Anne-Marie Coury arrived at 10 am
Julie Fairey
David Holm
Shail Kaushal arrived at 9.44 am
Elia Kumar arrived at 10.34 am

Apologies:

Also present: Victoria Villaraza, Mary Hay via SKYPE, Ben Moimo and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Member Kumar declared an interest for Item 4 Quick Response, Local Grant and Multiboard Grant Applications for: Roskill Chinese Group QR2015-105 and for YMCA North LG2015-112, Bhartiya Samaj Charitable Trust LG 2015-114, Walkowhai Community Trust LG2015-117, 5Trnz Communications Ltd MB1920-145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item: 1.0 Mural at Molley Green Reserve adjacent to the HNZ development at 39-45 Morrie Laing Avenue, Mt Roskill

Wendy Zapart
Senior Parks Planner
Parks Sports and Recreation

- Local initiatives/specific decisions

The officer presented on the mural at Molley Green Reserve. The local board was asked for their preference in the placement of the mural.

Item 2: 2019 Local and area plan monitoring progress update Monitoring and report Rebecca Greaves
Lead Planner
Plans & Places Planning - Central/South

- Oversight and monitoring

The officer presented on this item giving the board an overview on what had been noted previously. The local board provided feedback.

Next steps an annual workshop to be scheduled in 2020.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 3: Agenda Run Through</th>
<th>The local board reviewed the business meeting agenda for the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting for the 15 August 2019 and noted questions for officers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harry Doig (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4: Quick Response, Local Grant and Multiboard Grant Application</td>
<td>The local board reviewed the local grant applications. Next steps a report to the Puketāpapa Local Board business meeting for 15 August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Kuruvilla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mounita Dutta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Grants Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5: Local Board Engagement Plan Workshop 1</td>
<td>The officer presented on the draft Engagement Plan the local board provided their feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilia Brighouse-Fuavao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6: Weekly 5</td>
<td>The local board was updated on events in their calendar over the next fortnight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delwyn Burke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board PA/Liaison -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7: Memorial for six month tragedy in Christchurch</td>
<td>Board discussion. Next steps a further workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 2.54 pm.
**Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record**

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketapapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Thursday, 22 August 2019 commencing at 9.30 am.

**PRESENT**
- Chairperson: Harry Doig
- Members: Anne-Marie Coury arrived 9.38 am
  - Julie Fairey
  - David Holm
  - Shail Kaushal
  - Elia Kumar arrived 9.35 am

**Apologies:**
- Ben Moimoi, Mary Hay via SKYPE, Victoria Villaraza, and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>No declarations of interest recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1.0: Memorial Planting Event discussion Genieve Abrahams Event Organiser (Civic) Arts Community and Events, E:vents</td>
<td></td>
<td>The board was updated on the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2.0 Developing an Integrated Area Plan for part of the Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa Local Board area in response to the development of a Spatial Delivery Strategy by the Urban Development Group (formerly HLC) for part of Mt Roskill</td>
<td></td>
<td>The officers presented to the Puketāpapa and Albert Eden Local Boards on the draft area plan. Both boards provided feedback to officers. Next steps: A report to respective business meetings at the first opportunity in the new term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Also present:** Ben Moimoi, Mary Hay via SKYPE, Victoria Villaraza, and Selina Powell.
**Item 3: Watercare**

**Brent Evans**  
Manager Local Board  
Stakeholder Liaison  
Watercare

**Luke Woodhams**  
Project Engineer Shafts and Microtunnels - Abergeldie Joint Venture (Contractor for the CI project)

**Lesley Hopkins**  
Key Relationship manager Ghella - Abergeldie Joint Venture (Contractor for the CI project)

**Observers:**  
**Netty Richards**  
Parks & Places Specialist  
Parks Sports and Recreation

**Sunny Karan**  
Activation Advisor  
Parks Sports and Recreation

- **Oversight and monitoring**  
The officer introduced the team and updated the board on the Central Interceptor Project. The board provided feedback. Next steps further workshops to update the local board.

**Item 4: Weekly Five**

- **Oversight and monitoring**  
The board was updated on events in their calendar over the next fortnight.

**Item 5: Taste of Puketāpapa**

**Shriya Bhagwat-Chitale**  
Specialist Local Comm Communications

**Leanne Roche**  
Event Development Manager  
Arts Community and Events

- **Local initiatives/specific decisions**  
The officer gave an overview of the project to date. The board provided their feedback.

The workshop concluded at 2.48 pm.
Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketapapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Thursday, 29 August 2019 commencing at 9.30 am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Harry Doig
Members: Anne-Marie Coury arrived at 9.36 am
Julie Fairey
David Holm
Shail Kaushal arrived at 9.36 am
Elia Kumar arrived at 9.43 am

Apologies:
Also present: Victoria Villaraza, Mary Hay via SKYPE, Ben Moimoi and Delwyn Burke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Member Holm declared an interest for Roskill Together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1: Strategic relationship grant accountability update (18/19 final report)</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The officers provided the local board with an accountability update on projects delivered in 18/19. The board members asked questions of officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylyn Braganza Advisor Arts Community and Events Community Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita De Senna Strategic Broker Arts Community and Events Community Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2: Sherry Bekhet Event Facilitator Arts Community and Events</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The officers introduced the team to the board noting that there was now a change in the team looking after the local board area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Radosits Event Organiser Arts Community and Events</td>
<td></td>
<td>The team spoke to the board on events in the Puketāpapa Local Board area since they last met they also spoke on the up and coming Christmas Event. The board provided feedback to the team on this event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominique Crawford Event Facilitator Arts Community and Events Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Banks Team Leader Event Facilitation (Nith/WSI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 3: Current and upcoming
- **Regional/central government feedback**
- **Bio diversity strategy for Aotearoa NZ**
- **Proposed priority products and priority stewards scheme guidelines**

- **Input into regional decision making**
  - The officer provided the board with the feedback received and provided a timeline of when local board feedback would need to be submitted. The officer and board drafted their feedback.

### Item 4: Out and About Programme
- **Peter Caccioppoli**
  - Activation Team Leader
  - Parks Sports and Recreation
  - Active Recreation
- **Sunny Karan**
  - PSR Portfolio Manager
  - Parks Sports and Recreation

- **Setting direction/priorities/budget**
  - The officers presented on the draft activation programme to be delivered January – March 2020. The local board provided feedback.

### Item 5: PSR Work programme project details: Mt Roskill War Memorial Park Concept Plan and Open Space Service Provision Planning re Storytelling
- **Netty Richards**
  - Parks & Places Specialist
  - Parks Sports and Recreation
  - Park Services
- **Sunny Karan**
  - PSR Portfolio Manager
  - Parks Sports and Recreation
  - Rodney Klaassen
- **Rod Klaassen**
  - Stakeholder Advisor Community Facilities
- **Katrina Morgan**
  - Work Programme Lead Community Facilities Investigation & Design
- **Jody Morley**
  - Manager Project Delivery Community Facilities
  - Project Delivery

- **Local initiatives/specific decisions**
  - The officers presented and the local board provided feedback.
  - Next steps further workshops in December.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Louise Lakier</th>
<th>Oversight and monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renewals Coordinator</td>
<td>The members of HLC updated the local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>Next steps a further workshop to keep the local board updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation &amp; Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joby Barham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Programmes Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Programme Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christian Hurzelew</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precinct Director, Mt Roskill (HLC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alina Wimmer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Programme Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council COO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nick FitzHerbert</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Management Unit, Auckland Council COO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dom Sam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand (HLC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karla Beazley (HLC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kirsty Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Relationships and Placemaking Manager, Homes Land and Community (HLC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Todd Fraser (Piritali)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Development Manager, Roskill South</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anna Halliwell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Management Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Advisory Auckland Council I&amp;ES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 3.09 pm.
Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketapapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Thursday, 05 September 2019 commencing at 9.30 am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Harry Doig
Members: Anne-Marie Coury
          Julie Fairey
          David Holm
          Shail Kaushal
          Elia Kumar

Apologies:
Also present: Victoria Villaraza, Mary Hay, Ben Moimoi and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>No declarations recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 1: Youth Connection Allocation Options</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhaya Haran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Advisor - Youth Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Prosperity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Moredo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Advisor, Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Community and Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting direction/priorities/budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The officer reported to the local board on options for the work programme delivery for the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 2: Local Board Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liitia Brighouse Fuava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Engagement Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting direction/priorities/budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The officer started the conversation with the local board on engagement for the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 3: Community Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Klaassen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder &amp; Land Advisory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer introduced the team to the board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community Leasing

- **Three Kings United Football Club**
  - Michelle Knudsen
  - Community Lease Specialist:

### Project delivery work

#### Programme update

- **Phil Goulter**
  - Contingent Project Manager
  - Community Facilities
  - Project Delivery

- **Jody Morley**
  - Manager Project Delivery
  - Community Facilities
  - Project Delivery

- **Katrina Morgan**
  - Work Programme Lead
  - Community Facilities
  - Project Delivery

#### Oversight and monitoring

- The officers reported on the following:
  - Waikowhai Walkway (trail network)
  - Waikowhai Board walk
  - Margaret Griffin Reserve and Hillsborough Cemetery consultation
  - Avenue Reserve Park Benches

Members raised questions with officers on the following:

- Merton Road
- Keith Hay Park
- Children’s Playgrounds
- Arthur Faulkner
- Walmsley and Underwood Park
- Three Kings Toilet
- Keith Hay Park Playground

- **Local initiatives/specific decisions**

The officer spoke on the need to now rescind a resolution from 2012 that provided the Three Kings United Football Club to develop new clubrooms on Keith Hay Park. This was done through an agreement to lease.

The resolution resolved for officers to negotiate an agreement to lease and delegate final approval of that agreement to two board members of that time (Michael Wood and Ella Kumar) however only Ella Kumar is a member on the current local board.

The Puketapapa Local Board will need to make a new decision on the final approval of the lease.

Next steps a report to go to the Puketapapa Local Board Business Meeting in September 2019.
### Operational Maintenance
**Justin Cash**  
Operational Management and Maintenance

- **Oversight and monitoring**

  The officer gave the board an update on the following:
  - Waikowhai Park Playground
  - Wesley Playground
  - West Reserve

### Item 4: ACE Events – Movies in Park
**Kaiya Irvine**  
Senior Event Organiser  
Arts Community and Events

- **Local initiatives/specific decisions**

  The officer gave the board an update on this event.

  Next steps a further workshop to update the board.

### Item 5: Freeland Reserve – Update from Project Manager
**Nick FitzHerbert**  
Senior Event Organiser  
Arts Community and Events

**Bruce Kerr**  
Senior Healthy Waters Specialist  
Healthy Waters

- **Local initiatives/specific decisions**

  The officers updated the board on the project to date. The board provided feedback.

### Item 6: Weekly 5
**Dolwyn Burke**  
PA/Liaison

- **Local initiatives/specific decisions**

  The board was updated on events in the calendar for the next fortnight.

### Item 6: Healthy Puketāpapa
**Alisa Wilson**  
Project Manager  
Arts Community and Events  
Community Empowerment

**Ronelle Baker**  
Practice Manager - Operations  
Arts Community and Events  
Community Empowerment

- **Local initiatives/specific decisions**

  The officers spoke about the Healthy Puketāpapa Action Plan and asked the local board to consider the implementation of priorities.

The workshop concluded at 2.20 pm.
Valedictory Speech and Reflections

File No.: CP2019/16649

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide Puketāpapa Local Board members the opportunity to make a brief (5 minute) end of term or valedictory address.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This is an opportunity for Puketāpapa Local board members to make a brief end of term or valedictory address prior to the 2019 Local Government elections.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) receive the end of term address from local board members.

b) receive the valedictory speech from member David Holm and wish him all the best for his future endeavours and thank him for his hard work and contribution to the 2013-2016 and 2016-2019 terms of the Board.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketapapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Victoria Villaraza - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Attachment A
Item 8.1
LIFE EDUCATION

For over 30 years Life Education has been teaching health and nutrition in schools throughout New Zealand.

Every year over 250,000 children from 1,450 schools are involved in the Life Education programme. Through lessons in our mobile classrooms children learn about healthy eating, being a good friend, good and bad substances and how their body works.

We support and offer schools an integrated programme utilising a shared planning approach to ensure we are meeting children’s learning needs.
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85% of children and families each year
By 2025 we will engage directly with

Our goal

Purpose

For a healthy mind and body
To embrace positive choices
to educate and inspire generations

Vision

Enabling children to reach their full potential
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LIFE EDUCATION'S GRADUATE PROFILE

During the primary school years students will learn to be...

- Proud of their identity and confident in who they are.
- Empowered to make healthy, informed choices.
- Connected and engaged with the world.
- Curious and have inquiring minds.
- Respectful of themselves, others and the environment.
OUR INTEGRATED APPROACH

Through a shared planning approach with schools we support children in each school community. 96% of teachers report they would recommend us to other schools in their area.

1. Schools book us 12 months in advance to visit.
2. Educators liaise with teachers by discussing potential topics across our five learning strands and big questions.
3. Lessons are planned by our educators to meet individual needs and classroom resources.
4. Teachers attend two to three lessons in mobile classrooms.
5. We review our practice and resources to reflect and changing needs.
6. Students provide feedback on how we meet their needs.
7. Students continue working with the curriculum through classroom activities.
8. Teachers access the curriculum through our resources and integrate our materials into their lessons.
Life Education's evidence-based resources and registered specialist Educators offer tailor-made interactive learning experiences to complement your school's inquiry focus.
Today children and adolescents face a lot of challenges...

**Obesity**
- "One in nine children (ages 2 to 14 years) are obese and a further 21% of children are overweight, 15% of Maori and 30% of Pacific children are obese."
- "The effects of being overweight for a child include low self-esteem, bullying, eating disorders, chronic ill health and even suicide."

**Substance Use**
- "Approximately 11% of New Zealand high school students use substances at levels that are likely to cause them significant harm and may cause long-term problems. Students with very high substance use (including binge drinking) have more challenging family and school lives than others."

**Mental Health and Well-being**
- "New Zealand has the worst teen suicide rate in the developed world...the number of adolescents reporting two or more psychological symptoms (feeling low, feeling irritable, feeling nervous, and having sleeping difficulties) is increasing."
- "Six out of ten girls are so concerned with the way they look they participate in less daily life – from going swimming and playing sports, to visiting the doctor, going to school or even offering their opinions."

**Bullying**
- "Rates of school bullying in New Zealand are among the worst worldwide. About one in three Year 4 students report being bullied at least once a week or more frequent basis. 34% of New Zealand teachers believe that bullying occurs in their school and 69% believe it begins very early in a child’s life (between pre-school and Year 4)."
- "Nearly one in ten students have been asked if they would hurt or bother them in the past year."

---

**Life Education teach...**

**Food and Nutrition**
- Children learn how food gives them energy, how it helps them grow, and how their body digests it. They explore the variety of nutrient-rich foods needed every day, what a balanced diet looks like and how to read packaging. Lessons may include Science and Human Biology.

**Human Biology**
- Children learn about body systems and how they work to carry food, water and oxygen around their body. Children explore their brain and the nervous system as the control centre for their body. They learn that stress affects people in a variety of ways.

**Substances**
- We focus on the effects of alcohol and other drugs, both legal and illegal. Children learn how to identify the difference between helpful and harmful drugs, how drugs can change the way the mind and body works, and the impact drugs can have on people’s lives. Children explore the power of advertising, peer pressure and social influences. We want to empower children to make informed decisions as they enter their teenage years.

**Relationships and Communities**
- This strand focuses on connecting and relating to others. Lessons look at friendships and relationships as well as the need to show respect and consideration for others. Children learn about leadership and teamwork, coping with change, pressure and conflict, and digital citizenship. Bullying and online safety are often subjects schools request our expertise and support with.

**Identity and Resilience**
- Confidence in their own identity and where and how they fit in are challenges that come with growing up. Children learn about feelings and emotions, and that they are special and unique and it is okay to be different. Value is placed on the idea that each individual’s personality makes them unique and it shapes how they make decisions and respond to situations.

---

Life Education Trust shapes their programme around these challenges, working to give students the skills and knowledge needed to make well-informed decisions now and in the future. The programme is made up of five strands, they all interweave, because health and well-being is rarely isolated in a single topic.

Learn more and get contact details for your local Trust at www.lifeeducation.org.nz.

---
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What we know

- NZ has one of the worst youth suicide rates in the OECD
- NZ has one of the highest child obesity rates in the world
- 30% of children 13 and under have tried alcohol
### Puketapapa Tamariki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of children 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal Oak Intermediate</td>
<td>399/400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Therese</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Cecilia</td>
<td>187/159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Roskill Primary</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Roskill Intermediate</td>
<td>591/610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay Park</td>
<td>184/190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikowhai</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,745 students Year 1-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“This was the best anti bullying message I have ever seen targeted at 6-year olds. We talked about filling a person's bucket with positive comments. My kids really got the idea. It was hands on and it led my teaching for several weeks afterwards and still helps me discuss lunchtime incidents with my children.”

Feedback from primary school principal, Counties Manukau Region