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---
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1 Welcome

2 Apologies

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

3 Declaration of Interest

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

The Auckland Council Code of Conduct for Elected Members (the code) requires elected members to fully acquaint themselves with, and strictly adhere to, the provisions of Auckland Council’s Conflicts of Interest Policy. The policy covers two classes of conflict of interest:

i. a **financial conflict of interest**, which is one where a decision or act of the local board could reasonably give rise to an expectation of financial gain or loss to an elected member

2. a **non-financial conflict interest**, which does not have a direct personal financial component. It may arise, for example, from a personal relationship, or involvement with a non-profit organisation, or from conduct that indicates prejudice or predetermination.

The Office of the Auditor General has produced guidelines to help elected members understand the requirements of the Local Authority (Member’s Interest) Act 1968. The guidelines discuss both types of conflicts in more detail, and provide elected members with practical examples and advice around when they may (or may not) have a conflict of interest.

Copies of both the Auckland Council Code of Conduct for Elected Members and the Office of the Auditor General guidelines are available for inspection by members upon request. Any questions relating to the code or the guidelines may be directed to the Relationship Manager in the first instance.

4 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Thursday, 15 August 2019, as 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 Upper Harbour 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 North Shore Rowing Club update

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To provide members with an update on the North Shore Rowing Club’s ongoing facility strategy.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. Mike Stanley, representing the North Shore Rowing Club (NSRC), will be in attendance to outline the club’s plans to meet the growing demand for rowing opportunities on the North Shore. Some of the challenges they face are:

- the NSRC serves North-West Auckland, approximately 20 per cent of Auckland’s population, including nine secondary schools
- NSRC’s facilities service the following age groups:
  - Lake Pupuke – beginners, school-aged, masters
  - Rame Road – competitive, senior club, senior school
  - Hobsonville – NSRC affiliate Westlake Boys High School (WBHS), Rowing NZ Auckland Regional Performance Centre (RNZ ARPC)
- facilities at Lake Pupuke and Rame Road are at capacity, limiting the club’s ability to meet the growing demand for rowing opportunities from all ages
- efforts to establish a permanent Hobsonville Marine Centre are ongoing (accommodate NSRC affiliate WBHS and RNZ ARPC and provide community rowing opportunities among a mix of marine sports and recreation from the centre)
- NSRC has plans to renovate the Rame Road boathouse which is on a site leased from council
- NSRC has been working with the Greenhithe Residents Association to promote the purchase of the adjacent Salthouse, should it come up for sale.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) receive the deputation from Mike Stanley, representing the North Shore Rowing Club, and thank him for his attendance and presentation.

Attachments

A North Shore Rowing Club facilities infographic and pathway....................... 189
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.”
Minutes of the Upper Harbour Local Board meeting held
Thursday, 15 August 2019

File No.: CP2019/15216

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. The open unconfirmed minutes of the Upper Harbour Local Board ordinary meeting held on Thursday, 15 August 2019, are attached at item 11 of the agenda for the information of the board only.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) note that the open unconfirmed minutes of the Upper Harbour Local Board meeting held on Thursday, 15 August 2019, are attached at item 11 of the agenda for the information of the board only and will be confirmed under item 4 of the agenda.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories
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<th>Authoriser</th>
</tr>
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Upper Harbour Local Board
OPEN MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of the Upper Harbour Local Board held in the Upper Harbour Local Board Office, 30 Kell Drive, Albany on Thursday, 15 August 2019 at 9.35am

PRESENT

Chairperson
Margaret Miles, QSM, JP
Uzra Casuri Balouch, JP
Nicholas Mayne
John McLean
Brian Neeson, JP

Members

ABSENT

Deputy Chairperson
Lisa Whyte
1 Welcome
The Chairperson opened the meeting and welcomed those present.

2 Apologies
Resolution number UH/2019/80
MOVED by Chairperson M Miles, seconded by Member U Casuri Balouch:
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:
    a) accept the apology from Deputy Chairperson L Whyte for absence.
    
CARRIED

3 Declaration of Interest
There were no declarations of interest.

4 Confirmation of Minutes
Resolution number UH/2019/91
MOVED by Member B Neeson, seconded by Member N Mayne:
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:
    a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Thursday, 18 July 2019, as true and correct.
    
CARRIED

5 Leave of Absence
There were no leaves of absence.

6 Acknowledgements
There were no acknowledgements.

7 Petitions
There were no petitions.

8 Deputations
There were no deputations.

9 Public Forum
There was no public forum.

10 Extraordinary Business
There was no extraordinary business.
11 Minutes of the Upper Harbour Local Board meeting held Thursday, 18 July 2019
Note: the open unconfirmed minutes of the Upper Harbour Local Board meeting held on Thursday, 18 July 2019, are attached at item 11 of the agenda for the information of the board only and were confirmed under item 4 of the agenda.

12 Allocation of the Upper Harbour Local Board Community Safety Fund

The Elected Member Relationship Manager, Auckland Transport, was in attendance to support the item.

Resolution number UH/2019/92

MOVED by Chairperson M Miles, seconded by Member J McLean:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) approve the Community Safety Fund allocation of $658,428 to the Gills Road footpath extension, noting that completion of the project is subject to Auckland Transport finding the balance of funds.

b) approve the allocation of the Community Safety Fund of $658,428 to the following three projects, should Auckland Transport be unsuccessful in sourcing the balance of funds required to complete the Gills Road footpath extension as detailed in a) above, with any balance to be transferred back into the Community Safety Fund pool for use on other safety projects in the region:

i) pedestrian crossing on Brigham Creek Road, Whenuapai village - $260,000

ii) safety improvements to Lonely Track Road, Albany - $80,000

iii) raised pedestrian crossing on Schnapper Rock Road - $260,000.

c) approve the remaining balance of $39,000 from the Upper Harbour Local Board Transport Capital Fund to the Gills Road footpath extension project.

d) request that the Gills Road footpath extension project be undertaken with urgency once funding for the project has been secured.

e) request that Auckland Transport notify the local board immediately following its decision on the Gills Road footpath extension, and request speaking rights at the Auckland Transport Board meeting when its funding of this project is considered.

CARRIED

13 Auckland Transport monthly report - August 2019

The Elected Member Relationship Manager, Auckland Transport, was in attendance to support the item.

Resolution number UH/2019/93

MOVED by Member N Mayne, seconded by Member U Casuri Baioch:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) receive the monthly update report from Auckland Transport for August 2019.

CARRIED
### Upper Harbour Local Grants round one 2019/2020 grant applications

The Community Grants Advisor was in attendance to support the item.

*Member B Neeson left the meeting at 10.51am.*

*Member B Neeson returned to the meeting at 10.53am.*

Resolution number UH/2019/94

MOVED by Chairperson M Miles, seconded by Member U Casuri Balouch:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application in the 2019/2020 Upper Harbour Local Grants round one, listed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Amount allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LG2017-101</td>
<td>Literacy Aotearoa Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the programme delivery of four family literacy groups in the Upper Harbour Local Board area</td>
<td>$4500</td>
<td>$2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2017-104</td>
<td>Paremoremo Ratepayers and Residents Association Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the land rates on community’s gifted land for the 2019/2020 financial year</td>
<td>$1035</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2017-108</td>
<td>Hobsonville Hall Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards insurance cover for the Hobsonville Hall from December 2019 to December 2020</td>
<td>$3000</td>
<td>$3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2017-113</td>
<td>Business North Harbour Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards ‘Meet your Neighbours’ events, including coffee van hire, food and marketing, between 04/09/2019 and 31/03/2020</td>
<td>$5000</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2017-114</td>
<td>The StarJam Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards operational costs for ‘Albany Jazzy Jamming’ workshops between 02/09/2019 to 28/02/2020</td>
<td>$2815</td>
<td>$2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment A</td>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LG2017-117  | Greenhithe Community Trust | Community | Towards the facilitator fees, materials and refreshments for the Greenhithe Community Men's Projects Group | $5000 | $4000 |
| LG2017-118  | Youthline Auckland Charitable Trust | Community | Towards the purchase of new laptops for two youth workers at the Youth and Community Development Centre in Albany | $2485 | $1000 |
| LG2017-120  | Kaipātiki Project Incorporated | Community | Towards hireage of desk spaces for the Kaipātiki Project staff at a co-working space in Hobsonville over eight months | $4800 | $0 Not a high priority at this time |
| LG2017-123  | Kids Safe with Dogs Charitable Trust | Community | Towards administration, instructors' wages and printing costs for October 2019 to July 2020 | $4887 | $0 Not a high priority at this time |
| LG2017-110  | Philip and Sarah Elworthy | Environment | Towards the pruning of a pecan nut tree | $4370 | $2000 |
| LG2017-121  | Sustainable Paremroemo Group | Environment | Towards the wasp eradication project | $5000 | $3000 |
| LG2017-112  | Meadowood House Incorporated | Events | Towards a Christmas event at Meadowood on 6 December 2019 | $2000 | $1500 |
| LG2017-105  | Special Olympics Greenhithe | Sport and recreation | Towards basketball court hire and equipment between 01/01/2020 and 31/12/2020 | $3134.25 | $3000 |
| LG2017-106  | Greenhithe Tennis Club | Sport and recreation | Towards the purchase of tennis balls and a court drying machine | $5000 | $2000 |
| LG2017-107  | Albany Badminton Club Incorporated | Sport and recreation | Towards court hire at the Active Badminton Centre, Albany | $5000 | $4000 |
b) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application in the 2019/2020 Upper Harbour Multi-board Grants round one listed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Amount allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB1020-153</td>
<td>The Operating Theatre Trust trading as Tim Bray Theatre Company</td>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>Towards the 400 ‘Gift a Seat’ project, venue and ticketing costs for The PumpHouse Theatre, Māngere Arts Centre, Te Oro, Vodafone Events Centre and TAPAC, and the provision of return bus trips</td>
<td>$3103.55</td>
<td>Not a high priority at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-104</td>
<td>North Shore Centres of Mutual Aid Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards a proportion of operational costs, excluding wages, for eight centres on the North Shore</td>
<td>$5000</td>
<td>$2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1020-113</td>
<td>Pegasus Flying Trust Air Training Corps</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the installation of the electrical connection to</td>
<td>$2500</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Code</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount 1</th>
<th>Amount 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-116</td>
<td>Chinese New Settlers Services Trust Foundation</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards venue hire and teacher facilitation fees</td>
<td>$2943.20</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-134</td>
<td>The YES Disability Resource Centre Services Trust Board</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the costs to create a ‘Disability Youth Advisory Group’ for the North Shore, including catering, transport, coordination fees, two events and a training day</td>
<td>$3500</td>
<td>$1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-138</td>
<td>North Shore Women’s Centre</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards wages for a community resource worker and a social work position to support women with high and complex needs at the North Shore Women’s Centre</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-139</td>
<td>Epilepsy Association of New Zealand Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the educator salary, fuel costs and marketing for support services for people living with epilepsy</td>
<td>$2000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-141</td>
<td>Royal New Zealand Foundation of The Blind Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of digital talking books for the Blind Foundation library</td>
<td>$1600</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-170</td>
<td>Environmental Education for Resource Sustainability Trust</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of native plants from Te Whangai Trust and Gulf Trees</td>
<td>$4317.08</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment A

#### Item 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-151</td>
<td>New Zealand Nepal Society Incorporated: Events</td>
<td>$8007.50 – $0 Not a high priority at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-102</td>
<td>Badminton North Harbour Incorporated: Sport and recreation</td>
<td>$12,000 – $12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-169</td>
<td>Gymnastics Community Trust: Sport and recreation</td>
<td>$19,806.25 – $15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $67,577.58 – $37,500

**CARRIED**

Note: Chairperson M Miles declared an interest in application number LG2017-104 and did not participate in voting.

Note: The meeting adjourned at 11.26am and reconvened at 11.32am.

15 **Local Board feedback on the Productivity Commission inquiry into local government funding and financing**

The Relationship Manager, Local Board Services, was in attendance to support the item.

Resolution number UH/2019/95

MOVED by Chairperson M Miles, seconded by Member N Mayne:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:
16 Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

The Relationship Manager, Local Board Services, was in attendance to support the item.

Resolution number UH/2019/96

MOVED by Chairperson M Miles, seconded by Member U Casuri Balouch:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

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

b) support the recommended changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol and provide the following feedback:
   i) support option one (status quo) for film permit time-frames, as outlined in paragraph 31 of the agenda report
   ii) note that the use of local reserves for filming activities provides a good opportunity for local boards to promote their area.

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

CARRIED

17 Road name for unnamed public road at 260 Ōtehā Valley Road, Albany

Resolution number UH/2019/97

MOVED by Member B Neeson, seconded by Member J McLean:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) approve the road name Davies Drive for the short link road between Corban Avenue and Ōtehā Valley Road, as a continuation of the existing Davies Drive (as depicted in Attachment A to the agenda report).

CARRIED

18 Road name approval: New roads within subdivisions at 8A and 10 Scott Road, Hobsonville

Resolution number UH/2019/98

MOVED by Member J McLean, seconded by Member B Neeson:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) approve names for the following two new roads at 8A Scott Road, Hobsonville:
   - Road 1: Silverfern Avenue
   - Road 2 (commonly owned access lot): Huljich Way.

b) approve names for the following three new roads at 10 Scott Road, Hobsonville:
Item 11

19 Upper Harbour Local Board Annual Report 2018/2019

The Lead Financial Advisor was in attendance to support the item.

Resolution number UH/2019/99

MOVED by Chairperson M Miles, seconded by Member B Neeson:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) adopt the 2018/2019 Upper Harbour Local Board Annual Report as set out in the confidential Attachment A.

b) note that any proposed changes will be clearly communicated and agreed with the chairperson before the report is submitted for adoption by the Governing Body by 26 September 2019.

c) note that the draft 2018/2019 Upper Harbour Local Board Annual Report (refer to Attachment A to the agenda report) will remain confidential until after the Auckland Council group results for 2018/2019 are released to the New Zealand Stock Exchange which are expected to be made public by 30 September 2019.

CARRIED

20 Auckland Council’s Year End and Quarterly Performance Report: Upper Harbour Local Board for quarter four 2018/2019

The Senior Local Board Advisor and Lead Financial Advisor were in attendance to support the item.

Member B Neeson left the meeting at 11.55am.

Member B Neeson returned to the meeting at 11.56am.

Resolution number UH/2019/100

MOVED by Chairperson M Miles, seconded by Member U Casuri Balouch:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) receive the performance report for financial quarter four (1 April to 30 June 2019) and overall performance against the agreed 2018/2019 local board work programmes for the financial year ending 30 June 2019.

b) note the financial performance report in Attachment B of the report will remain confidential until after the Auckland Council Group results for 2018/2019 are released to the New Zealand’s Exchange which are expected to be made public on 30 September 2019.

c) thank local board staff and wider council staff for their assistance in ensuring that 90 per cent of projects have either been completed or are on track for completion as originally envisaged, in the financial year ending 30 June 2019.

CARRIED
21 Governance forward work calendar - September 2019 to August 2020
Resolution number UH/2019/101
MOVED by Member N Mayne, seconded by Member B Neeson:
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:
   a) receive the Upper Harbour Local Board governance forward work calendar for the period September 2019 to August 2020, as set out in Attachment A to this agenda report.
CARRIED

22 Record of the Upper Harbour Local Board workshops held on Thursday 11 and 25 July, and 1 August 2019
Resolution number UH/2019/102
MOVED by Member N Mayne, seconded by Member J McLean:
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:
   a) receive the record of the Upper Harbour Local Board workshops held on Thursday 11 and 25 July, and 1 August 2019 (refer to Attachments A, B and C to the agenda report).
CARRIED

23 Board members’ reports - August 2019
Resolution number UH/2019/103
MOVED by Chairperson M Miles, seconded by Member N Mayne:
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:
   a) receive the verbal board members’ reports.
CARRIED

24 Consideration of Extraordinary Items
There was no consideration of extraordinary items.

12.11pm The Chairperson thanked Members for their attendance and attention to business and declared the meeting closed.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD AT A MEETING OF THE UPPER HARBOUR LOCAL BOARD HELD ON

DATE: ............................................................

CHAIRPERSON: ................................................
Huntington Reserve: Approval of concept plan

File No.: CP2019/12945

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve the concept design for the Huntington Reserve playspace.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. As part of the local board’s 2019/2020 work programme, the Community Facilities department is currently developing a locally driven initiative (LDI) project for a playspace at the Huntington Reserve.

3. The concept design (refer Attachment A) has been developed for a neighbourhood playspace catering for junior and intermediate age groups. The concept design was presented to the local board at a workshop and feedback received has been incorporated into the design.

4. Consultation with local residents and mana whenua was undertaken, with the feedback received helping to inform the design.

5. Once the concept design is approved by the local board, the detailed design phase can begin with construction forecast to commence in 2020.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) approve the concept design for the new playspace at Huntington Reserve (as provided in Attachment A to the agenda report).

Horopaki
Context
6. Parks and Places Specialists from the Community Services team completed a strategic assessment during the financial year 2018/2019 on developing a playspace at Huntington Reserve in accordance with the 2018 Huntington Reserve Playspace Assessment (refer Attachment B).

7. The assessment of Huntington Reserve concluded that the reserve is suitable for a new playspace and as a result, LDI capital funding has been allocated to the design and development.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
8. The playspace assessment (refer Attachment B) identified the desired outcomes and service levels of creating a strong neighbourhood playspace that provides play opportunities for junior (5 years and under) and intermediate (5–10 years) age groups.

9. Community consultation was undertaken between 13 and 31 May 2019, with 500 letters being delivered to residents within an approximate five to eight-minute walking distance of Huntington Reserve. Posters were erected within the reserve informing users of the public
consultation and it was also advertised online via the Upper Harbour Local Board’s Facebook page and through Auckland Council’s ‘Have Your Say’ website.

10. Feedback was gathered on the following concept design:

![Concept Design Image]

11. A total of 41 submissions were received and the following is a summary of the feedback:

- most of the respondents are supportive of the play space (89 per cent)
- overall positive comments on the proposed playground concept
- most support the establishment of a footpath connection through the playspace/reserve
- a few comments were received on the suitability of the proposed spinner bowl for the younger age group
- requests were made for shade provision
- suggestions were made for different play equipment such as a flying fox, water play/splash pad, fitness equipment and a see-saw.

12. A shade sail allowance was included in the initial concept cost estimate but was omitted from the drawings prior to public consultation due to budget constraints. A shade sail can easily be added to the playspace at a later stage once further funding becomes available. Several trees are included in the concept design which will provide natural shade to some areas of the reserve.

13. The additional suggested equipment (a flying fox, water play/splash pad, fitness equipment and see-saw) is not appropriate for this park due to its location, spatial restrictions, high maintenance costs and the relative costs of additional play elements.

14. Some comments were received on the provision of additional seating, a drinking fountain and a toilet for the reserve. Seating areas are provided throughout the playspace, acting as informal balancing play elements, as well as seating for the users. In relation to a drinking fountain and toilet, this is a neighbourhood park and mainly serves the local catchment. Therefore, the demand and use of the space does not require a toilet and the addition of this facility is well beyond the current project budget. A drinking fountain could be considered in future years as an additional service level for the space.

15. Further comments were received on considering provision of youth facilities such as a half basketball court, scooter path and a cycle track. However, the location and the size of the neighbourhood park is not considered appropriate for these types of facilities, whereas
providing equipment for the early childhood to junior age range suits the location and size of the reserve.

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

16. Auckland Council’s Parks and Places and the Operational Management and Maintenance teams have been consulted with and are supportive of the proposed concept design (refer Attachment A).

17. Local residents will benefit from this playspace as there are no other facilities in the area, except for the playground at the Upper Harbour Primary School.

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

18. Improving the provision of play at Huntington Reserve has been identified as part of a programme to improve levels of service, responding to key outcomes in the 2017 Upper Harbour Local Board Plan. This project will help deliver the outcome ‘Healthy and Active Communities’.

19. Views of the local board were sought at a workshop on 28 March 2019, at which stage the local board requested removing the shade sail from the concept design.

20. The concept design was well supported from the feedback received from local residents.

21. The new playspace will provide a play facility for the local residents and improve the recreation opportunities in the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement**

22. The project was presented to the Parks and Recreation - North West Mana Whenua Engagement Forum on 2 September 2017. Local iwi, Ngati Manuhiri, were supportive of the concept design.

23. The new playspace will enable whānau and tamariki within the Greenhithe Māori community to have safer and easier access to passive recreation and education through play, as it will for families of all cultures in the area.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications**

24. The 2019/2020 and 2020/2021 Community Facilities work programme includes LDI capital budget of $393,649. The allocated funding covers all aspects of the proposed concept design, including detailed design plus delivery.

25. The cost estimate for the physical works based on the concept design is $360,000.

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

26. Should the local board not support the concept plan, this will subsequently delay and extend the timeframes to deliver the project as the scope will need to be redefined and further consultation with the community and mana whenua will need to be undertaken.

27. The cost estimate is concept level only; therefore, it includes contingency values as well as the potential for costs to change as more detailed designs are undertaken and following tendering for the physical works. Should the cost required for physical works come in significantly higher than the budget, the local board will be consulted to discuss a way forward to potentially remove elements of the design or alternatively, the local board may consider allocating additional funding to cover the budget shortfall.
28. Public expectation has been raised for a new playspace at Huntington Reserve. If the concept is not supported by the local board, expectations will need to be reset in the community.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

29. Once the concept design is approved by the local board, the project will be progressed through the detailed design, consents and procurement phases to enable construction to commence in 2020.

30. The estimated timeframes assume successful and timely completion of each identified project step. Unforeseen delays in procurement or contractor availability have the potential to delay completion of the project beyond the identified timeframes, which are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailed design</td>
<td>October 2019 to February 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procure physical works contractor</td>
<td>March/ April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical works</td>
<td>September to October 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. The timeframe for physical works is dependent on weather conditions during this period.

32. Neighbouring residents will also be informed of the local board’s decision, and the proposed timeframe for construction.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**
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<table>
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SITE DESCRIPTION

Huntington reserve is located in the centre of a newer residential development in Greenhithe, Auckland. Sitting at the intersection of Kyle Road and Huntington Park Drive, the reserve size is appropriate to serve the immediate neighbourhood.

As indicated on the context diagram, there is an opportunity to provide recreational facilities within the residential area in question. Currently the nearest recreational facilities are located in Waitoni park where there is one playground and sports fields for the Greenhithe football club. The fields make up the majority of the park. Even though there are 4 playgrounds located around the wider Greenhithe area, they are not easily accessible from the study area by foot, and even the vehicle network is somewhat disconnected due to the location of the Upper Harbour Motorway. The 4 existing playgrounds are also of a smaller scale which serve more of a direct neighbourhood function.

Upper Harbour Primary is located within this residential area, with 2 playgrounds, courts, fields, sandpit and bike track within the school vicinity. However the school has fences around its boundary and doesn’t seem like the playground and courts are open to free and easy public access.

Being in a central location within 5-10min walking distance to most of the surrounding residential properties and Upper Harbour Primary School, Huntington Reserve seems like the right location for a typical neighbourhood scale playspace that will be utilised by nearby residents and kids from Upper Harbour Primary. The site is strongly visible from the adjacent streets and neighbouring houses, has a good number of existing semi-mature trees (predominantly native) and a pond/wetland on one edge. An existing footpath link runs through the reserve from Lemon Grove Lane through to Kyle Road and on-street carparking is also available around the reserve.
HUNTINGTON RESERVE

KEY
- Potential playspace allocation (up to 500m²)
- Existing rain garden/wetland
- Existing footpath network
- Existing trees
- Proposed plant buffer to adjacent residential properties
- Proposed separation to road
- Proposed informal connection to playspace
- General water fall direction

OPPORTUNITIES
- 01. Easily accessible by residents due to central location within residential development (within a 5-10min walking distance)
- 02. Innovative measures to slow traffic/ prevent children from running across the street
- 03. Good visibility and overlook for positive CPTED outcomes
- 04. Existing trees for natural shade
- 05. Appropriate scale for the neighbourhood area
- 06. Possibility to make use of natural site contour for play opportunities
- 07. Possible secondary path connection from Huntington Drive to Lemon Grove Lane

CONSTRAINTS
- 01. Close to road/traffic, safety concern
- 02. The site has a reasonable contour about 1.5 gradient with highest point in the middle of the reserve
- 03. Adjacent wetland pond with deep water could cause safety issues
- 04. Close proximity to residential boundary. Need to provide sufficient setback and consideration of neighbouring properties

SITE ANALYSIS
Not to scale
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CONCLUSIONS
The study has completed a detailed review of the existing spatial network around Huntington reserve, the level of connectivity between surrounding residential areas and facilities and their relationships to each other. Through this Huntington Reserve was identified as appropriate for development of a playspace due to its location, scale and general site context. While only seen as a neighbourhood playspace, there is potential that the areas becomes a sub-destination along the future greenway route, this connecting a series of existing neighbourhood playspaces together.

A new playspace within Huntington reserve will create a central point of activation within the new residential area and is well connected by surrounding footpath networks. Some key existing constraints such as proximity to the street, neighbours and the wetland pond will need to be addressed in future design, but these are not seen to be factors that seriously limit the potential of the site. Other key factors that will need to be considered include existing slopes and grades, related drainage and overland flow and a cross connection from Huntington Drive through to Lemon Grove Lane. Positive factors such as the extent of existing trees and the strong CPTEP outcomes of the site aid in supporting the sites use for a playspace. It is considered that the existing contour of the site could be used to advantage in the types of equipment incorporated and ensuring the space is better drained by using the area high in contour.

As a small neighbourhood playground, the age range best served is more likely to be the toddler to 10 years age bracket. The land area and proximity to neighbours means that it is less well suited for larger more challenging equipment or groups of older children and teens. A range of play types should be enabled including both prescriptive and less defined and allowing opportunities for skills of strength, balance, agility, swinging, spinning, sliding and jumping.

For the development of Huntington reserve consultation will form an integral part of the future design development, this taking into account iwi and also wider community views and preferences. It is considered that while options for theming and concept direction have been noted, these would be refined with specific reference to the feedback gained in preliminary consultation and from consultation following concept review.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Drawing from the analysis within the previous pages, and the conclusions above we would recommend that the future design of the playspace should focus on:
- Creating a strong neighbourhood playspace that provides play opportunities for junior (5 & under) and intermediate (5-10 years) level
- Ensure a range of play equipment that challenges abilities and offers both prescriptive and less defined play opportunities. This may include providing play opportunity for a mix of imaginative play, multi-play units and some popular traditional play elements
- Making use of the existing stormwater wetland pond context of the site. The wetland theme could be expressed strongly throughout
- Possibility to use natural gradient on site for play elements
- The provision of some form of natural buffer/barrier to the road or measures to prevent children from running onto the street is needed
- Potential direct connection through the reserve from Huntington Drive, past the playspace and on to Lemon Grove Lane
- Make use of existing trees for natural shade and informal picnic areas
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To adopt the refreshed Upper Harbour Greenways Plan – September 2019 (refer Attachment A).

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The refresh of the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan was undertaken to update and identify opportunities to improve walking and cycling in the Upper Harbour Local Board area. The intent of the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan is to create pedestrian and cycle connections between communities and destinations, encouraging safe travel and a reduction in vehicle use for local trips.

3. The Upper Harbour Greenways Plan outlines a high-level vision for the development of connections through parks and on-road within the Upper Harbour Local Board area, and neighbouring local board areas, to assist the local board in decision-making.

4. Overall consultation on the refreshed Upper Harbour Greenways Plan included workshops with local board members, mana whenua, internal and external stakeholders, targeted engagement with specific interest groups, public drop-in sessions and wider online public engagement.

5. The final Upper Harbour Greenways Plan for adoption is attached (Attachment A).

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) adopt the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan – September 2019 as presented at Attachment A to the agenda report, which will assist the local board in decision-making to improve pedestrian and cycle connections throughout the local board area.

Horopaki

Context

6. The Upper Harbour Greenways Plan – September 2019 is a strategic document which shows connectivity within the Upper Harbour Local Board area and connectivity into neighbouring local board areas.

7. The document is a refresh of the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan developed in 2015 and is intended to fulfil some of the aspirational outcomes outlined in the 2017 Upper Harbour Local Board Plan. It also includes new opportunities presented by the development of the Northern Corridor Improvements project.

8. The refreshed greenways plan was based on the existing 2015 Upper Harbour Greenways Plan and was developed through the following process:

a) background research, including GIS mapping and researching neighbouring greenways plans
b) targeted consultation, meeting with mana whenua, workshops with key stakeholders and working group meetings

c) public engagement through two drop-in sessions at community events and online ‘Have Your Say’ surveys

d) Upper Harbour Local Board adoption of the greenways plan.

9. Phases a) to c) have been completed and the project team are now seeking local board adoption of the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan (refer Attachment A).

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

10. The original Upper Harbour Greenways Plan was published in 2015 in response to objectives and key initiatives proposed within the 2014 Upper Harbour Local Board Plan. In 2017, the Upper Harbour Local Board published its current local board plan. This further highlighted its intention to both provide efficient and effective transport links and to investigate and expand on some of the projects that had transpired since the adoption of the 2015 Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.

11. At the time of developing the refreshed greenways plan, the Northern Corridor Improvements project is underway which will improve the northern motorway and the Upper Harbour Highway. This project presents significant opportunities to improve walking and cycling connections. The focus area of the Northern Corridor Improvements project has been used to highlight these opportunities and enable the improvements to be incorporated into the wider network once works are completed.

12. The refreshed Upper Harbour greenways network is built on the existing and planned Upper Harbour walking and cycling network, with the purpose of delivering improved recreational opportunities and effective alternative transport/travel options.

13. In the greenways plan, the Upper Harbour Local Board area has been organised into six focus areas to clearly identify, evaluate and prioritise key routes and key connections for each area. The six focus areas are:
   - Albany, Albany village and Rosedale
   - Northern Corridor Improvements project
   - Lucas Heights and Pāremoremo
   - Greenhithe and Schnapper Rock
   - Whenuapai and Herald Island
   - Hobsonville and West Harbour.

14. Each focus area has its own character, community, needs, aspirations and a unique set of constraints, challenges and opportunities.

15. In order to help frame next steps and to prioritise specific projects and funding, key routes and connections have been identified for each focus area.

16. The key routes and connections for each focus area have not been prioritised. Prioritisation of connections located within parks and reserves will be undertaken as part of the 2019/2020 Community Facilities work programme adopted by the local board at the 20 June 2019 business meeting (resolution number UH/2019/70).

17. Prioritisation of routes and connections for further investigation will need to consider kauri dieback and be in line with accepted best practice.

18. Connections within the road corridor sit with Auckland Transport. The local board can discuss the prioritisation or further investigation of these connections with Auckland Transport.
19. As connections and associated projects are progressed through investigation and design, further opportunities will arise to undertake community consultation and shape community aspirations within the design phases.

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

20. Throughout the development and finalisation of the refreshed greenways plan, engagement with internal partners was undertaken, including Auckland Transport, to assist with drafting the plan. Council group impacts and views have been included in the final plan.

21. The Auckland Council Community Facilities Strategic Projects – Kauri Dieback team will be engaged where any proposed route or connection passes through a kauri ecosystem.

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

22. The refreshed greenways plan aligns to the 2017 Upper Harbour Local Board Plan outcome ‘Efficient and effective transport links; A well-connected and accessible network that provides a variety of transport options’. The key objective of this outcome is for safe footpaths and cycleways that enable people to reach key destinations in a timely manner.

23. The Upper Harbour Local Board approved the development of a refreshed greenways plan at its 21 June 2018 business meeting (resolution number UH/2018/66). Locally driven initiatives (LDI) funding was allocated to develop this plan as part of the 2018/2019 Parks Sport and Recreation (PSR) work programme.

24. During the project, the Upper Harbour Local Board has been consulted on the project methodology, key milestones and engagement approach.

25. The refreshed draft greenways plan was discussed on 23 May 2019 at an Upper Harbour Local Board workshop. Members supported the document’s vision for improving connections in their local board area. A further draft was circulated for comment in September 2019.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

26. On 5 June 2019, a draft of the refreshed greenways plan was presented at the Parks Sport and Recreation North-West Mana Whenua Forum. It was confirmed that the general feedback already provided on the Henderson-Massey Connections Plan should apply, where iwi representatives provided direction on using Te Aranga design principles as a framework to capture mana whenua values and aspirations for this project.

27. There was general interest in having the opportunity to be involved in specific projects as they progress into more detailed stages.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

28. The key routes and connections outlined within the plan identify a range of connections at a strategic level. These routes and connections can be delivered in any order, as and when funding and other opportunities arise through the local board, Auckland Council, Auckland Transport, community support and developer initiatives.

29. To initiate projects based on activities in the Community Parks and Places work programme, further LDI investment may be required. Staff will work with the local board to identify possible opportunities for funding as part of the proposed Community Facilities work programme.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

30. There is an inherent risk in investing in investigation and design to initiate a project when there is no capital funding identified to deliver the physical work components.

31. The investigation and design phase of the project delivery may identify issues that require the feasibility of routes to be reassessed.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

32. The refreshed greenways plan identifies desired outcomes for existing and new connections. Detail on the activities that will deliver on the agreed outcomes will require investigation, design and community engagement.

33. The adopted greenways plan will be used to prioritise connections as part of the 2019/2020 Community Facilities work programme adopted by the local board at the 20 June 2019 business meeting (resolution number UH/2019/70). Candidate projects can also be included in future Community Facilities work programmes to be progressed through investigation and design.

34. As each identified connection is progressed, further engagement will be undertaken with the local board, mana whenua, relevant key stakeholders, community groups and the local community.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
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Hooton Reserve car parking

File No.: CP2019/16295

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To agree an approach to address the parking issues at Hooton Reserve.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. Commuter and business parking within Hooton Reserve carpark is preventing recreational users of the recreation reserve from accessing park facilities.

3. This report outlines a potential response to address parking issues at Hooton Reserve. The purpose of this report is to agree on a preferred response to enable further detailed investigation by an independent traffic engineer. Auckland Transport has delegated responsibility for enforcement of council-owned off-street parking facilities.

4. A resolution report from an independent traffic engineer is a requirement of the Auckland Transport Traffic Control Committee before enforcement can be carried out by Auckland Transport, after the resolution report is approved by Auckland Transport Traffic Control Committee and appropriate signs/road markings are installed.

5. The Reserves Act 1977 provides for the administering body to set aside areas of reserve for parking and set charges for this carparking. When on a recreation reserve, this is permissible with the prior consent of the Minister for Conservation where it is provided for the convenience of the users of the recreation reserve, or alternatively, on a local purpose reserve where it is consistent with the classified purpose of the reserve. Therefore, commuter carparking and charges would be permissible on a local purpose (carparking) reserve, but not on a recreation reserve.

6. Several parking management approaches at Hooton Reserve have been identified as worthy of being tested on a trial basis for a period of one year, to facilitate evidence-based data collection to best inform long-term management options.

7. **Scenario one:** A strategy is investigated further with the intent to protect parking for recreational park users. This would include generating non-rates revenue and investigating a direct mechanism to enable revenue to be reinvested back into the reserve to fund maintenance, renewals and possible improvements. This strategy is a complementary approach, on a trial basis, of:
   - parking restrictions of two hours enforcement in the east carpark
   - paid parking in the west carpark, aligned with paid parking in the surrounding streets, from 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

8. **Scenario Two:** A strategy to protect parking for park users is investigated further with the intent to implement, on a trial basis:
   - two hours enforcement in the east carpark
   - no controlled parking in the west carpark.

9. **Scenario three:** A strategy to protect parking for park users is investigated further with the intent to reduce the peak average occupancy of the east carpark to 85 per cent, to be implemented on a trial basis.

10. **Scenario four:** Maintain the current approach.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) support the continued investigation into Scenario one, as the preferred response to addressing commuter parking issues at Hooton Reserve, on a trial basis, to enable evidence-based data collection to best inform long-term management options.

b) allocate $10,000 of locally driven initiative operational funding to facilitate the continued investigation into Scenario one by an independent traffic engineer.

Horopaki
Context

11. Hooton Reserve is an approximately 11ha suburb park in Albany, just north of Albany Lakes and Westfield Mall. The reserve runs on the northern edge of Ōtehā Valley Road, starting from the western edge of the Northern Motorway through to the Albany Tennis Park (Ōtehā Valley Reserve), and includes the newly built North Harbour BMX track. Approximately one third of the reserve consists of carparking.

12. There are two carparks to the west of the reserve; a relatively large, chip-sealed, non-marked, perimeter kerb and channelled carpark which is classified as a ‘local purpose (car parking) reserve’ (west carpark). Adjacent to this carpark is a second, well-formed, good quality sealed surface, line marked, kerb and channelled facility with 108 car parks which forms part of the classified ‘recreation reserve’ (east carpark). Both have flood-lighting and are accessed from Mills Lane.

13. Hooton Reserve is part of an extensive open space network in the Albany area, including connectivity with Ōtehā Valley Reserve, Gills Reserve and, via an underpass beneath the Albany bridge, The Landing and Kell Park.

14. The proposed Auckland Transport (AT) project to link Ōtehā Valley Road to Gills Road will result in a signalised crossing close to the current intersection between Ōtehā Valley Road and Mills Lane. The crossing will make it safer and easier for pedestrians to cross Ōtehā Valley Road and will increase the demand for parking at Hooton Reserve by making it more accessible to people visiting the shopping area, and the Albany Pool and Leisure Centre.

15. This AT project is subject to a notice of requirement (NoR) that is in place for the road extension of Appian Way, which will cut through the western end of the west carpark. The project is currently at local board landowner approval stage.

16. The carparking arrangements at Hooton Reserve sit within two parcels of land. Both parcels were vested on deposit in 1999 for recreation. They were not formally classified for the same purpose at that time. A classification report was submitted to the Upper Harbour Local Board on 16 May 2019, recommending reclassification of Lot 1 and classification of Lot 2 to better reflect the future use of the reserve.

17. The local board approved reclassification on 16 May 2019. Lot 1 was classified as ‘local purpose (car parking) reserve’ while Lot 2 was classified as ‘recreation reserve’.
18. The west carpark at lot 1 (parcel highlighted in yellow on the left in the image above) is currently partly occupied by the North Harbour BMX club and the remainder is used for carparking, while the east carpark located at lot 2 (parcel highlighted in yellow on the right in the image above) is mainly used for recreational purposes. The portion of Lot 1 occupied by the BMX Club is covered by a community lease and is excluded from the scope of this report.

19. Commuter and business parking within Hooton Reserve carpark is preventing legitimate users of the park from accessing park facilities. An occupancy survey at both the east and west carparks was undertaken over three days on Wednesday/Thursday May 1-2, and Tuesday 7 May 2019.

20. When the carpark occupancy survey was undertaken, the average peak occupancy for the east carpark was consistently over 90 per cent. This indicates that the carpark is effectively full during the peak times of the day with an average vehicle stay of over four hours.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

21. There is a need to investigate and implement a more equitable use of reserve carparks throughout the Auckland region. This is due to a number of factors, including Auckland’s growth, a year-on-year increase in the number of new registered vehicles, as well as current and future demand for carparking spaces at park and ride facilities close to public transport nodes. At Hooton Reserve, increased demand for commuter parking is now impacting on access to the reserve for legitimate users. In addition, AT have also introduced paid parking on the streets surrounding the Albany park and ride which has exacerbated the issue.

22. In 2015, Auckland Council delegated to AT all powers, duties and responsibilities for managing existing off-street parking places. Accordingly, given this delegation, there will need to be engagement with AT in order to agree responsibilities for the management of new or existing off-street parking facilities.
23. Auckland Transport considers an average peak occupancy of 85 per cent as the maximum rate where a carparking space can be found within an acceptable time from arriving in a carpark.

24. The following parking management approaches at Hooton Reserve have been identified.

25. **Scenario one**: A strategy is investigated further with the intent to protect parking for recreational park users in the east carpark and generate non-rates revenue in the west carpark. Test whether it is able to be directly reinvested back into the reserve to fund maintenance, renewals and possible improvements. This strategy is a complementary approach, on a trial basis, of:

- parking restrictions of two hours enforcement in the east carpark (recreation reserve)
- paid parking in the west carpark (local purpose car parking reserve) aligned with paid parking in the surrounding streets.

26. The advantages of Scenario one are:

- It represents the most cost-effective way to maximise the total number of carparking spaces for both reserve users and commuters.
- The Reserves Act 1977 would not permit an administering body to make provision for commuter parking on a recreation reserve. This would be wholly inconsistent with the values and purpose for which a recreation reserve is held. Scenario one will provide an appropriate mechanism to manage the reserve for the purpose it is held and respond to the current practice of commuters parking in the east carpark on Lot 2 (recreation reserve).
- Estimated (non-rates) annual revenue at Hooton Reserve (west carpark) is $140,000 (to be confirmed).
- On the above basis, the estimated revenue would be approximately $1 million per decade. Investigation is required to see if a mechanism is available to reinvest the revenue directly in the reserve.
- Cost of the required carpark renewal (estimated to be $350,000) to be covered at no cost to the Upper Harbour Local Board parks work programme in order to facilitate a trial of user pays parking.
- The paid parking and associated enforcement will provide a means to manage the high number of commercial vehicles, freedom campers and anti-social behaviour that is affecting the perceived safety and condition of the carpark.
- It is expected that, with a formalised and more efficient layout in the west carpark, the total number of useable parking spaces available to commuters will not be adversely impacted by the loss to commuters of the 119 parking spaces in the east carpark.
- Better management and the improved carpark layout will make the carpark safer and more attractive for users.

27. The disadvantages of Scenario one are:

- Paid parking is initially likely to be unpopular with sections of the community as there is an overall perception that parking in Albany is scarce, especially close to the park and ride.
- AT has recently implemented paid parking on many of the streets in Albany which has been unpopular.

28. Scenario one is based on the following assumptions:

- Pricing $1/hr – similar to the AT charging model for surrounding streets in Albany
- 10 hours metered per weekday (8am to 6pm) – advised by AT for the Auckland Domain model
• Weekday utilisation of 50 per cent
• 20 per cent revenue share with AT to procure, operate, maintain and enforce
• The details of the parking model need to be confirmed by an independent traffic engineer commissioned to report to the Auckland Transport Traffic Control Committee.

29. **Scenario two**: A strategy to protect parking for park users is investigated further with the intent to implement, on a trial basis:

- two hours enforcement in the east carpark (recreation reserve)
- no controlled parking in the west carpark (local purpose car parking reserve).

30. The advantages of Scenario two are:

- Parking by non-reserve users will be disincentivised resulting in better management of the parking spaces for the recreation reserve users in the east carpark.
- The Reserves Act 1977 would not permit an administering body to make provision for commuter parking on a recreation reserve. This would be wholly inconsistent with the values and purpose for which a recreation reserve is held. Scenario two will provide an appropriate mechanism to manage the reserve for the purpose it is held and respond to the current practice of commuters parking in the east carpark on Lot 2 (recreation reserve).
- Will provide a better managed and laid out commuter carpark that the community is seeking and is already using the west carpark for.

31. The disadvantages of Scenario two are:

- Lost opportunity for funding to potentially be re-invested into the reserve (estimated revenue of approximately $1 million per decade).
- There are currently limited options to enforce restrictions on commercial vehicles, freedom campers and anti-social behaviour. Management of the west carpark will remain challenging which will have a negative effect on the overall amenity and perceived safety of the reserve.
- The use of the park by heavy commercial vehicles will continue to quickly degrade the carpark surface. When renewal is required, the cost (estimated to be $350,000) will have to be met by the Upper Harbour Local Board renewals programme.
- The usable car parking spaces both for the reserve and for commuter use will not be maximised.

32. **Scenario three**: A strategy to protect parking for park users is investigated further with the intent to reduce the peak average occupancy of the east carpark to 85 per cent, implemented on a trial basis:

- a reduction in average peak occupancy could potentially be achieved by implementing two-hour parking restrictions on a portion of the east carpark.

33. The advantages of Scenario three are:

- Parking by non-reserve users will be disincentivised resulting in better management of the parking spaces for the recreation reserve users in the east carpark.

34. The disadvantages of Scenario three are:

- The Reserves Act 1977 would not permit an administering body to make provision for commuter parking on a recreation reserve. This would be wholly inconsistent with the values and purpose for which a recreation reserve is held. Scenario three will not provide an appropriate mechanism to manage the reserve for the purpose it is held and respond to the current practice of commuters parking in the east carpark on Lot 2 (recreation reserve).
• Lost opportunity for funding to potentially be reinvested into the reserve.
• The use of the park by heavy commercial vehicles will continue to quickly degrade the carpark surface. When renewal is required, the cost (estimated to be $350,000) will have to be met by the Upper Harbour Local Board renewals programme.
• There are currently limited options to enforce restrictions on commercial vehicles, freedom campers and anti-social behaviour. Management of the west carpark will remain challenging.
• The usable carparking spaces both for the reserve and for commuter use will not be maximised.

35. **Scenario four**: Maintain the current approach.

36. The advantages of Scenario four are:
• Allows for further analysis and deliberation.

37. The disadvantages of Scenario four are:
• Lost opportunity for funding to be reinvested into the reserve.
• There are currently limited options to enforce restrictions on commercial vehicles and activities, freedom campers and anti-social behaviour. Management of the west carpark will remain challenging.
• The usable carparking spaces both for the reserve and for commuter use will not be maximised.
• The Reserves Act 1977 would not permit an administering body to make provision for commuter parking on a recreation reserve. This would be wholly inconsistent with the values and purpose for which a recreation reserve is held. Scenario four will not provide an appropriate mechanism to manage the reserve for the purpose it is held and respond to the current practice of commuters parking in the east carpark on Lot 2 (recreation reserve).
• The use of the park by heavy commercial vehicles will continue to quickly degrade the carpark surface. When renewal is required the cost (estimated to be $350,000) will have to be met by the Upper Harbour Local Board renewals programme.

38. Staff propose that Scenario one be implemented on a trial basis, to be in place for a period of one year, to facilitate evidence-based data collection to best inform long-term management options.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

39. The Auckland Council Business Opportunity Advisory Panel endorsed progressing the charging for carparking at the west carpark at Hooton Reserve, Albany, as a pilot project subject to approval from the Upper Harbour Local Board and Auckland Transport’s Traffic Control Committee.

40. Other local boards have also initiated and funded investigation into enforcement, for example, Olympic Park in the Whau Local Board area.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

41. The Upper Harbour Local Board indicated at a workshop on 23 May 2019 that paid parking was unpopular with the community and did not support investigating paid parking at Hooton Reserve at that time.
42. Subsequently, the Chairperson of the Upper Harbour Local Board has requested a report which presents a range of options to manage the demand for carparking at Hooton Reserve.

43. A communication and engagement plan is being developed in conjunction with council’s specialist teams. This will be presented to the local board for feedback and endorsement in the event that the local board supports the recommended option (Scenario one). The key message is that revenue generated from a user pays scheme will be reinvested back into the specific park or associated infrastructure. This will either provide an enhanced level of maintenance for the park, fund renewal or upgrade of existing park facilities, or improve other associated amenities on site (e.g. parking, toilets, lighting, CCTV).

44. A user pays approach will improve traffic management and manage parking demand on Hooton Reserve for the benefit of the reserve users.

45. To enable the staff recommendation to continue investigation into Scenario one, the local board will need to allocate $10,000 of LDI operational funding to facilitate the continued investigation into Scenario one by an independent traffic engineer.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
46. To date, no engagement has been undertaken with iwi for this proposed initiative. However, if initiated, this programme will be presented to the Northwest Mana Whenua Forum. At this time, iwi will have the opportunity to express interest in the project and indicate how they would like to be involved.

47. Mana whenua engagement will be part of the communication and engagement plan.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
48. The paid parking operating model already occurs across the region, and this proposal would see AT install, own and manage/maintain the parking infrastructure (machines, signage) under a lease fee arrangement with Auckland Council. AT would also provide the enforcement role.

49. Parking revenue (80 per cent) would be returned to council and enforcement fees would be returned to AT (agreed in principle).

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
50. In order to allow for commuter parking, the relevant parcel of reserve land must be classified for a purpose consistent with that use.

51. Lot 1 (west carpark) has been reclassified to ‘local purpose car parking reserve’. This aligns to its current use.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
52. The current process to progress AT enforcement of off-street carparks held under the Reserves Act is:
   - Engage an independent traffic engineer to undertake a parking assessment to identify occupancy rates and issues at the carpark. This requires funding from the local board.
   - A report is produced by a traffic engineer and an associated design for the carpark developed for solutions and enforcement implications, for which funding is also required.
   - A formal report seeks local board approval for the plans.
• The local board as administering body, with the prior approval of the Minister for Conservation, would need to approve setting aside the relevant areas of the reserves for parking and approve the setting of charges.

• Further approval is sought from the AT Traffic Control Committee. Approval will also be sought for AT to patrol and enforce the parking. This process can take up to six months.

• This would be followed by line marking and signage in line with the carpark design, which would require local board funding for delivery.

53. Before this process can be initiated, the local board needs to endorse a general approach to inform the direction taken by the traffic engineer when considering options for carpark management.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories
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<th>Author</th>
<th>Jeff Lyford - Parks Advisor - Rodney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Mace Ward - General Manager Parks, Sports and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Perry - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo  
Purpose of the report  
1. To formally approve the name ‘Te Ara Manawa Hobsonville / Onekiritea Coastal Walkway’ for the coastal walkway at Hobsonville Point.

Whakarāpopototanga matua  
Executive summary  
2. The developer, Homes, Land and Community Limited (HLC), has requested Park Services seek a resolution from the Upper Harbour Local Board to formally name the new coastal walkway.
3. Mana whenua engagement is required under the Conservation Act 1987 and Reserves Act 1977. Local boards hold allocated decision-making authority for the naming of local community parks and facilities.
4. The Māori Language Policy was adopted by the Governing Body in 2016. The policy recognises council’s commitment to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi. This policy recognises that the Māori language is a cultural treasure and an official language of Aotearoa. It notes that the Māori language and culture forms a critical part of a Māori identity that is Auckland’s point of difference in the world. Reclaiming or identifying new Māori names for local community parks and features within the Upper Harbour Local Board area provides a significant opportunity to fulfil the policy intent.
5. HLC has worked with mana whenua on establishing an appropriate name for the walkway. Te Kawarau a Maki and Ngati Whatua have agreed that ‘Te Ara Manawa Hobsonville / Onekiritea Coastal Walkway’ reflects the cultural and historical character of the walkway.

Ngā tūtohunga  
Recommendation/s  
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) approve the name for the coastal walkway at Hobsonville Point as ‘Te Ara Manawa Hobsonville / Onekiritea Coastal Walkway’.

Horopaki  
Context  
6. Auckland Council is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Treaty of Waitangi) and its broader legal obligations to Māori. The council recognises these responsibilities are distinct from the Crown’s Treaty obligations and fall within an Auckland local government context.
7. These commitments are articulated in the council’s key strategic planning documents: the Auckland Plan, the 2018-2028 Long-term Plan, local board plans and the Unitary Plan.
8. In responding to council’s commitments and obligations to Māori in a way that will improve outcomes for all, Whiria Te Muka Tangata – the Māori Responsiveness Framework, has been developed. Its purpose is to enhance and guide Auckland Council’s responsiveness to Māori. The framework articulates that council will work to ensure its policies and its actions consider:
- recognition and protection of Māori rights and interests within Tāmaki Makaurau
- how to address and contribute to the needs and aspirations of Māori.

9. Auckland Council’s Māori Language Policy was adopted by the Governing Body in 2016. The policy recognises council’s commitment to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi. This policy recognises that the Māori language is a cultural treasure and an official language of Aotearoa. It notes that the Māori language and culture forms a critical part of a Māori identity that is Auckland’s point of difference in the world. Reclaiming or identifying new Māori names for community parks within the Upper Harbour Local Board area provides a significant opportunity to fulfil the policy intent.

10. Key outcome areas of the Māori language policy are:
- Te reo tē kitea – Māori language that is visible
- Te reo tē rongohia - Māori language that is heard
- Te reo tē kōreohia - Māori language that is spoken
- Te reo tē ākona – Māori language that is learned.

11. The Māori Language Policy acknowledges that te reo Māori is an official language of Aotearoa and should receive equal status to English and New Zealand Sign Language.

12. All local boards were consulted on the Māori Language Policy. Local boards have allocated decision-making authority for naming local community parks and facilities.

13. The coastal walkway is defined by the site map provided by HLC (refer Attachment B).

14. Te Kete Rukuruku is a programme led by Te Waka Tai-ranga-whenua and developed in partnership with mana whenua to provide a framework to progress Māori naming and associated story-telling of parks and places. The programme has been designed to value and promote Auckland’s Māori identity and use of te reo Māori. In the 2018/2019 financial year, the Upper Harbour Local Board is not participating in Te Kete Rukuruku.

15. HLC met with mana whenua representatives in May and September 2015, and March 2017.

16. The name ‘Te Ara Manawa Hobsonville / Onekiritea Coastal Walkway’ has been approved by the board of HLC.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

17. The Reserves Act 1977 is subject to the Conservation Act 1987, which requires that the Reserves Act 1977 be interpreted and administered to give effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. Auckland Council must consult with and have regard to the views of iwi or hapu before undertaking action and making decisions about reserves for which it is the administering body.

18. The draft 2018 Interim Park Management Guidelines outline within its principles that names should have strong historical, geographical, or local significance. Names should commemorate notable historical events of sites, persons or groups of people such as explorers, settlers, surveyors, and geologists, both Māori and European.

19. Auckland Council recognises the Māori language as a cultural treasure and official language of New Zealand and is one of the main points of difference for Auckland in the world. The Auckland Council Māori Language Policy is council’s commitment to ensure the Māori language is seen, heard, spoken and learned throughout Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland by actively using and integrating it in its activities and functions.

20. Dual or bilingual signage for all council owned reserves and facilities is a priority for action identified in the Auckland Council Māori Language Policy (refer Attachment A). Dual naming is considered a potential stepping-stone to parks and park features becoming known only by their original Māori name. In general, if dual names are used, the Māori name should be
stated first, followed by a forward slash (with a visible space on each side), and then the non-Māori name.

21. In this instance the proposed name does not follow the naming convention. However, it is considered a name gifted by mana whenua.

22. Using the interim naming guidelines, staff have assessed the proposed name and concluded as follows:

- the site was not gifted to the public, therefore there is no requirement for a specific name
- the suggested name ‘Te Ara Manawa Hobsonville / Onekiritea Coastal Walkway’ has support from mana whenua as well as HLC, and is featured on proposed wayfinding and interpretive signage
- the suggested name ‘Te Ara Manawa Hobsonville / Onekiritea Coastal Walkway’ complements the history and character found within the park
- the suggested name ‘Te Ara Manawa Hobsonville / Onekiritea Coastal Walkway’ is not currently in use for a park in the Auckland region
- the use of dual naming aligns with the Auckland Council 2016 Māori Language Implementation Plan, Te Reo te Kitea - Māori language that is visible.

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

23. The work of Te Kete Rukuruku has sought to establish a best practice approach to Māori naming through an agreed process, in partnership between mana whenua and local boards. Through this partnership it is envisaged that relationships between mana whenua and their local boards will be strengthened. It is suggested that future naming decisions follow the same approach as Te Kete Rukuruku.

24. The coastal walkway has been delivered by HLC under the terms of the Infrastructure Funding Agreement.

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

25. The naming of the walkway was workshopped with the local board on 2 September 2014 and further discussion was had at workshops on 4 August 2015 and 27 September 2018. The local board are supportive of the proposed name.

26. In the 2018/2019 financial year, the Upper Harbour Local Board is not participating in Te Kete Rukuruku. The local board will have the opportunity to participate in the programme in the future.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

27. Mana whenua who hold mana and traditional associations with Tāmaki Makaurau, and for which Tāmaki Makaurau is their tūrangawaewae (standing place) and whakapapa (a genealogical link) are the most appropriate authority from which to seek Māori names.

28. The recommended name is supported by Te Kawarau a Maki and Ngati Whatua as it reflects tangata whenua values and is considered to be appropriate for the location (refer Attachments C and D).

29. The recommended name means the heart (philosophical not physical, the essence of a thing or bloodlines) and the mangrove plant are referred to as manawa. Te Ara Manawa is specific to the linear walkway and the experience of the intertidal zone. While Te Kawerau a
Maki recognises Te Ara Manawa as an inclusive name for the walkway, the trustees have requested that Onekiritea be included as the name for the area.

30. Te Kawerau a Maki wishes to keep the history and tikanga associated with the names of their cultural sites. Through consultation with Te Kawerau a Maki and Ngati Whatua o Kaipara trustees, it has been agreed that Onekiritea should exist in parallel to Hobsonville Point and that Te Ara Manawa should exist in parallel to coastal walkway.

31. Both iwi groups have provided letters of support for the proposed name (refer Attachments C and D). It is noted that the name in the letters of support provided by iwi do not contain the word ‘Hobsonville’. Auckland Council staff have received confirmation emails from both iwi groups that they are comfortable with the name ‘Te Ara Manawa Hobsonville / Onekiritea Coastal Walkway’.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

32. The naming process does not include any capital expenditure.

33. If the walkway is formally named, HLC will be responsible for the cost and installation of the wayfinding signage, subject to the standard landowner approval process.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

34. Where there are multiple iwi interests, there may be no agreement. There is overlapping iwi interest throughout much of Tāmaki Makaurau. In recognition of this, a principle of the Te Kete Rukuruku project, as agreed by mana whenua, is that mana whenua will work together to provide a single name except where there is more than one traditional name for a site.

35. In this instance, mana whenua have already agreed on the proposed name ‘Te Ara Manawa Hobsonville / Onekiritea Coastal Walkway’.

36. As the naming of this feature is considered low risk, there is no requirement to undertake public consultation. The local board may however, request this if they feel there are affected parties to the naming process.

37. The reputation of Auckland Council is at risk if meaningful engagement with mana whenua is not undertaken.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

38. HLC will be responsible for the cost and installation of the wayfinding signage. The signs will then be handed over to council to maintain, subject to the standard landowner approval process.

39. The coastal walkway will be named ‘Te Ara Manawa Hobsonville / Onekiritea Coastal Walkway’ in the Auckland Council asset management system.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
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<td>C</td>
<td>Letter of support - Nga Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Letter of support - Te Kawerau a Maki</td>
<td>69</td>
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Ko te reo te mauri o te mana Māori
Ko te kūpu te mauri o te reo Māori
E rua ā nei wehenga kōrero e hāngai tonu ana ki runga i te reo Māori
Ko te reo, nō te Atua mai

The language is the life force of the mana Māori
The word is the life force of the language
These two ideas are absolutely crucial to the Māori language
A language, which is a gift to us from the creator

He Whakamārama Foreword

Māori Language and Auckland’s unique identity

Auckland Council recognises that Māori language is a cultural treasure and an official language of New Zealand. We acknowledge that Māori language and culture forms a critical part of “a Māori identity that is Auckland’s point of difference in the world”.

Through this policy and the related implementation plan Council is committed to the Māori language being seen, heard, spoken and learnt throughout Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland and that Council is able to contribute to the celebration, protection, revitalisation and the integration of Māori Language throughout its functions and activities.

Māori Language Framework

We have developed a Māori Language Framework to underpin how Council gives effect to this policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Area</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Potential Action Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Te Reo te Kītea - Māori Language that is visible | Te Reo te Kītea is about Council’s contribution to the visibility of the Māori language throughout Auckland | • Bilingual Signage  
• Dual Naming of Council facilities  
• Road Naming |
| Te Reo te Rongohia - Māori Language that is heard | Te Reo te Rongohia is about Council’s contribution to the Māori language heard throughout Auckland | • Digital audio platforms  
• Civic events  
• Call Centre |
| Te Reo te Kōreroa - Māori Language that is spoken | Te Reo te Kōreroa is about Council’s contribution to the Māori language spoken throughout Auckland | • Customer Reception  
• Business meetings  
• Hearings |
| Te Reo te Ākona - Māori Language that is Learnt | Te Reo te Ākona is about Council’s contribution to the Māori language learnt throughout Auckland | • Māori language immersion spaces  
• Digital learning platforms  
• Interpretive signs |
Kupu Whakataki Introduction

Auckland Council is committed to meeting its responsibilities under the Treaty of Waitangi and its broader legal obligations to Māori. The council recognises these responsibilities are distinct from the Crown’s Treaty obligations and fall within a local government Auckland context.

These commitments are articulated in the council’s key strategic planning documents – the Auckland Plan, the Long-term Plan, Local Board Plans and the Unitary Plan.

In responding to Council’s commitments and obligations to Māori in a way that will improve outcomes for all, Whiria Te Muka Tangata – The Māori Responsiveness Framework has been developed. Its purpose is to enhance and guide Auckland Council and it’s family’s responsiveness to Māori.

The Framework articulates that Council will work to ensure its policies and actions consider:

- the recognition and protection of Māori rights and interests within Tāmaki Makaurau, and
- how to address and contribute to the needs and aspirations of Māori.

The Māori Language Policy provides a practical means for Council to fulfil its commitments and obligations to Māori.

Te Koronga Purpose

The purpose of the Māori Language Policy is to direct and guide the actions of Auckland Council, in relation to the celebration, integration, protection and revitalisation of the Māori language in council business.

Auckland Council aims to:

- Ensure that anyone who receives or uses Auckland Council’s services or contributes to the democratic process has the choice to do so in Māori or English.
- Encourage the use of the Māori language in the community.

Ngā Mātāpono Principles

The principles that underpin this Māori Language Policy are:

- Māori language is a cultural treasure which is at the heart of Māori identity
- dialects reflect tribal identity and considerations have been made in this document
- because te reo Māori is an official language of Aotearoa, it shall receive equal status to the English and Sign languages
- Auckland Council is committed to celebrating Māori identity - ‘Auckland’s point of difference in the world’.
Ngā Tikanga Conventions

The Auckland Council group will apply these practices to all official communications and publications when using the Māori language:

i. Refer to the ‘Guidelines for Māori Language Orthography’ by Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori when applying Māori language in its written form. This publication gives current best practice for the written word and is the convention Auckland Council will follow.

Mana whenua, should they choose, shall be exempt from those guidelines. They may determine for themselves the spelling that will differ in order to reflect their identity, dialect and narratives.

ii. Mana whenua interpretations of their stories and relationships to Tāmaki Makaurau remain the intellectual property of mana whenua.

iii. Written reference to ancestral names will be with the express permission of mana whenua.

iv. The Māori language will be incorporated into Auckland Council’s proceedings, operations, delivery and communications including:
   - key documents and publications
   - meetings and events
   - other communications such as media releases, websites, signage and interpretation.

v. When using the Māori language in written or spoken communications, Auckland Council will include an English translation except when the words or phrases are in such common usage that it is considered unnecessary. For example; whānau, iwi, hapū.

vi. Auckland Council will encourage the use and correct application of the Māori language in its communications, publications and signage. In general the Māori language shall precede English, however there are some exceptions to this. For example; Where navigation aids, maritime safety or emergency responses appear or in the digital environment and when the search function would be affected. In these cases English will precede Māori. For example; Emergency Exit, First Aid, Assembly Point, Fire Alarm.

vii. Transliterations will not be used except where there is no alternative.
vii. The Māori Language Policy and related implementation plan will inform other Auckland Council group protocols and policies on:

- signage and interpretation
- dual-language naming
- road naming
Attachment B
Item 15

TE ARA MANAWA
HOBSONVILLE / ONEKIRITEA
Coastal Walkway

How many different FLOWERS can you find?

How many different types of BIRD can you see?

How many people can you give HIGH-FIVES to?

Can you find some local MUSICIANS to listen to?

Can you find any PONDS on your walk? What do you think they are for?

Can you find any TUI'S on your walk? There aren't many around here!

How many PEOPLE'S NAMES can you learn as you walk around?

How many ARTWORKS can you spot along the walkway?

Can you find where the MANGROVES are growing out in the water?

Can you find any GECKOS or SKINKS as you walk around?

How many people with the SAME COLOURED SHOES as you can you find?

How many ARCHWAYS can you take photos under?
6th May 2019

Hobsonville Land Company [HLC]

Attn: Erin Taylor

Re: Te Ara Manawa Coastal Walkway

This letter is to confirm Nga Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara support the Naming of Te Ara Manawa Onekiritia Coastal Walkway.

Te Ara Manawa

Onekiritia Coastal Walkway

was agreed between Nga Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara and Te Kawerau a Maki on the 9th August 2018 for the naming of the Hobsonville coastal walkway.

The narrative for Te Ara Manawa from Nga Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara

The name “Te Ara Manawa” literally means the pathway amongst the mangroves. But it is also a play on words as the Maori word Manawa also refers in poetic terms to the heart or seat of human emotions. This is most clearly illustrated by the traditional artistic term te “rarangi manawa” which refers directly to the central or heart line of ‘Kowhaiwhai’ rafters patterns. Te Ara Manawa therefore describes the physical lineal pathway that wends its way around the whole Hobsonville site. And it also describes the heartfelt aspirations to advocate for the natural environment, species and habitats in ways that honour cultures and welcomes people as an authentic sense of peace and community.

Nga mihi

Pani Gleeson

 Kaiarahi Taiao

Nga Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara
20th June 2019

Erin Taylor
Erin.taylor@hic.co.nz
Assistant Development Manager
Urban Development Group

Tena koe Erin,

Re: Te Ara Manawa Onekiritea Coastal Walkway

Please consider this letter as confirmation from Te Kawerau a Maki regarding the jointly agreed name for the coastal boardwalk as Te Ara Manawa Onekiritea Coastal Walkway.

As outlined in emails, Te Kawerau a Maki’s agreement was on the condition that Onekiritea was incorporated into the name.

Nga mihi,

Scott Lomas (MSc)
Heritage and Environment Manager
Te Kawerau Iwi Tribal Authority & Settlement Trust
2/3 Airpark Drive, Airport Oaks, Auckland | PO Box 59-243, Mangere Bridge, Auckland.
Email: scott.lomas@tekawerauiwi.nz
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To approve the 2019 Upper Harbour Third-Party Opportunities Study for sport and recreation provision.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. The 2019 Upper Harbour Third-Party Opportunities Study (refer Attachment A) was undertaken to identify public access opportunities for sport and recreation purposes, to facilities owned by third parties such as schools and sports clubs.
3. The purpose of the third-party opportunities study is to:
   • identify public access opportunities for sport and recreation purposes, within local facilities owned by third parties
   • identify capacity available within third-party facilities
   • ascertain the current issues and challenges regarding third-party facility access
   • review relevant information and studies to understand the background information and project need
   • research any other similar plans and how their success or learnings can be applied to this project.
4. The study will help guide provision of sport and recreation opportunities in the Upper Harbour area in third-party facilities. Feedback received from the local board has been incorporated into the assessment and informed the development of suggested next steps for further investigation.
5. The study identifies seven facilities for next stage investigations.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) approve the 2019 Upper Harbour Third-Party Opportunities Study (refer Attachment A to the agenda report) to assist the local board in making decisions to improve their network of sport and recreation facilities.

Horopaki

Context
6. The 2019 Upper Harbour Third-Party Opportunities Study (refer Attachment A) was developed by reviewing existing data relating to sport and recreation facilities within the local board area, completing relevant stakeholder engagement to understand current needs, provision, barriers/challenges and potential opportunities. A facility inventory was then completed, alongside the identification and scoping of potential partnership opportunities.
7. The assessment is aligned strategically with the following guiding documents:
• 2017 Upper Harbour Local Board Plan
• Community Facilities Network Plan
• Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan
• Auckland Sport Sector Facility Priorities Plan
• Auckland Indoor Court Plan
• sport facility plans.

8. Engagement with relevant parties was undertaken to understand the current service provision for sport and recreation within the local board area. Potential partnership options to support and address facility shortfalls that are negatively impacting the current provision of sport and recreation in the local board area have been identified.

9. The purpose of identifying the potential partnership options is to provide a starting point for discussion with the local board and community. This is anticipated to guide potential community access into third-party facilities to provide sport and recreation opportunities. These potential partnership options are high-level only and require further investigation to fully understand the opportunities and constraints.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

10. The 2017 Upper Harbour Local Board plan identifies a key initiative to investigate improving sporting infrastructure through public and private partnerships. This initiative aligns with the Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan which looks to facilitate partnerships to make the most of local facilities and resources.

11. The sport codes that were consulted with provided an overview of their current delivery and challenges that they are being faced with in the wider North Shore region:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Basketball | - Deficiency of indoor court availability  
|           | - Primary and intermediate games are shortened to allow for maximised delivery due to venue capacity issues  
|           | - There is growing demand for social basketball leagues  |
| Badminton | - Core delivery sites are at capacity during peak hours and are nearing full capacity  
|           | - Badminton is popular with the Asian demographic which is a growing population within the local board area  |
| Bowls    | - Clubs require assistance with maintenance of clubrooms and greens  
|          | - Support clubs with hosting community events/multi-use  |
| Futsal   | - Availability of court space is inconsistent  
|          | - High demand existing with no capacity to deliver  |
| Gymnastics | - Storage required at facilities to allow for pack in/pack out delivery model  
<p>|            | - Trampoline and rhythmic gymnastics require roof height of at least 10m  |
| Hockey   | - 6-a-side hockey has seen increased demand for alternative turf surfaces such as netball courts and school  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Southern North Shore area identified as next priority for turf delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Netball North Harbour Centre is currently at capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Multiple courts are required to make satellite delivery viable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table tennis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Volunteers stretched due to pack-in/pack out delivery model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Availability of additional space is either inconsistent or does not provide adequate storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support required for sustainability of current facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support required for opening facilities up for multi-use partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Predominantly delivered to school-aged participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Demand increasing for court space across the region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. An inventory of third-party facilities within the local board area is provided in Attachment A (pages 21-26).

13. Opportunities to provide additional sport and recreation provision in the local board area at the sites identified below should be investigated further for project viability:
   - Albany Junior High
   - Hangar building
   - Kristin School
   - Northcross Intermediate
   - Pinehurst School
   - West Harbour Tennis
   - Whenuapai School.

14. The opportunities for each site are detailed in Attachment A (pages 28-36).

15. The identified sites support multi-use for a range of sport and recreation activity. Activation programming at a proposed site would consider needs from a range of targeted community groups such as Asian communities, Māori communities and young women.

16. Consideration of targeted communities is supported by the Increasing Aucklanders’ Participation in Sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039, which focuses on:
   - communities with low sport participation rates
   - increasing participation in emerging and ethnically diverse sports
   - sustaining popular sports with high participation rates.

17. It is recommended that the local board approves the 2019 Upper Harbour Third-Party Partnership Opportunities Study as this will provide direction for further project investigation work.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

18. Subject to formal local board approval of the partnership opportunities defined for sport and recreation provision in the Upper Harbour Local Board area, further investigation into key projects will be initiated. This investigation will consider and collaborate with all appropriate departments where required.

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

Local impacts and local board views

19. The 2019/2019 Parks Sport and Recreation work programme was approved by the Upper Harbour Local Board on 21 June 2018 (resolution number UH/2018/66). A third-party service assessment for the delivery of sport and recreation provision in the Upper Harbour Local Board area was included in the programme.

20. A workshop was held with the local board on 13 June 2019 when the Sport and Recreation Lead presented the 2019 Third-Party Partnership Opportunities Study in draft form. Based on feedback received at this workshop, a final report has been provided.

21. The project aligns to the outcome in the Upper Harbour Local Board Plan, ‘Outcome 3: Healthy and active communities’.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

22. Five per cent of the population in Upper Harbour are Māori residents.

23. Sport New Zealand insights show that in the Upper Harbour Local Board area, the most popular ways for Māori to participate in physical activity is walking, jogging, and playing games.

24. During next stage investigations, Māori participation trends will be considered to align with proposed projects.

25. The 2018/2019 Parks Sport and Recreation work programme was presented at the north-western area mana whenua hui. No request for further engagement was made at this stage.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

26. If the recommended outcomes are agreed, staff will work with the third parties and local board to identify possible opportunities for funding as part of the 2019/2020 Parks Sport and Recreation work programme ID 702 ‘Equitable access to sport and recreation’.

27. If the third-party opportunities study is not approved, there is a risk that the allocated budget in the 2019/2020 work programme ID 702 ‘Equitable access to sport and recreation’ will not be allocated before the end of the financial year.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

28. There is an inherent risk in the investigation of a project when the cost to deliver the physical work components is not currently known.

29. The investigation phase of project delivery would consider financial constraints and potential funding opportunities.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

30. The 2019/2020 Parks Sport and Recreation work programme ID 702 ‘Equitable access to sport and recreation’ delivers investigation of the potential sites identified in the study. Staff will work with the local board to progress the project.

31. During next stage investigations, consideration will be made for aligning activity programming with the needs of targeted communities such as Asian communities, Māori communities and young women.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments
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</tbody>
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Approving Reserves Act 1977 classifications following public notification

File No.: CP2019/16614

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve classification and reclassification of reserves in the Upper Harbour Local Board area under the Reserves Act 1977, following the close of public submissions.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Classification of reserve land is an essential step in preparing the Upper Harbour Local Parks Management Plan and a statutory requirement under the Reserves Act 1977 (RA).
3. Classification will make clear the primary values of these reserves and the types of activities that can take place on that land into the future. It will create better consistency in the management of those primary values across adjacent parcels and clarify the legal status of land.
4. On 16 May 2019, the local board resolved to publicly notify the classification of three parcels of land and the reclassification of 17 parcels of land (resolution number UH/2019/48 in Attachment A).
5. One land parcel to be classified was incorrectly publicly notified. The remaining two parcels were publicly notified and are identified in Table 1 in paragraph 10 of this report.
6. The period for public submissions has closed and no submissions were received on the proposals, which means that no hearing is required. A resolution of the local board is now required to approve the classification of land as shown in Table 1 above, and the reclassification of land as shown in Table 2 in paragraph 10 of this report.
7. Once approved, staff will seek the approval of the Minister of Conservation (delegated to the General Manager Community Facilities, Auckland Council) to publish the changes in the New Zealand Gazette.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) approve the classification of the following parcels of reserve land, pursuant to sections 16(1) and 16(2A) of the Reserves Act 1977:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve name</th>
<th>Physical address</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Survey area (sqm)</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Reserves Act 1977 section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Moir Reserve</td>
<td>Waimarie Road</td>
<td>Part Lot 5 DP 46137</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>s16(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Accessway</td>
<td>Georgia Terrace</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 201241</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Local Purpose (Accessway) Reserve</td>
<td>s16(2A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) approve the reclassification of the following parcels or part parcels of reserve land, pursuant to section 24 (2)(b) of the Reserves Act 1977:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve name</th>
<th>Physical address</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Survey area (sqm)</th>
<th>New classification</th>
<th>Previous classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 117563</td>
<td>6587</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 4 DP 75423</td>
<td>58133</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 196341</td>
<td>4825</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 10 DP 105344</td>
<td>8063</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 113792</td>
<td>8364</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 4 DP 110260</td>
<td>6033</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 94243</td>
<td>5060</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 5 DP 105344</td>
<td>19876</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 206485</td>
<td>15817</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights West Reserve</td>
<td>Dairy Flat Highway</td>
<td>Lot 23 DP 98738</td>
<td>69153</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(b)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Beach</td>
<td>The Terrace</td>
<td>Lot 8 DP 39775</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Local Purpose (Accessway) Reserve</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernhill Escarpment</td>
<td>Bush Road</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 94890</td>
<td>20740</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gills Reserve</td>
<td>Oteha Valley Road</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 145012</td>
<td>44733</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(b)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gills Reserve</td>
<td>Oteha Valley Road</td>
<td>Lot 5 DP 151093</td>
<td>33002</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(b)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahui Reserve</td>
<td>Rahui Road</td>
<td>Lot 43 DP 23734</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>Local Purpose (Esplanade) Reserve</td>
<td>Local Purpose (Accessway) Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serenity Reserve</td>
<td>Twin Court</td>
<td>Lot 5 DP 169799</td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(b)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Horopaki

Context

Classification programme

8. A review of the land status and classification of local parks in Upper Harbour has been undertaken as part of the Upper Harbour Local Parks Management Plan and was reported to the local board’s business meeting on 16 May 2019.

9. At that meeting, the local board approved several parcels of land to be declared reserve under the Reserves Act 1977 and approved the classification by resolution of a large number of unclassified reserve parcels. Attachment A includes a copy of those resolutions.

10. In addition, the local board approved the public notification of:
   - proposals to classify land as listed in Table 1 below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve name</th>
<th>Physical address</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Survey area (sqm)</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Reserves Act 1977 section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Moir Reserve</td>
<td>Waimarie Road</td>
<td>Part Lot 5 DP 46137</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>s16(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Accessway</td>
<td>Georgia Terrace</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 201241</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Local Purpose (Accessway) Reserve</td>
<td>s16(2A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- proposals to reclassify land as listed in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve name</th>
<th>Physical address</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Survey area (sqm)</th>
<th>New classification</th>
<th>Previous classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 117563</td>
<td>6587</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 4 DP 75423</td>
<td>58133</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 196341</td>
<td>4825</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 10 DP 105344</td>
<td>8063</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 113792</td>
<td>8364</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 4 DP 110260</td>
<td>6033</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 94243</td>
<td>5060</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 5 DP 105344</td>
<td>19876</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Parcels to be reclassified under section 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve name</th>
<th>Physical address</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Survey area (sqm)</th>
<th>New classification</th>
<th>Previous classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights Reserve</td>
<td>Albany Heights Road</td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 206485</td>
<td>15817</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Heights West Reserve</td>
<td>Dairy Flat Highway</td>
<td>Lot 23 DP 98738</td>
<td>69153</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(b)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Beach</td>
<td>The Terrace</td>
<td>Lot 8 DP 39775</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Local Purpose (Accessway) Reserve</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernhill Escarpment</td>
<td>Bush Road</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 94890</td>
<td>20740</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(a)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gills Reserve</td>
<td>Oteha Valley Road</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 145012</td>
<td>44733</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(b)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gills Reserve</td>
<td>Oteha Valley Road</td>
<td>Lot 5 DP 151093</td>
<td>33002</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(b)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahui Reserve</td>
<td>Rahui Road</td>
<td>Lot 43 DP 23734</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>Local Purpose (Esplanade) Reserve</td>
<td>Local Purpose (Accessway) Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serenity Reserve</td>
<td>Twin Court</td>
<td>Lot 5 DP 169799</td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve 19(1)(b)</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. These were publicly notified on 1 August 2019 in the North Harbour News in accordance with the requirements outlined in section 119 (1)(b) of the Reserves Act 1977. The submission period closed on 1 September 2019.

12. One of the three parcels to be classified was incorrectly recorded in the public notification. This parcel has been excluded from Table 1 in paragraph 10 of this report. The correct public notification will be arranged and included in a future report to the local board to have its classification approved.

13. A further resolution of the local board is required to confirm the classification and reclassification actions now that public notification has closed.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

Outcome of consultation

14. Mana whenua involvement and views on the proposed classifications and reclassifications were described in detail in the report to the business meeting on 16 May 2019. Iwi supported the recommendations for classification and reclassification.

15. No submissions were received on the classification and reclassification proposals. There were no requests received to speak to these proposals and therefore, no hearing is required.

Decisions relating to the proposed classification actions

16. The local board may choose to approve the proposed classification actions as they were publicly notified; or to change those actions.
17. In this case, there have been no public submissions. We recommend therefore, that the local board approves classifying and reclassifying the reserve parcels as proposed in Tables 1 and 2 (in paragraph 10 of this report).

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

**Council group impacts and views**

18. The impacts and views of classification on council groups was outlined in the report to the 16 May 2019 business meeting. No additional impacts arise from the decisions proposed in this report.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

**Impacts of the land status work**

19. As described in the 16 May 2019 report and outlined on a parcel-by-parcel basis in Table 1, each parcel of land has been classified to assign it with a primary purpose that aligns with its present values, as defined in section 17 to 23 of the RA.

20. Some parcels of land (refer to Table 2 in paragraph 10 of this report) have also been reclassified to:
   - better align the reserve classification with the parcel’s primary purpose
   - create consistency of reserve classification with adjacent parcels
   - confirm or clarify the intention of previous resolutions or actions to classify the land parcels that were not completed following RA process.

21. The proposed classifications and reclassifications will make clear the primary values of these reserves and the types of activities that can take place on that land in the future. It will also create better consistency in the management of those primary values across adjacent parcels and create certainty around the legal status of land.

22. It is noted that any substantive changes in the types of activities proposed on particular reserves arising through consultation on the Upper Harbour Local Parks Management Plan can inform policies to change the classification of particular areas to accommodate those activities.

**Local board views**

23. Local board views were described in the report to the business meeting on 16 May 2019. The local board’s views were put forward for consultation and no comments were received.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

24. Mana whenua views on the proposed classification and reclassifications were described in the report to the 16 May 2019 business meeting. Mana whenua supported the proposed actions and did not make any submissions to oppose the classifications and reclassifications during the notification period.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

25. Reserves will be formally classified under the RA when a gazette notice describing each land parcel has been published in the New Zealand Gazette. Costs associated with this process will be funded through internal statutory land management budgets.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

26. The following table outlines the risks and mitigation associated with the classification and reclassification of reserves. This reflects relevant risks listed in the 16 May 2019 business meeting report, with an update following public notice period closing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-notification risk</th>
<th>Post notification update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA classifications constrain the range of uses for land</td>
<td>The lack of submissions on the proposed classifications and reclassifications mean no additional risks around the range of uses contemplated have been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public objections to proposed classifications and reclassifications delaying the management plan process</td>
<td>There have been no submissions, meaning no delays will eventuate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially high number of submissions on proposed classifications, because the notification will occur at the same time as public consultation on the intention to prepare the plan.</td>
<td>No submissions relevant to the classifications or reclassifications have been received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. The absence of public submissions could indicate a lack of community awareness about the public notification of these classifications and reclassifications. However, it is considered the risk of potential objections to these proposals to be minor given that the changes align the classifications with the current use of the land parcels being considered in this report.

Ngā korininga ā-muri
Next steps

28. Once the local board has approved the classification actions, they must be included in a notice published in the New Zealand Gazette.

29. Approval of gazette notices has been delegated from the Minister of Conservation to the General Manager Community Facilities. A report will be prepared seeking his signature to the gazette notices.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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Attachment A: 16 May 2019 Resolutions of the Upper Harbour Local Board

14 Upper Harbour local parks land classification programme

The Service and Asset Planner and the Planning Specialist, from Service Strategy and Integration, were in attendance to support the item.

Resolution number UH/2019/48

MOVED by Chairperson M Miles, seconded by Deputy Chairperson L Whyte:
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) confirm eight parcels of land will continue to be held under the Local Government Act 2002 as described in Attachment B to the agenda report, dated 16 May 2019.

b) approve 14 parcels of land to be declared a reserve and classified according to their primary purpose, pursuant to section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977 as proposed in Attachment C to the agenda report, dated 16 May 2019.

c) approve the proposed classification of 488 parcels of reserve land pursuant to sections 16(1) and 16(2A) of the Reserves Act 1977 as described in Attachment D to the agenda report, dated 16 May 2019.

d) approve public notification of proposals to classify three parcels of reserve land pursuant to section 16(4) of the Reserves Act 1977 as described in Attachment E to the agenda report, dated 16 May 2019.

e) approve public notification of the proposals to reclassify 17 parcels of reserve land pursuant to section 24(2)(b) of the Reserves Act 1977 described in Attachment F to the agenda report, dated 16 May 2019, noting that:

i. since publication of the business meeting agenda and this report, further investigation undertaken by staff indicate that the land parcel associated with Meadowood Reserve (Lot 360 DP 132246) was

f) approve a hearing panel, consisting of all local board members in preparation for any requests to speak to objections or submissions on the proposed classifications that have been publicly notified under clause d) and e) above, noting that the role of the hearings panel will be to hear submissions and make recommendations to the local board on classification decisions.

CARRIED
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To approve proposed mitigation work on tracks in local parks to protect healthy kauri and prevent kauri dieback spread within the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

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

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

4. An interim report was presented to the Upper Harbour Local Board on 21 March 2019 (resolution number UH/2019/19). This report obtained the local board’s endorsement of the proposed high-level kauri protection measures prior to the development of a detailed programme of works.

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

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

7. Seven local parks in the Upper Harbour Local Board area were initially assessed and prioritised. Kereru Reserve was subsequently removed from the list as no kauri were found in this park. Albany Heights West Reserve, Dene Court Reserve and Redfern Nature Reserve were deemed to be low risk as they are not easily accessible and/or had no formed tracks. Detailed investigation was carried out to determine the appropriate mitigation measures for the remaining four parks which are identified in Attachment A.

8. A workshop was held with the Upper Harbour Local Board on 22 August 2019 to discuss the proposed detailed mitigation programme.

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

10. A variety of mitigation measures are proposed for the five local parks in the Upper Harbour Local Board area, including indefinite track closure and track upgrades. Location maps and proposed mitigation outcomes are provided in Attachments A and B. Kereru Reserve was identified as a reserve to be investigated for kauri dieback, but on inspection of the park, no kauri trees were found and the local board were advised that Kereru Park is no longer on the list of investigations.
11. Further detailed design and procurement is planned for September and October 2019. The identified mitigation works are planned to be undertaken from November 2019 to March 2020, subject to any required consents and other approvals.

12. Track mitigation works will be carried out in accordance with the kauri-safe standards and specifications provided by the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) for kauri dieback management.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) approve the proposed mitigation work programme identified in the following table to protect healthy kauri and reduce the impact of kauri dieback disease in the Upper Harbour Local Board area, which will be funded by the natural environment targeted rate (NETR):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Cost estimate (physical works only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gills Reserve</td>
<td>Option two</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The second option is to close the S14 track which will ensure a loop track is still available to users while diverting people away from the large mature kauri grove.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formalisation of a viewing area at the trig location and removal of the trig station on track S17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Streams Reserve</td>
<td>Option one</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Closure of all track links except for tracks S20, S17, S8, S21, S1 and S7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- This would allow for pedestrian access between Twin Court and Dairy Flat Highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Phoenix Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Closure of the informal track through kauri forest between Kittiwake Drive and the junction to the cycleway path.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mitigation of the single kauri present on track S8 through appropriate stormwater management and track maintenance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Install new edge board, top up track surface within kauri zone as required and provide new no-dig drain to shed water away from kauri roots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Camber the track surface to shed water away from kauri root zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paremoremo Scenic Reserve</td>
<td>Option one</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Close tracks S02 and S03.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- This would require planting out at the entrances to the track segments. Install temporary fencing until the plants have matured.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

c) note that the proposed mitigation work programme (as detailed in Attachment A to the agenda report) is incorporated into the 2019-2022 Community Facilities work programme.

Horopaki Context

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

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

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

16. An interim report (resolution number UH/2019/19) regarding proposed kauri dieback mitigation in local parks was presented to the Upper Harbour Local Board on 21 March 2019. The local board resolved the following:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

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

i. undertake detailed investigations to determine appropriate mitigation measures (such as track upgrades, track re-alignment, track re-routing, or other physical works), and consider temporary closure until mitigation works are completed to protect symptom-free high-value kauri ecosystems in the following Category A parks:
   - Gills Reserve
   - Kereru Reserve.

ii. undertake detailed investigations to determine appropriate mitigation measures (such as track upgrades, track re-alignment, track re-routing, or other physical works), and consider temporary closure until mitigation works are completed to prevent potentially infected kauri ecosystems in the following Category A parks from becoming a source of infection:
   - Paremoremo Scenic Reserve
   - Three Streams Reserve
   - Lady Phoenix Reserve, noting that since the report was prepared identifying it as Category D, further information has resulted in this reserve being classified as Category A.

iii. discourage public access through barrier planting and signage in the Category B park, being Albany Heights West Reserve.

iv. note that Category B parks Dene Court Reserve and Redfern Nature Reserve are closed to the public.

v. note that the Category D parks are considered to be low-value kauri ecosystems with low-value recreational use, thus making them a lower priority for mitigation investment at this stage.
vi. note that a detailed kauri dieback mitigation programme with costs and timelines will be developed and submitted to a local board business meeting in mid-2019 for approval.

vii. seek confirmation that the detailed kauri dieback mitigation programme will be funded from regional budgets.

viii. look forward to receiving further information as to how the ecological volunteers active in the board’s area can support the kauri dieback mitigation programme.

17. The kauri dieback budget is dedicated to protecting kauri and preventing the spread of kauri dieback disease through the provision of new assets or upgrading of existing assets. The natural environment targeted rate budget cannot be used for the renewal of tracks in kauri forest, unless it is specifically allocated to protecting kauri.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
18. The interim report provided to the Upper Harbour Local Board on 21 March 2019 (resolution number UH/2019/19) included the results of the prioritisation of local parks and sought endorsement of the recommended high-level kauri protection actions prior to the development of the detailed programme of works.

19. There are currently 47 local parks across Auckland subject to partial of full track closures. These closures were implemented between April and July 2019 as a temporary measure while mitigation options were developed. In the Upper Harbour Local Board area, the following parks/reserves were closed temporarily:

- Gills Road Reserve
- Three Streams Reserve
- Lady Phoenix Reserve
- Paremoremo Scenic Reserve.

20. Twenty-five local parks in Upper Harbour were initially assessed and prioritised. Nineteen of these were deemed to be low risk as they are not easily accessible and/or had no formed tracks adjoining kauri. A detailed investigation was carried out to determine appropriate mitigation measures (refer Attachments A and B). At the request of the Upper Harbour Local Board on 21 March 2019 (resolution number UH/2019/19), the kauri dieback team also assessed the ecosystem at Kereru Reserve and found no kauri trees within this reserve.

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

- The value of the kauri ecosystem, which was classified as high, medium or low. A kauri ecosystem value was assigned by council ecologists based on the work undertaken by Singers et al (2017): Indigenous terrestrial and wetland ecosystems of Auckland.

- The health status of the kauri which was noted as infected, possibly infected or symptom free. This information was sourced from the council’s active surveillance programme which includes soil sampling.

- The recreational value of the park which was identified as high, medium or low. The analysis considered key recreational activities such as recreational trails, active transport, visitor destinations, volunteer activity and sports and recreation use, whether there were alternative tracks available and potential future growth. Reviews of reserve management plans (if applicable) and any other relevant strategic documents were undertaken.

22. The priority for natural environment targeted rate (NETR) funding is on formal tracks with high value kauri areas and high recreational use. Mitigation of unformed or informal tracks is generally not a high priority. Those tracks are normally recommended for indefinite closure.
23. Consultation has been undertaken with the local board, key park stakeholders and mana whenua.

24. The kauri dieback disease mitigation programme below identifies some of the key milestones. Timeframes are estimates only, and are subject to resourcing, weather conditions (for construction) and the actual scope of the works that are required to be undertaken.

25. The mitigation options in Upper Harbour are described in detail in Attachment A. Location maps are provided in Attachment B. The recommended mitigation works are summarised as follows:

- **Gills Reserve**: the second option is to close track S14 which will ensure a loop track is still available to users while diverting people away the large mature kauri grove. Formalisation of a viewing area at the trig location, and removal of the trig station (on track S17) is recommended. The estimated cost is $185,000 with an estimated timeframe for completion of May 2020, subject to contractor availability and weather conditions.

- **Three Streams Reserve**: closure of all track links except for S20, S17, S8, S21, S1 and S7. This would allow for pedestrian access between Twin Court and Dairy Flat Highway. The estimated cost is $54,000 with an estimated timeframe for completion of December 2019, subject to contractor availability and weather conditions.

- **Lady Phoenix Reserve**: mulch around lone kauri to prevent access and protect roots. Closure of the informal track through kauri forest between Kitiwake Drive and the junction to the cycleway path. Mitigation of the single kauri present on track S8 through appropriate stormwater management and track maintenance is recommended. Install new edge board, top up track surface within kauri zone as required and provide new no-dig drain to shed water away from kauri roots. The estimated cost is $5000 with an estimated timeframe for completion of December 2019, subject to contractor availability and weather conditions.
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- **Paremoremo Scenic Reserve**: mulch around the kauri on green space to prevent access and protect roots. Closure of all track links except for S20, S17, S8, S21, S1 and S7. This would allow for pedestrian access between Twin Court and Dairy Flat Highway. The estimated cost is $6000 with an estimated timeframe for completion of March 2020, subject to contractor availability and weather conditions.

- **Kereru Park**: the local board requested staff to investigate and determine if there were any required mitigation measures for kauri dieback within this reserve. Staff have investigated the reserve and no kauri were found so no further action was taken.

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

#### Council group impacts and views

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

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

28. Auckland Council biosecurity specialists and kauri dieback team members have visited all parks in the Auckland region that have kauri in close proximity to tracks to assess possible mitigation options.

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

#### Local impacts and local board views

29. On 21 March 2019, an interim report was presented to the Upper Harbour Local Board where multiple high-level kauri protection measures for local parks and reserves were endorsed.

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

31. A key park stakeholder meeting was held with local board members, park rangers and park specialists from Auckland Council. The purpose of the meeting was to gain feedback on the proposed detailed mitigation works. The community group representatives were supportive of the need to temporarily close the tracks until mitigation works were completed.

32. Key park stakeholders were supportive of the proposed mitigation measures to protect the kauri in the reserve. Sustainable Paremoremo are an active community group involved with Paremoremo Scenic Reserve and would like to be kept informed on any changes. Gills Reserve volunteers have developed tracks to the northern section of the reserve and will need to be consulted when rationalising the track network.

33. Lady Phoenix Reserve provides a commuter link for school children and the school use this reserve for environmental purposes. The school has asked for the barrier fence to be moved to the lower area to continue with their education. The community raised concerns of compliance issues should the tracks be closed for a long period. It was agreed that the community groups would be kept informed on the timings of the track works and information would also be provided to the local schools.

### Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

#### Māori impact statement

34. Auckland Council is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and its broader legal obligations to Māori. The council recognises these responsibilities are distinct from the Crown’s Treaty obligations and fall within a local government Tāmaki Makaurau context. These commitments are articulated in the council’s key strategic planning
documents: the Auckland Plan, the 2018-2028 Long-term Plan, the Unitary Plan and local board plans.

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

36. Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara attended the initial site scoping meetings as part of the conversation regarding track upgrades. A request to involve Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara are consulted on any track upgrade works. Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara conceptually agreed to the recommendations and recommended further engagement with Te Kawerau a Maki regarding any track upgrade work within these reserves.

37. A workshop with mana whenua was held on 7 August 2019 where the proposed mitigation works were discussed in detail. There was no indication from the attendees regarding the mitigation of kauri dieback within the Upper Harbour Local Board area and the protection of kauri trees was fully supported.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

38. In May 2018, the Governing Body approved a natural environment targeted rate (NETR) to support environmental initiatives, including addressing kauri dieback. The rate will raise $311 million over the duration of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 (resolution number GB/2018/91). The NETR provides funding for kauri dieback control, including new infrastructure such as track upgrades to kauri-safe standard.

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

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

41. The following estimated costings table and allocation of budgets applies to local parks only. They are based on undertaking mitigation measures in accordance with the National Technical Specification for Track Mitigation Measures 2019. the National Kauri Dieback Track Infrastructure Guidelines 2019 and the relevant standard drawings to protect kauri that are near walking tracks and public areas on local parks. Budgets exclude the provision of hygiene stations which will be required at most of the entrances to kauri tracks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local board</th>
<th>Total length of track to be mitigated LM</th>
<th>% of length of tracks per local board LM</th>
<th>Kauri budget total allocation $</th>
<th>% of budget per local board</th>
<th>Proposed indefinite track closure per local board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. The following table provides the proposed mitigation work programme to protect healthy kauri and prevent kauri dieback spread in the Upper Harbour Local Board area to be funded by the NETR and local renewals funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park/reserve location</th>
<th>NETR funding</th>
<th>Local board renewals funding</th>
<th>Total funding for kauri mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gills Reserve – option two</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Streams Reserve – option one</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Phoenix Reserve</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paremoremo Scenic Reserve – option one</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

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

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

51. The local board and the local community will be kept updated and informed on the timing for the planned works.
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## ATTACHMENT A: Description of proposed mitigation works for local parks in Upper Harbour Local Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Site Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gills Reserve</td>
<td>259 Oheka Valley Road, Albany</td>
<td>Gills Road Reserve covers approximately 14.2 hectares of predominantly bush-clad land in Albany. The reserve consists of two parts, bisected by Gills Road. This report covers the Western portion of the reserve that has numerous significant Kauri trees. In addition to this, the upper part of the reserve contains some of the largest Puriri trees on the North Shore. This report focuses on the Western part of the reserve where significant Kauri are present. This part of the reserve can then further be broken up into Northern and Southern sections which are significantly different. The approximately 10-hectare Northern parcel contains mature dense kauri forest whereas the Southern parcel of the reserve is mainly Greenfields for informal recreational activity and dog walking. There are proposed Greenways as part of the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan, running North (from Carol Lee Place) to South, through the Western parcel of Gills Road Reserve. A second link is proposed to run along the Southwestern end of the reserve adjacent to Lucas Creek. Both proposed Greenway links connect to the existing shared path which runs adjacent to the stream through the Eastern parcel of Gills Road Reserve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current Status
The reserve is densely populated with Kauri at the Northern end of the reserve, and along the North Eastern boundary where an existing large vehicle accessway bench cut has been previously formed. Multiple Kauri are marked on the GIS as Kauri with ill thrift, and the remaining Kauri are marked as non-symptomatic. Multiple informal tracks exist in the Kauri zone within this reserve and extensive mitigation is required to meet the Auckland Council Kauri Dieback Disease mitigation guidelines outlined in the Local Parks Track Plan.

### Assessment Criteria
- Kauri forest ecological value - Medium
- Recreational value - Medium
- Availability of alternative tracks – Yes, there are alternative walking tracks in the local vicinity.

### Proposed mitigation options
The existing track alignment and grade is poor for both Kauri health and user experience along most of the extensive track network. It is evident that there is higher recreational track usage on the Northern informal tracks, and low usage on the Southern slope of the reserve. Immediate closure of S12 is recommended. Appropriate signage should be installed. This is a narrow ridge with a steep drop off on both sides and is dangerous to users. It is recommended to formalise the some or all the existing informal tracks which will remain open in the Northern end of the reserve, as per Auckland Council Kauri Dieback Disease mitigation guidelines outlined in the Local Parks Track Plan.

**Option One**

**Attachment A: Description of proposed mitigation works for local parks in Upper Harbour Local Board**
- Disestablish Eastern Track Loop S19 and S17
- Existing triangulation station on S17 disestablished and removed.

**Option Two**
- The second option is to close S14. This will ensure a loop track is still available to users while diverting people away the large mature Kauri grove.
- Formalisation of a viewing area at the trig location, and removal of the trig station (on S17) is recommended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Analysis and Recommendation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Proposed Recommendation</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option One:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- It is recommended to disestablish the Eastern track loop, S19 and S17 as per the attached location plan.</td>
<td>Kauri are protected due to track upgrades to kauri-safe standard and exposure to kauri dieback is significantly reduced.</td>
<td>This option is not recommended because it does not protect the kauri present in the reserve. Local Board confirmed at the workshop that this was not the preferred option due to costs and protecting the Kauri within this reserve. The negative recreational effect of this closure is that the existing longer loop track will no longer exist. The only recreational experience on offer will be a smaller upper loop track and a link connecting the Southern part of the reserve to the North.</td>
<td>$259,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- As part of the upgrade works a single-entry point at Carol Lee Place should be formalised and installation of a cleaning station at this entry point. Location and type of cleaning station to be confirmed at detail design phase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The existing triangulation station on S17 should be disestablished and removed as part of S17 closure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Track mitigation works will be carried out in accordance with the dry track standards and specifications provided by the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) for Kauri Dieback Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option Two</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The second option is to close S14.</td>
<td>Kauri are protected due to track upgrades to kauri-safe standard and exposure to kauri dieback is significantly reduced.</td>
<td>This is the recommended option because it provides maximum kauri protection at a cost commensurate with the recreational use of this reserve. This will ensure a loop track is still available to users while diverting people away the large mature Kauri grove. The Upper Harbour Local Board supported option two as the preferred option.</td>
<td>$184,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formalisation of a viewing area at the trig location, and removal of the trig station (on S17).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Track mitigation works will be carried out in accordance with the dry track standards and specifications provided by the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) for Kauri Dieback Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1. Park Name**

**Three Streams Reserve (Refer to location map in ATTACHMENT B)**

**Site Address**
335 Dairy Flat Highway, Albany

**Site Background**
The Three Streams Reserve was developed as an arboretum by John Hogan and then passed on to the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust (QEII Trust). The QEII Trust sold this site to Council in 2005. Council manages this site in an integrated manner with the neighbouring reserves, Serenity Reserve and Albany Heights West Reserve. The network of walking tracks has been developed by volunteers. The neighbouring green space property to the East is the Parish of Paremoremo. There is a dwelling located on the Western edge of the reserve with vehicle access through the reserve from Dairy Flat Highway. Pedestrians use the reserve as a thoroughfare between Twin Court and Dairy Flat Highway. – There is a bus stop at the reserve entry (S20). There is a bus stop at the reserve entry (S20).
Current Status

There is an extensive track network in this reserve and the tracks are generally in poor condition. There is little track surfacing and in some areas the track show evidence of being muddy after rain. There are several fallen pine trees which have been cut to remove the track obstruction. There are also multiple mature pine trees, posing potential deadwood hazards from falling branches, and/or trees. The local board have identified within the approved three year work programme to renew Three streams track network – this work is planned to start in 2022.

There are multiple Kauri marked on Auckland GIS within the Three Streams Reserve. The majority are located along S11 (near the centre of the reserve). According to Auckland GIS, one Kauri has a possible infection and two others have ill thrift. The remaining trees are recorded as non-symptomatic. All Kauri within this reserve are evidently planted. There is one significant Kauri at S7 which was planted in 1988 from a seeding from Tane Mahuta.

Assessment Criteria

- Kauri forest ecological value - Medium
- Recreational value - Medium
- Availability of alternative tracks – Yes, there are alternative walking tracks in the local vicinity.

Proposed mitigation options

The prioritisation categorisation of this reserve should be recategorised to category C, due to the current low recreational value. The road within the reserve will remain open providing access to the residential property. It is however, recommended that a gate is installed at S20 to control access into the reserve. It is recommended that one of the following two recommendations is implemented. Option 1: We recommend the following track links are closed for the protection of Kauri and safety of the public: S2, S4, S6, S9, S11, S12, S13, S14, S18 and S19. S5 is currently closed and should remain closed.

Option One

- The following track links are closed for the protection of Kauri and safety of the public: S2, S4, S6, S9, S11, S12, S13, S14, S18 and S19. S5 is currently closed and should remain closed.

Option Two

- Closure of all track links except for S20, S17, S6, S21, S1 and S7. This would allow for pedestrian access between Twin Court and Dairy Flat Highway.

Option Analysis and Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Proposed Recommendation</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ATTACHMENT A: Description of proposed mitigation works for local parks in Upper Local Board.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option One:</th>
<th>Kauri are protected due to track upgrades to kauri-safe standard and exposure to kauri dieback is significantly reduced.</th>
<th>This is the <strong>recommended option</strong> because it provides maximum kauri protection at a cost commensurate with the recreational use of this reserve.</th>
<th>$63,305</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• It is recommended to disestablish the Eastern track loop, S19 and S17 as per the attached location plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• This option enables two small track loops as a recreation activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As part of the upgrade works a single-entry point at Carol Lee Place should be formalised and installation of a cleaning station at this entry point. Location and type of cleaning station to be confirmed at detail design phase.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Upper Harbour Local Board supported option one to ensure protection of kauri.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The existing triangulation station on S17 should be disestablished and removed as part of S17 closure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Track mitigation works will be carried out in accordance with the dry track standards and specifications provided by the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) for Kauri Dieback Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Two</th>
<th>Kauri are protected due to track upgrades to kauri-safe standard and exposure to kauri dieback is significantly reduced.</th>
<th>This option is <strong>not recommended</strong> because it does not protect the kauri present in the reserve.</th>
<th>$36,770</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The second option is to close S14.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• It is recommended to keep this link open as there is a bus stop on Dairy Flat Highway and it is therefore ideal to provide pedestrian access to this bus stop. This option is focused on keeping open the existing commuter route within the reserve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formalisation of a viewing area at the trig location, and removal of the trig station (on S17).</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Upper Harbour Local Board supported option one to ensure protection of kauri.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Track mitigation works will be carried out in accordance with the dry track standards and specifications provided by the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) for Kauri Dieback Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTACHMENT A: Description of proposed mitigation works for local parks in Upper Local Board**

Kauri dieback disease - local park track mitigation in the Upper Harbour Local Board area
Upper Harbour Local Board
19 September 2019

1. Park Name  
Lady Phoenix (Refer to location map in ATTACHMENT B) 

Site Address  
335 Dairy Flat Highway, Upper Harbour 

Site Background  
Lady Phoenix Reserve is an approximately seven-hectare area within a regenerating forest, including some 100+ year Kauri and Matai on the Southern slopes which run down to Te Wharau Stream. There is significant spread of climbing asparagus and tradescantia along the Northern ridge boundary with private properties. Te Wharau Stream runs along the Southern end of the reserve and is an identified Giant Kōkōpu habitat. A formalised concrete laneway between 38 and 40 Kittiwake Drive, leads to an informal track that runs centrally through the reserve North to South. The initial section of this informal track has a steep gradient and is likely to deter most users. It appears to be used for weed and pest control only. This informal route passes through a Kauri grove, and is a risk factor in the spread of Kauri dieback. The Southern end of the informal track joins onto a bike track (within the reserve).

The formalised bike track, located along the South-western end of the reserve, is in good condition. The track is an aggregated surface for the most part, with some sections of concrete. There are two timber bridges within this park. There is a formal aggregate track along the South-eastern coastal boundary. This track appears to be relatively new and is in good condition.

Current Status  
The informal track from Kittiwake Drive entrance initially follows a steep gradient, followed by a gentle gradient which leads into a dense Kauri Zone. The track is slippery and hazardous. The expected use of this track is for pest and weed management only. The informal track continues down the hill, and then extends West before connecting into the formalised tracks S4 and S3 at the Southern end of the reserve. The formal links provide access from Schompois Place through to Miromiro Place and are in good condition. The formalised tracks at the Southern end of the reserve run parallel to the stream and provide good connection to roads. These tracks show evidence of high use.

Dense mature (some over 100 years) and young Kauri located centrally in the reserve, adjacent to S7. A single Kauri is located approximately 38m along S8 East of the Miromiro Place entrance.

Assessment Criteria  
- Kauri forest ecological value - High
- Recreational value - Low
- Availability of alternative tracks – Yes, there are alternative walking tracks in the local vicinity.

Closure of the informal track through Kauri forest, between Kittiwake Drive and junction to cycleway path. Pest trapping may continue, provided the appropriate training is given in consultation with community members such that no trapping occurs within the Kauri zone. This track should be reclassified as Prioritisation Category 'B', given

ATTACHMENT A: Description of proposed mitigation works for local parks in Upper Local Board.
**Proposed mitigation options**

- Its low use. Mitigation of the single Kauri present on S8 through appropriate stormwater management and track maintenance is recommended. Install new edge board, top up track surface within Kauri zone as required and provide new no dig drain to shed water away from Kauri roots. Furthermore, camber the track surface to shed water away from Kauri root zone. The track is generally in good condition and has a dry surface. It is recommended that the formalised track remains open.

**Option One:**

Closure of the informal track through Kauri forest, between Kittiwake Drive and junction to cycleway path. Pest trapping may continue, provided the appropriate training is given in consultation with community members such that no trapping occurs within the Kauri zone. This track should be recategorised as Prioritisation Category ‘B’, given its low use. Mitigation of the single Kauri present on S8 through appropriate stormwater management and track maintenance is recommended. Install new edge board, top up track surface within Kauri zone as required and provide new no dig drain to shed water away from Kauri roots. Furthermore, camber the track surface to shed water away from Kauri root zone. The track is generally in good condition and has a dry surface. It is recommended that the formalised track remains open.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Analysis and Recommendation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Proposed Recommendation</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Option One:**                    | - This track should be recategorized as Prioritisation Category ‘B’, given its low use.  
- Mitigation of the single Kauri present on S8 through appropriate stormwater management and track maintenance is recommended  
- Install new edge board, top up track surface within Kauri zone as required and provide new no dig drain to shed water away from Kauri roots.  
- Camber the track surface to shed water away from Kauri root zone.  
- Moving the Waiare testing station out of the kauri zone and still providing this education tool for the school.  
- Track mitigation works will be carried out in accordance with the dry track standards and specifications provided by the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) for Kauri Dieback Management | Kauri are protected due to track upgrades to kauri-safe standard and exposure to kauri dieback is significantly reduced. | - This is the **recommended option** because it provides maximum kauri protection at a cost commensurate with the recreational use of this reserve.  
- This option enables two small track loops as a recreation activity.  
- The Upper Harbour Local Board **supported option one** to ensure protection of kauri. | **$5,000** |

**ATTACHMENT A:** Description of proposed mitigation works for local parks in Upper Harbour Local Board
**Site Address**

Paremomo Reserve comprises just under 100 hectares of bush covered ridges and valleys. The significant attributes of the reserve, which include scenic beauty, environmental and recreational values, make it a highly prized part of the area's network of public open space. During the late 19th and early 20th Century, Paremomo Reserve was milled for kauri and dug over for kauri resin. The kauri milling and digging resulted in the ridges being burnt off repeatedly. Consequently, large mature trees are confined to the gullies and stream banks, the ridges being covered in varying stages of shrubland vegetation. Quayning of the Western part of the reserve was carried out during the 1930's-40's, and ceased operation in the early 1950's. Subsequently, the quarry site was used for a tip site until June 1977 when it reached capacity and was closed. Fires have been a significant part of the reserve’s history. Aerial photos taken in 1940, 1950, 1963 and 1989 show evidence of many fires having burnt large areas of the reserve. Council has concentrated on developing recreational opportunities and controlling pests at Paremomo Reserve. In 1995, a study was commissioned to investigate weed threats and recommend a walkway circuit. In the following years the recommendations of the report were followed, with the more serious weed threats targeted for control.

**Current Status**

The track is in poor condition, overgrown, slippery and excessively wet and muddy in parts. S01: Track in poor condition consisting of wet and muddy sections. Minor realignments will improve the experience of this track. S01 is currently in the process of being upgraded. The upgrade is managed by Thomas Civil and is not part of the Kauri Dieback programme.

S02: Some young Kauri are located close to Ridge Road and a few located mid-way along the track. The track is overgrown, slippery, includes many steep sections and has multiple stream crossings. There are also sections where the track diverts off a ridge, down to the valley, then back up again the other side of the valley to the neighbouring ridge.

S03: Track in poor condition and located within multiple dense mature Kauri trees. The Southern end of the track segment is hazardous with multiple muddy sections and fallen trees across the track surface. The track is steep and slippery on the western side of the reserve.

**Assessment Criteria**

- Kauri forest ecological value - High
- Recreational value - Medium
- Availability of alternative tracks – Yes, there are alternative walking tracks in the local vicinity.
### Proposed mitigation options

Recategorize this reserve to prioritisation category B. Consideration should be taken as to the standard of the track to construct or maintain, given the expected low usage of this reserve. Track segment S01 is currently in the upgrade process and this is managed by Thomas Civil. This provides a connection to the waterfall. The Eastern track loop S03 is located close to many high value Kauri, some of which have been identified as Kauri with Hill thrift and others with possible dieback. Given the ecological sensitivity of this track segment it should be indefinitely closed. The option to keep this track segment open would involve specific design and long sections of boardwalk and structure.

**Option One**
- Close S02 and S03.
- This would require planting out at the entrances to the track segments. Install temporary fencing until the plants have matured.

**Option Two**
- It is recommended to plant out S03 at the track segment entrances. Install temporary fencing until the plants have matured.
- There are sections on S02 where the track diverts off a ridge, down the to the valley, then back up the other side of the valley to the neighbouring ridge.
- The user experience would benefit from a new alignment to follow a single ridge climb to the top of the hill and avoid multiple ridge valley crossings if possible. It is recommended to undertake a feasibility realignment investigation if there is interest in keeping this track segment open. It is recommended to install boxed steps, and boardwalks as required for the track upgrade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Analysis and Recommendation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Proposed Recommendation</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option One:</strong></td>
<td>Close S02 and S03. This would require planting out at the entrances to the track segments. Install temporary fencing until the plants have matured. Track mitigation works will be carried out in accordance with the dry track standards and specifications provided by the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) for Kauri Dieback Management.</td>
<td>Kauri are protected due to track upgrades to kauri-safe standard and exposure to kauri dieback is significantly reduced.</td>
<td>This is the recommended option because it provides maximum kauri protection at a cost commensurate with the recreational use of this reserve. The Upper Harbour Local Board supported option one as the preferred option. The negative recreational effect of this closure is that the existing longer loop track will no longer exist.</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option Two</strong></td>
<td>To plant out S03 at the track segment entrances. Install temporary fencing until the plants have matured. There are sections on S02 where the track diverts off a ridge, down the to the valley, then back up the other side of the valley to the neighbouring ridge. Track mitigation works will be carried out in accordance with the dry track standards and specifications provided by the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) for Kauri Dieback Management.</td>
<td>Kauri are protected due to track upgrades to kauri-safe standard and exposure to kauri dieback is significantly reduced.</td>
<td>This is NOT the recommended option because it provides maximum kauri protection at a cost commensurate with the recreational use of this reserve. The user experience would benefit from a new alignment to follow a single ridge climb to the top of the hill and avoid multiple ridge valley crossings if possible. It is recommended to undertake a feasibility realignment investigation if there is interest in keeping this track segment open. It is recommended to install boxed steps, and boardwalks as required for the track upgrade. This will ensure a loop track is still available to users while diverting people away the large mature Kauri grove. Local Board confirmed at the workshop that this was not the preferred option due to costs and protecting the Kauri within this reserve.</td>
<td>$655,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTACHMENT A: Description of proposed mitigation works for local parks in Upper Local Board
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. The purpose of this report is to provide:
   • an update on the status of the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF)
   • a summary of consultation material sent to the local board
   • transport-related information on matters of specific application and interest to the
     Upper Harbour Local Board and its community.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. In particular, this report includes:
   • updates on the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) in the Upper Harbour
     Local Board area
   • update on the Auckland Transport major capital works in the Upper Harbour Local
     Board area
   • consultation information sent to the local board for feedback.

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

Horopaki
Context
3. This report addresses transport-related matters in the Upper Harbour Local Board area.
4. Auckland Transport (AT) is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding
   state highways. AT reports monthly to local boards, as set out in local board engagement
   plans. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important engagement role
   local boards play within and on behalf of their local communities.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
Local Board Transport Capital Fund update
5. The Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) is a capital budget provided to all local
   boards by Auckland Council and delivered by 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
Item 19

- be in the road corridor, although projects running through parks can be considered if there is a transport outcome.

6. The Upper Harbour Local Board’s LBTCF allocation was $1,835,080 for the current political term. In addition, there is a sum of $764,795 which was approved by the council and became available from 1 July 2018. A summary of projects allocated funding from the LBTCF are listed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Spend to date</th>
<th>Current phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gills Road pedestrian bridge</td>
<td>$297,222</td>
<td>$307,070</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Stayput Signs</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$20,644</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester/Wickham cycle route</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$55,935</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rame Road upgrade</td>
<td>$1,540,000</td>
<td>$106,348</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Road footpath</td>
<td>$544,000</td>
<td>$9,345</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsway Road pedestrian access</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$3,518</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour Drive junction</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$3,393</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gills Road footpath extension</td>
<td>$39,060</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Set up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. At its August 2019 business meeting, the Upper Harbour Local Board allocated the remainder of the LBTCF to the Community Safety Fund project, the Gills Road footpath extension (resolution number UH/2019/92) as below:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

c) approve the remaining balance of $39,060 from the Upper Harbour Local Board Transport Capital Fund to the Gills Road footpath extension project.

8. The following table outlines the status of the LBTCF projects as at 21 August 2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board Transport Capital Fund project status as at 21 August 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rame Road project</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rame Road project is still at the detailed design stage as per the option agreed in December 2018 (resolution number UH/2018/158) with some amendments from the local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT’s internal consultation process was completed on 27 May 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External consultation/public notification is to happen once the updated plan and engagement letter is approved by the local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tender process will commence once the outcome of consultation is known and confirmation is received from the local board to proceed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Kyle Road footpath**                          |
| Detailed design will be approximately eight weeks, with a targeted completion date of mid-September 2019. |
| Tender evaluation and award will be approximately six weeks, with an intended completion date of October 2019. |
| Construction will be approximately eight weeks, with an intended completion date of mid-January 2020. |

| **Upper Harbour Drive junction**                |
| A consultant has been engaged to provide a concept design and rough cost estimate. A draft report is expected in September 2019 for consideration by the project manager. An update will be provided at the board’s business meeting in December 2019. |

| **Kingsway Road pedestrian access upgrade**    |
| The local board allocated $34,000 to carry out improvements to Kingsway Road. The works will commence in September 2019 and will include: |
| bush on both sides of Kingsway Road to be heavily trimmed |
Local Board Transport Capital Fund project status as at 21 August 2019

- northern road edge of seal to be widened at pinch points on the Kauri Road side by excavating and compacting metal and sealing with asphalt by hand
- widening the Herald Island end – the bank at the transformer will be cut back and a low retaining wall, approximately 15m long, will be built to accommodate widening
- reflective studs to be placed just outside the white line.

The contractor is still on target to complete the work by the end of September 2019.

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

9. The impact of information in this report is confined to AT 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.

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

Consultation documents on proposed improvements

10. Consultation documents for the following proposals have been provided to the Upper Harbour Local Board for feedback:

- Begin works for blocks TU3 and TU4 of the Te Uru development in Hobsonville. The site is located on the southern side of Hobsonville Point Road, to the west of Nugget Avenue. Engineering plan approval for these roads has been granted and construction based on the approved design is underway.

- Proposed no stopping at all times parking restrictions on Ceres Court in Rosedale.

11. After consultation, AT considers the feedback received and determines whether to proceed further with the proposal as consulted on, or whether to proceed with an amended proposal if changes are considered necessary.

Major capital works in the Upper Harbour Local Board area

12. The following table outlines the status of major capital works in the Upper Harbour Local Board area as at 26 August 2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major capital works as at 26 August 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gills Road link project and Dairy Flat Highway / The Avenue project</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gills Road link and Dairy Flat Highway / The Avenue projects will undergo a strategic re-evaluation, taking a more holistic view of the issues and opportunities to determine the most appropriate improvements required. This will also include the Albany village area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medallion Drive link project</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Medallion Drive link project has been confirmed and is expected to be completed by mid-2021. Design has been completed and the construction phase will start in February 2020 with an expected completion time of approximately 18 months. More information about this project can be found at <a href="https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/albany-developments/medallion-drive-link/">https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/albany-developments/medallion-drive-link/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian signal on Oteha Valley Road</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT has completed internal consultation and revised the concept. AT will now be undertaking external consultation in early to mid-September. This was delayed due to concerns raised by some internal teams around trees in close proximity to the pedestrian crossing, which have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major capital works as at 26 August 2019

| Dairy Flat Highway / Coatesville-Riverhead Highway intersection | Physical construction works commenced on Monday 19 August 2019. Traffic management is in place and site clearance works are underway. Piling work for the retaining walls will commence during the week of 26 August 2019. Expected completion date for the project will be around mid-2020. |

Issues investigated and responses

13. The local board has requested the following issues be considered, which are still currently under investigation:
   - Hooton Reserve parking controls – meeting with Auckland Council parks department to discuss options for the board’s consideration
   - Traffic lights proposed for Albany Highway
   - Roading issue on the corner of Te Kaua Pass and William Pitcher Place, Greenhithe.

Bush Road parking removal and afternoon/evening clearway

14. External consultation will commence at the beginning of September. When this is complete, AT will report back to the local board.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

15. Receipt of this monthly report presents no impacts on or opportunities for Māori. Any engagement with Māori or consideration of impacts and opportunities will be carried out on an individual project basis.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

16. There are no financial implications to the local board in receiving this monthly update.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

17. Receipt of this monthly report has no risks. AT has risk management strategies in place for the transport projects undertaken in the local board area.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

18. AT provides the Upper Harbour Local Board with the opportunity to comment on transport projects being delivered in the local board area.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Owena Schuster – Elected Member Relationship Manager Auckland Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon – Elected Member Relationship Team Manager Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Perry - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upper Harbour Water Access Assessment

File No.: CP2019/16418

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To adopt the Upper Harbour Local Board Water Access Assessment report dated September 2019 (refer Attachment A).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Upper Harbour Local Board Water Access Assessment was completed in September 2019. The study assesses current water access provision for sport and recreation at a network level and identifies:
   - geographical provision gaps
   - relationships between facilities and activities
   - opportunities to improve network functionality and access to the marine area for sport and recreation.
3. Identified opportunities to improve marine area access and network functionality are prioritised into high, medium, and low categories to assist future decisions and investment into water access in the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) adopt the Upper Harbour Local Board Water Access Assessment report dated September 2019, to guide future decisions and investment into water access in the Upper Harbour Local Board marine area.

b) note that Community Facilities staff will report back to the local board on development opportunities identified in the Upper Harbour Local Board Water Access Assessment and provide options for progressing the improvement of water access at these sites.

Horopaki
Context
4. The Upper Harbour Local Board area features a significant length of coastline around the upper reaches of the Waitematā Harbour, including Lucas Creek and numerous other estuaries. The adjoining marine areas are key recreational space in the local area.

5. Various active sporting groups use this water from within the local board area, including:
   - Hobsonville Yacht Club
   - North Shore Rowing Club
   - Westlake Boys Rowing Club
   - Westlake Girls Rowing Club
   - the Training Ship Bellona Sea Cadet Corps.
6. There are 13 council-owned facilities (nine boat ramps and four wharves) and 138 privately owned facilities for water access throughout the local board area.

7. In 2015/2016, a paddling network feasibility project was undertaken to develop options for a paddling network and set out the required steps for implementing and managing the options for the network relating to Auckland Council regional and local parks. Part of this project focused on several sites in the Upper Harbour Local Board area and identified various potential kayak trails and options to activate these. The areas focused on included Greenhithe/Whenuapai, Lucas Creek/Paremoremo and Birkenhead.

8. The recommendations for paddling network signage were not implemented in the Upper Harbour area, but a document titled ‘Upper Harbour Paddling Guide’ was created that outlined various paddling routes throughout the Waitematā Harbour and Lucas Creek.

9. The Upper Harbour Local Board is conscious of the impact of population growth and the limited funding environment and has signaled a desire to ensure that its marine areas are used as a key recreational asset.

10. The Upper Harbour Local Board Plan 2014 includes the following initiative:
   - Outcome: A healthy, active community that values its sport and recreation facilities
   - Initiative: Investigate opportunities for water sport access across Upper Harbour, particularly Sanders Reserve and Hobsonville.

11. On 18 May 2017, the Upper Harbour Local Board allocated $20,000 locally driven initiatives (LDI) operational funding (resolution number UH/2017/68) to undertake an Upper Harbour feasibility and options assessment for provision of water sport facilities.

12. The scope for the investigation was approved in a workshop with the Upper Harbour Local Board on 18 April 2018.

13. In February 2019, Bespoke Landscape Architects Limited were engaged to undertake the investigation. The assessment was aligned strategically to the following Auckland Council guiding documents:
   - Auckland Plan 2050
   - Auckland Council Parks and Opens Space Strategic Action Plan 2013
   - Auckland Council Open Space Provision Policy 2016
   - Upper Harbour Local Board Plan 2017
   - Upper Harbour Open Space Network Plan (draft 2018)
   - Sport and Recreation in the Lives of Young Aucklanders Upper Harbour Local Board Area Report 2013
   - Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan (2017 refresh).

14. A draft of the Upper Harbour Water Access Assessment was discussed in a workshop with the Upper Harbour Local Board on 13 June 2019. The completed report was delivered to council staff by Bespoke Landscape Architects Limited on 2 September 2019.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

15. The assessment divides the study area into eight catchments.

16. Current water access provision for sport and recreation is considered at a network level and the assessment identifies geographical provision gaps, relationships between facilities and activities, and opportunities to improve network functionality and access to the marine area for sport and recreation.
17. The assessment prioritises opportunities for improving network functionality and water access into low, medium and high categories according to impact on network provision, location and accessibility, activity provision and proximity to population growth.

18. There are 17 network development opportunities identified in the assessment (pages 11-13):
   - six high priority
   - five medium priority
   - six low priority.

19. The six high priority opportunities are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catchment</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hobsonville</td>
<td>Catalina Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limeburner Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nimrod Inlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenuapai</td>
<td>Riverlea Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany and Albany Heights</td>
<td>Wharf Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paremoremo</td>
<td>Sanders Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. The scope of the assessment did not include resolving the impending water access issues at Catalina Bay or identifying a location for a marine recreation centre. However, it was necessary to identify the strategic significance of Catalina Bay within the recreational water access network. This significance is reflected in the report by the Hobsonville catchment having three high priority opportunities due to geographic gaps in provision overlapping with high population growth.

21. It is recommended that development opportunities identified in the assessment, particularly the high and medium priority opportunities, should be further investigated for implementation.

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

22. The assessment identifies several locations where there is opportunity to improve water access for sport and recreation. Each location has its own context, constraints and stakeholders. These council-based stakeholders may include, without limitation:
   - Auckland Transport
   - Infrastructure and Environmental Services
   - Community Facilities
   - Parks Sport and Recreation.

23. Relevant council stakeholders should be consulted in the process of investigating each individual development opportunity.

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

24. The Upper Harbour Local Board is conscious of the impact of population growth within a limited funding environment and has signaled a desire to ensure that its marine areas are used as a key recreational asset.

25. The Upper Harbour Local Board Plan 2014 includes the following initiative:
• Outcome: A healthy, active community that values its sport and recreation facilities.

• Initiative: Investigate opportunities for water sport access across Upper Harbour, particularly Sanders Reserve and Hobsonville.

26. On 18 May 2017, the Upper Harbour Local Board allocated $20,000 LDI operational funding (resolution number UH/2017/68) to undertake an Upper Harbour feasibility and options assessment for provision of water sport facilities.

27. The scope for the assessment was discussed in a workshop with the Upper Harbour Local Board on 18 April 2018.

28. An 80 per cent complete draft report was discussed in a workshop with the Upper Harbour Local Board on 13 June 2019.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

29. The assessment is focused on recreational access to the marine area. Input from mana whenua must be sought in relation to any proposed development initiative. Each location has its own context, constraints and stakeholders, so it is considered necessary to treat each development on a case-by-case basis.

30. Mana whenua will be advised of the completed assessment. It is recommended that advance notice of any potential individual development initiative arising from the report be provided in order that mana whenua can provide input at an early stage.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

31. The Upper Harbour Local Board allocated funding of $20,000 LDI capital expenditure to their Community Facilities 2019/2020 work programme, and a further $30,000 asset-based services capital expenditure is indicated in 2020/2021 to begin implementation of actions from the water access assessment.

32. The current budget allocation is not sufficient to progress all identified development opportunities. Prioritisation of works will be required to effectively apply the available funds.

33. Future financial allocations will need to be determined through investigation and design processes for each individual development site.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

34. Adoption of the Upper Harbour Water Access Assessment will indicate that the Upper Harbour Local Board has a commitment to maintaining and enhancing recreational water access within its boundaries. There is a risk that the current 2019/2020 budget of $20,000 and indicative 2020/2021 budget of $30,000 will be insufficient to maintain and enhance water access across the study area.

35. It is likely that additional future budget allocation will be required to implement identified development opportunities. Further investigation is required to assess the estimated cost of identified development opportunities. It is noted that these further investigations are in the Community Facilities work programme for the current financial year.

36. There is risk that coastal inundation may change the current relationship of coastal land and infrastructure to the marine area. This could affect the relevance or validity of the assessment’s findings. Although coastal inundation is predicted as one of a number of impacts of climate change, the precise implications at local sites within the assessment area are difficult to predict. It is advised that council’s coastal infrastructure specialists (Infrastructure and Environmental Services) are engaged during planning of any coastal infrastructure works.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

37. Staff will further investigate the development opportunities identified in the assessment and present the local board with options for progressing the improvement of water access at these sites by quarter three of 2019/2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Upper Harbour Local Board Water Access Assessment, September 2019 (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Nick Harris - Sport &amp; Recreation Team Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Mace Ward - General Manager Parks, Sports and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Perry - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To approve the Draft Upper Harbour Urban Forest (Ngahere) Analysis Report 2019 (refer Attachment A.)

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The Upper Harbour Local Board provided locally driven initiatives (LDI) operational funding of $15,000 in the 2018/2019 financial year to undertake the ‘Knowing’ phase of the Urban Ngahere (Forest) programme.

3. The ‘Knowing’ phase has involved detailed analysis of the urban tree cover using a variety of data sources from the council, Statistics New Zealand 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 as outlined in the Auckland Plan.

4. The report has established that urban tree coverage in the local board area was approximately 27 per cent of the overall land area in 2013. The total tree cover is excellent when compared to the averages across the region and is 12 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 of less than 15 per cent.

5. To continue to maintain the tree canopy cover in the long term, new specimen trees will still need to be planted annually.

6. In the 2019/2020 financial year, the local board has provided LDI operational funding of $10,000 to undertake the ‘Growing’ phase of the Ngahere programme. This will commence work to develop the long-term planting plan (1-10 years), to help coordinate and direct local planting initiatives to maintain or increase the tree cover in areas where it is most needed, along with work to develop partnerships to help grow native plants locally.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) approve the draft Upper Harbour Urban Forest (Ngahere) Analysis Report (refer to Attachment A to the agenda report).

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 draft Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report that are required before public release.
Horopaki

Context

7. In 2017, Auckland Council staff developed a regional tree strategy to address concerns around tree cover changes resulting from: development pressures, disease threats, climate change, and changes to tree protection rules. The development of the strategy included workshops and consultation with elected members, mana whenua, and internal stakeholders. The work resulted in the regional Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy, which was adopted by the Environment and Community Committee in February 2018.

8. Currently the region has an average tree canopy cover of 18 per cent. The strategy sets targets that encourages all local boards to have a minimum tree canopy cover of at least 15 per cent, and on a regional scale the target is set at 30 per cent by 2050, in line with the Auckland Plan.

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

10. The local board Urban Ngahere programme has three phases: ‘Knowing’, ‘Growing’ and ‘Protecting’. The ‘Knowing’ phase involves establishing an accurate current state analysis report with recommendations for future actions. The ‘Growing’ phase involves a number of activities, including annual tree plantings ongoing to address areas of low tree cover. The Upper Harbour Local Board has allocated LDI operational funding of $10,000 to begin the ‘Growing’ phase in the 2019/2020 financial year.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

11. The analysis report highlights the excellent overall tree canopy coverage at 27 per cent for the Upper Harbour local board area.

12. The report provides a number of other statistics:
   - 27 per cent of the local board area has tree canopy cover
   - 21 per cent of parks and open space has tree canopy cover
   - 4.4 per cent of local roads have tree canopy cover, which is very low
   - 67 per cent of urban tree cover is on private land.

13. Section 6.6 of the report sets out some key focus areas for increasing the tree canopy coverage in target areas 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.

14. Funding for an ongoing annual programme of tree planting on public land in parks, open space areas and especially 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 maintain the area’s overall tree canopy coverage.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

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

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

18. The Upper Harbour Local Board has provided direction and support for the project at a workshop in September 2018 to complete the 'Knowing' phase. The board provided in-principle support to adopt the report at the August 2019 workshop.

19. 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.

20. The board has also provided LDI operational funding of $10,000 for the next stage of the Ngahere programme in the 2019/2020 financial year.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

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

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

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

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

24. It is recommended the local board adopts a long-term annual programme 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 programme should take place annually over a number of years to help increase tree canopy cover in local parks, reserves and along the road corridor.

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

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

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

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

28. The analysis report highlights a need for additional efforts to 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 resilience planning-related changes that are taking place.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

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

30. Community Services and Community Facilities will work collaboratively to develop an outline of the ‘Growing’ programme to set out new tree planting plans for next five years. The long-term growing plan for the planting programme 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>A</td>
<td>Draft Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
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<td>Authorisers</td>
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Road name approval: New roads within the subdivision at 13 Scott Road, Hobsonville

File No.: CP2019/15508

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To name a new public road and a new private road created by way of subdivision at 13 Scott Road, Hobsonville.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Auckland Council has road naming guidelines that set out the requirements and criteria of the council for proposed road names. These requirements and criteria have been applied in this situation to ensure consistency of road naming across the Auckland region.
3. The applicant, Simon Property Development Company Limited, has submitted the following names:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road 1</td>
<td>Takahikare Road</td>
<td>Kāruhiruhi Road</td>
<td>Rāpunga Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jointly owned access lot (JOAL) 100</td>
<td>Pararā Way</td>
<td>Pakaha Way</td>
<td>Kawau Tui Way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:
a) approve the following names for the new public and private roads constructed within the subdivision being undertaken by the Simon Property Development Co. Limited at 13 Scott Road, Hobsonville:
   i) road 1 –
   ii) jointly owned access lot 100 –

Horopaki
Context
4. Resource consent has been obtained for a 42-lot residential subdivision at 13 Scott Road, Hobsonville. A site plan of the roads and development can be found at Attachment A of this report, along with a location map at Attachment B.
5. In accordance with the national addressing standard, all public roads require a name. The private road also requires a name as it serves more than five lots.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
6. Auckland Council’s road naming criteria typically require that road names reflect:
   • an historical or ancestral linkage to an area
Item 22

7. The applicant has chosen names based on the theme of sea birds (in te reo Māori), as the roads in the immediate area have mostly been named after animals, especially birds. The proposed road names, along with their meanings, are listed in the following table in order of preference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Proposed name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road 1</td>
<td>Takahikare Road</td>
<td>New Zealand white-faced storm petrel, <em>Pelagodroma marina</em></td>
<td>Meets criteria – thematic and unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kāruhiruhi Road</td>
<td>Pied shag, <em>Phalacrocorax varius</em></td>
<td>Meets criteria – thematic and unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rāpunga Drive</td>
<td>Seagull, southern black-backed gull, <em>Larus dominicanus</em></td>
<td>Meets criteria – thematic and unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOAL 100</td>
<td>Pararā Way</td>
<td>Broad-billed prion, a common seabird, <em>Pachyptila vittata</em></td>
<td>Meets criteria – thematic and unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakaha Way</td>
<td>Fluttering shearwater, <em>Puffinus gavia</em></td>
<td>Meets criteria – thematic and unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kawau Tui Way</td>
<td>Little black shag, <em>Phalacrocorax sulcirostris</em></td>
<td>Meets criteria – thematic and unique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) has confirmed the proposed and alternate names are acceptable and no duplicates exist within the Auckland region. The names are also deemed to meet council’s road naming guidelines.

9. All iwi in the Auckland area were written to and invited to comment, and the following responses were received:
   - Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua – deferred comment to local iwi
   - Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei – deferred comment to Te Kawerau a Maki who did not respond
   - Ngāti Manuhuri – supported the proposed names.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

10. The decision sought for this report does not trigger any significance policy and is not considered to have any immediate impacts on any council groups.

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

Local impacts and local board views

11. Auckland Council allocated the responsibility for the naming of new roads to local boards, pursuant to section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974. A decision is therefore sought from the Upper Harbour Local Board in this report.

12. The decision sought for this report does not trigger any significant policy and is not considered to have any immediate impact on the community.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
13. The applicant has corresponded with local iwi and no objections were received.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
14. 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
15. 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
16. Approved road names are notified to LINZ who records them on their New Zealand-wide land information database, which includes street addresses issued by councils.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13 Scott Road - scheme plan</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>13 Scott Road - location map</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>Eric Perry - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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Road name approval: New roads within the subdivision at 13 Scott Road, Hobsonville
Te take mō te pūrongo

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

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. Auckland Council is reviewing the Animal Management Bylaw 2015 as part of its required five-year statutory review.

3. In May 2019, staff circulated a draft findings report on the bylaw review to all local boards. Eighteen local boards requested individual workshops to ask staff questions and provide informal views on the draft findings. Staff conducted these workshops in June and July 2019.

4. The workshop discussions about the draft findings report included:
   • animal nuisances occurring regionally and locally
   • issues with some definitions in the bylaw
   • requirements to provide identification for owned animals
   • Auckland Council’s processes for managing animals
   • current and suggested controls on specific animals, e.g. stock, bees, horses, and cats.

5. This report summarises the informal views provided at these workshops. These informal views will guide staff in developing and assessing options for managing animals in Auckland.

6. This report also gives local boards an opportunity to formalise any views before staff present findings and options to the Regulatory Committee (or a committee similarly established in the new political term of council) in early 2020. Staff will seek direction from the committee at that time if the bylaw needs to be confirmed, amended, or revoked.

7. Local boards will have another opportunity to provide formal views when staff develop a statement of proposal following the Regulatory Committee’s recommendations.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

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

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

Context


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

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

**Figure 1 – Animal Management Bylaw 2015 framework**

The bylaw does not address dogs


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

The bylaw does not regulate animal welfare

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

20. The following sections summarise informal local board views from the workshops collectively. The sections provide informal views on:
   - ongoing animal nuisance issues
   - the bylaw’s definition of ‘owner’
   - the bylaw’s definition of ‘nuisance’
   - exclusion rules for companion animals
   - identifying owned animals
   - the council’s processes for managing animals
   - views on existing and new controls for specific animals.

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 - Local board informal views on animal nuisances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feeding wild pigeons and seagulls is causing a nuisance.

**Cats**
- There are large numbers of stray cats across the region.
- Cats breed in construction and development spaces.
- Cats cause a nuisance by defecating in vegetable gardens.
- Abandoned kittens become feral and cause nuisance.
- Cats are eating native wildlife.

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

**Table 2 - Local Board informal views on the definition of ‘owner’**

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

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

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

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

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

   Table 3 - Local board informal views on the definition of ‘nuisance’

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

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

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

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

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

   Table 4 - Local board informal views on adding companion animals in the bylaw’s definitions

**Companion animals should have separate rules**

- Some animals should be defined as companion animals in the bylaw.
- The bylaw should make exceptions if any animal is defined as stock but is a pet.
- Companion animals should be excluded from the bylaw rules.
  - Goats are popular pets and can be good companions.
  - Farm animals as pets can provide the same benefits as traditional pets.

**Companion animals should not have separate rules**

- Companion animals which are stock animals should still require the same licensing process as other stock animals.
- Companion animals should not have their own rules as some neighbours are not familiar or okay with stock animals being kept as pets.
• 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.

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

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

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

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

**Table 5 - 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.

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

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

36. The draft findings report identified that some Aucklanders are unclear about the council’s processes and protocols for managing animals, especially unowned animals. This confusion reduces people’s willingness to report nuisance as they are unsure who is responsible. Only 2 per cent of surveyed respondents who experienced animal nuisance reported it to the council.

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

**Table 6 - 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.
38. In response to questions from local boards at the workshops, staff note the following:

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

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

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

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

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

**Table 7 - 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><strong>Bees</strong></td>
<td>Any properties, urban or rural, can keep any number of bees. Beekeepers must manage the flight path and temperament of their bees. Beekeepers must ensure nuisance from their bees’ excrement is minimised, and the bees have a suitable water source on the premises.</td>
<td>The council should restrict beekeeping if people have bee-sting allergies. Limit the number of beehives in an area to prevent colony competition. Increase awareness and visibility of who keeps bees in an area. Restrict beekeeping to rural areas. Restrict the number of beehives a person can have in urban areas. Restrict beehive ownership by size of property. There should be minimum training or qualification to own bees. You need experience. Amateur beekeepers should be treated differently to commercial beekeepers.</td>
<td>Bees are not causing much nuisance, so there is no need for more regulation. We should be encouraging beekeeping. Should regulate rather than overregulate. Do not restrict bees to just rural 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><strong>Horses</strong></td>
<td>Local boards are</td>
<td>The same access rules</td>
<td>Horse owners should be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Item 23

### Animal Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Current control</th>
<th>Views on more control</th>
<th>Views on same or less control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Horses | able to set specific controls for horses for local parks and beaches.  
- Horses are currently not allowed to be kept in urban areas without a licence from the council unless the premises is larger than 4000 square metres.  
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. | for dogs on beaches should be applied to horses.  
- Do not prohibit horses on beaches but restrict them to off-peak times.  
- Should lobby central government to include the same powers that protect native fauna and wildlife from dogs for horses. | responsible for removing manure. The bylaw should encourage accountability and consider that picking up manure is not always practical, e.g. on busy roads.  
- Should be allowed to ride horses on berms.  
- Horses should not be banned from roads. There are few places to ride.  
- 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 4000 square metres.  
Stock in urban areas must also be restrained within the boundaries of the premises on which they are kept, and chicken | 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 | 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)*

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

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

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

**Table 8 - Local board informal views on controls for cats and other animals**

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

*Informal views on not introducing controls for cats |

• Cat registration is difficult and has failed before. Auckland Council already has difficulty registering and enforcing dogs.
• Rely on the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 guidelines.
- Cats naturally wander. Containing them would be cruel.
- The council should invest in substantial long-term public education regarding cats.
- If the council restricts caring for stray cats, it could create animal welfare issues.
- Controlling cats is too trivial for the council to get involved.

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

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

**Other views from local boards**

*Rights of property owners and protection*

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

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

*Enforcement*

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

49. The Local Government Act 2002 does not give the power to issue an infringement notice under a bylaw. Compliance officers have said this inhibits their ability to address nuisance issues as, after trying to elicit voluntary compliance, the next step is prosecution. This can be costly to the council.
50. Some local boards provided views that the Local Government Act 2002 should be amended to allow for infringement fines. Some local boards viewed that the bylaw would already be fit for purpose if it could be enforced with infringements.

**Education**

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

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

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

**Council group impacts and views**

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

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

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

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

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

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

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

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

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

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

59. Local boards will have an opportunity to provide formal resolutions on any changes proposed to the bylaw in early 2020 before a public consultative procedure.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

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

61. Staff will seek formal local board views when developing a statement of proposal once the committee gives direction on animal management.
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What is the bylaw about?

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

- protects the public from nuisance
- maintains and promotes public health and safety
- minimises the potential for offensive behavior in public places
- manages animals in public places.

Contains specific controls for:

- keeping of bees in an urban area
- keeping of stock in an urban area
- horses in public places.

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

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

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

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

Local Government Act 2002 – Statutory review

- Bylaw must be reviewed within five years of being made
- The council must decide whether:
  - a bylaw is the most appropriate way of addressing the perceived problem
  - the bylaw is ‘fit for purpose’
  - the current bylaw gives rise to any Bill of Rights implications
  - to retain, amend, replace, or revoke the bylaw
- Auckland Council Regulatory Committee
Most Aucklanders own animals.
People’s Panel data on animal ownership

No animal ownership (pg. 9)

Overall (pg. 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animals on property</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
<th>Average amount (Range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cats</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1.6 (1-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1.4 (1-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens / roosters</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6.7 (1-150,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish (indoor and/or outdoor)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13.2 (1-200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.0 (1-3,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.0 (1-150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bees</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.0 (1-80 hives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cows</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.0 (1-740)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbits</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1.0 (1-150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>included - insects, frogs, hedgehogs, and worms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses / ponies</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1.0 (1-33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.0 (1-950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.0 (1-83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea pigs</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.0 (1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mice / rats</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.0 (1-200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.0 (1-1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owns no animals</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People’s Panel data on animal ownership

Cats (pg. 8)

Chickens and roosters (pg. 10)
Many Aucklanders are experiencing animal nuisance
Top issues from complaints data and People’s Panel

Council complaints data 2015-2019

( pg. 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Examples of complaints</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wandering</td>
<td>Stock on roads and property</td>
<td>117,601 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animals getting into left out rubbish</td>
<td>107,374 (involving dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,227 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Barking and crowing</td>
<td>88,187 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86,657 (involving dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,530 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faeces</td>
<td>Wandering animals leaving poop on property</td>
<td>2,206 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owners not picking up after their animals</td>
<td>1,795 (involving dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>411 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead animals</td>
<td>Dead animals dumped on side of roads</td>
<td>1,268 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dead animals in ponds and storm water fields</td>
<td>671 (involving dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>595 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smell</td>
<td>Bad odours attracting mice and rats</td>
<td>1,244 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decomposing animals</td>
<td>408 (involving dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smelly chicken coops</td>
<td>836 (without dogs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People’s Panel April 2019

( pg. 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Examples of nuisance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,550 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhygienic behaviour</td>
<td>Animal faeces left in parks, walkways or on private property, especially vegetable gardens</td>
<td>1,550 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal wandering</td>
<td>Animals wandering into neighbouring property</td>
<td>895 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory nuisance</td>
<td>Odour from animal excreta</td>
<td>697 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loud animals, especially crowing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to property</td>
<td>Scratched deck furniture</td>
<td>531 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yard dug up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property damage from animal faeces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Animals attacking native wildlife</td>
<td>423 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeding wild animals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressive looking livestock in public areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discouraged animals in public areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad behaviour</td>
<td>Pets and people being attacked by aggressive animals</td>
<td>370 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter</td>
<td>Finding the practice of killing animals offensive</td>
<td>59 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Witnessing slaughter or leftover remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top nuisances (People’s Panel)

Overall nuisance rates (pg. 17)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- **Animal management** — animal management officers mostly enforce dogs. AMOs not responsible for cats, wildlife, animal pests, birds, marine mammals or urban poultry, bees or stock.

  - **Stock** — “cattle, deer...poultry and any other animal kept in captivity, or farmed, an dependent on humans for their care and sustenance.”

  - **Poultry** — “means any live bird that is kept or raised for the purpose of producing eggs, hatching eggs or poultry products and includes chickens, ducks... roosters and swans.”
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)
### Beekeeping in urban areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keeping of Bees Control - Flight path management</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keeping of Bees Control - Bee management</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keeping of Bees Control - Provision of water</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keeping of Bees Control - Bee excrement management</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) Every person keeping bees in an urban area must take all reasonable steps to minimise nuisance to any other person from bee excrement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Horse riding in a public place

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

1. A horse must remove or safely dispose of any horse manure that is deposited in a public place;
2. Must show due consideration for other public place users at all times;
3. 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
4. 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

1. The following conditions apply to the presence of horses on Aplins Beach, Hatfields Beach, Martins Bay Beach, Ocean Beach, Orewa Beach and Snells Beach –
   - horses must not be ridden or lead along the beach between the times of mid and low tide and must be ridden or lead alone; the beach between the high tide mark; between 1 December and 15 February (including weekends), horses are only allowed before 10:00am and after 7:00pm; and
   - horses are prohibited at Easter weekend (Friday to Monday inclusive) and Labour weekend (Saturday to Monday inclusive).
2. The following conditions apply to the presence of horses on Kariotahi Beach as shown in Schedule 1 –
   - during high use periods, horses are restricted to a walk within the 1km ZONE, at all other times horses are restricted to a walk within the Safe Zone;
   - within the 1km ZONE, horses must remain within 10 metres of the water’s edge wherever possible;
   - horse manure must be removed from the 1km ZONE; and
   - the unloading of horses is only permitted in the Horse Unloading Area.
Current bylaw controls (2/3)

Keeping of stock in urban areas (1/2)

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

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

Explanatory note: Obligations of animal owners still apply as contained in clauses 6, 7 and 8 of the Animal Management Bylaw.
## Current bylaw controls (3/3)

### Keeping of stock in urban areas (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keeping of Stock Control – Prevention of wandering stock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) The owner of any stock in an urban area must ensure their stock is restrained within the boundaries of the premises on which they are kept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

- **Bees (pg. 53)** — restrict to rural, require urban licence, restrict number of hives in urban, excrement unenforceable
  - People’s Panel — Bee controls
  - About right: 66%
  - No view/don’t know: 24%
  - Less control: 7%
  - More control: 4%

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

- **Stock (pg. 59)** — no stock in urban areas, ban roosters in urban areas and rural-urban boundary, stricter fencing rules, restrict how close coops to property boundaries
  - People’s Panel — Stock controls
  - About right: 63%
  - No view/don’t know: 25%
  - More control: 9%
  - Less control: 3%
Views on new controls

People's Panel

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

*Other* includes sheep, snakes, guinea pigs, reptiles, mustelids, stoats, wasps, and fish

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

File No.: CP2019/16362

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 should consult with the chairperson. After the election, there will be no local board portfolio holders or chairpersons 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 chairperson. Staff will consult with the local board chairperson 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 Upper Harbour 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 chairperson and deputy chairperson 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 chairperson where there is no portfolio holder in place), from 22 October 2019, noting that staff will consult with the chairperson 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 2019, 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 chairperson and deputy chairperson the power to make urgent decisions on behalf of the local board during this period.

13. The urgent decision-making process enables the local 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 2019 (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 chairpersons and deputy chairpersons 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 chairperson.

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 chairperson where there is no portfolio holder). However, after the election, there will be no portfolio holders or chairpersons 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 chairperson following the inaugural meeting until new arrangements are made at the first business meeting in the term.

Appointment to external bodies

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

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

24. The arrangements proposed in this report enable the council to process routine local matters during the election period. They apply only to local boards. The reduced political decision-making will be communicated to the wider council group.
25. The Governing Body has made its own arrangements to cover the election period, including delegating the power to make urgent decisions between the last Governing Body meeting of the term and the day the current term ends, to any two of the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and a chairperson of a committee of the whole. From the commencement of the term of office of the new members until the Governing Body's inaugural meeting, the Chief Executive will carry out decision-making under his current delegations.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
26. This is a report to all local boards that proposes arrangements to enable the council to process routine local matters during the election period. This will enable the council to meet timeframes and provide good customer service.

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

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
28. The decisions sought in this report are procedural and there are no significant financial implications.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
29. There is a risk that unforeseen decisions will arise during this period, such as a decision that is politically significant or a decision that exceeds the Chief Executive’s financial delegations.
30. This risk has been mitigated by scheduling meetings as late possible in the current term and communicating to reporting staff that significant decisions should not be made during October 2019.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
31. The decision of the local board will be communicated to senior staff so that they are aware of the arrangements for the month of October 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Anna Bray - Policy and Planning Manager - Local Boards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Perry - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To present the updated governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. The governance forward work calendar for the Upper Harbour Local Board is in Attachment A. The calendar is updated monthly, reported to business meetings and distributed to council staff.
3. The governance forward work calendars were introduced in 2016 as part of Auckland Council's quality advice programme and aim to support local boards' governance role by:
   • ensuring advice on meeting agendas is driven by local board priorities
   • clarifying what advice is expected and when
   • clarifying the rationale for reports.
4. The calendar also aims to provide guidance for staff supporting local boards and greater transparency for the public.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:
a) receive the Upper Harbour Local Board governance forward work calendar for the period October 2019 to September 2020, as set out in Attachment A to this agenda report.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Upper Harbour Local Board governance forward work calendar - October 2019 to September 2020</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Cindy Lynch - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Eric Perry - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Draft Golf Facilities Investment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-19</td>
<td>inaugural business meeting (swearing in new local board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-19</td>
<td>Q1 Reporting: July to September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-19</td>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-Dec-19</td>
<td>Auckland climate action plan (previously Low Carbon Auckland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-Dec-19</td>
<td>RFA quarterly report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Dec-19</td>
<td>[Extraordinary meeting] Agree consultation material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-19</td>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-20</td>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-20</td>
<td>Q2 reporting: October 2019 to December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-20</td>
<td>RFA quarterly report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-20</td>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-20</td>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-20</td>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-20</td>
<td>Q3 Reporting: January to March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-20</td>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-20</td>
<td>Adopt local board work programmes FY21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-20</td>
<td>Adopt local board agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-20</td>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-20</td>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-20</td>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Record of the Upper Harbour Local Board workshops held on Thursday 22 August, and 5 and 12 September 2019

File No.: CP2019/15221

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. An Upper Harbour Local Board workshop was held on Thursday 22 August, and 5 and 12 September 2019. Copies of the workshop records are attached (refer to Attachments A, B and C).

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) receive the record of the Upper Harbour Local Board workshops held on Thursday 22 August, and 5 and 12 September 2019 (refer to Attachments A, B and C to the agenda report).

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Upper Harbour Local Board record of workshop - 22 August 2019</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Upper Harbour Local Board record of workshop - 5 September 2019</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Upper Harbour Local Board record of workshop - 12 September 2019</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Cindy Lynch - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Eric Perry - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Upper Harbour Local Board workshop record

Workshop record of the Upper Harbour Local Board held in the Upper Harbour Local Board office, Kell Drive, Albany Village, on 22 August 2019, commencing at 9.30am.

**Chairperson:** Margaret Miles  
**Members:** Uzra Casuri Balouch, Nicholas Mayne, John McLean, Brian Naess  
**Apologies:** Deputy Chairperson Lisa Whyte

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work programme update: Community Facilities</td>
<td>To provide an update on the work programme</td>
<td>Representatives from Ventia were in attendance to provide members with an annual progress report on the key performance indicators specified by the local board at the beginning of their contract. Staff from the Kauri Diaback team were also in attendance to gather feedback from members on preferred options for mitigation measures in affected local parks. A formal report seeking the board’s approval for this mitigation programme will be coming to the September 2019 business meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenters:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shar Farland Ventia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grant Muir Ventia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grant Jennings Programme Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leigh Redovan Senior Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cherie Veza Stakeholder Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Work programme update: Community Places | To provide an update on the work programme | Staff from Community Places were in attendance to provide members with a quarterly update on community facilities in Albany, Hobsonville and Meadowood. |
| Presenters: | | |
| - Jamie Adkins Manager, Albany Hub | | |
| - Marilyn Kelly Senior Relationship Advisor | | |

| Work programme update: Community Leasing | Proposed new community lease to Albany Hall Committee Inc | The Community Lease Specialist was in attendance to seek feedback from the board on proposed lease renewals for the Albany Hall Committee and the Sustainable Paremoremo Group. The lease renewals will be formalised in a report to the local board’s September 2019 business meeting. |
| Presenters: | Proposed new community lease to Sustainable Paremoremo Group | | |
| - Michelle Knudsen Community Lease Specialist | | |
**Record of the Upper Harbour Local Board workshops held on Thursday 22 August, and 5 and 12 September 2019**

---

**Attachment A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Work programme update: Infrastructure and Environmental Services (I&ES)

**Presenters:**
- Miriana Knox  
  I&ES Relationship Advisor
- Cushla Barfoot  
  Wilkinson Environmental Ltd
- Sonia Parra  
  Senior Healthy Waters Specialist (via Skype)

- Provide an update on the Industry Pollution Prevention Programme

The Senior Advisor from Wilkinson Environmental Ltd, supported by council staff, was in attendance to update members on phase 1 of the Industry Pollution Prevention Programme, recently implemented in Rosedale.

Phase 2 of the programme will begin in January 2020 with 100 site visits planned, along with a number of educational sessions for businesses in the area.

### Regional Facilities Auckland (RFA) update

**Presenters:**
- Paul Nisbet  
  Director Auckland Stadiums
- Steve West  
  Head of Facilities
- Judy Lawley  
  Manager Local Board Engagement

- Provide an update

The Director of Auckland Stadiums, supported by other RFA staff, was in attendance to update board members on their plans to reconfigure the sports fields which will increase capacity and flexibility for both high-performance and community use.

### Local Parks Management Plan: Results from stakeholder engagement

**Presenter:**
- Jacqueline Collins  
  Service and Asset Planner

- Update on submissions received from the Local Parks Management Plan (LPMP) initial public consultation held in July/August
- Update on key stakeholder feedback gathered in preparation of drafting the Local Parks Management Plan

The Service and Asset Planner was in attendance to update members on phase 1 of the public consultation stage for the Local Parks Management Plan (LPMP). Consultation has been extended for a further week with various methods of engagement utilised to enable good response rates.

Further engagement will be undertaken with mana whenua before drafting of the LPMP starts in 2020.

---

The workshop concluded at 1.41pm
### Upper Harbour Local Board workshop record

Workshop record of the Upper Harbour Local Board held in the Upper Harbour Local Board office, Kell Drive, Albany Village, on 5 September 2019, commencing at 10am

**Chairperson:** Margaret Miles  
**Deputy Chairperson:** Laa Whyte  
**Members:** Uzra Casuri Balouch, Nicholas Mayne, John McLean, Brian Neeson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Work programme: Parks, Sport & Recreation (PSR) | To provide an update on selected PSR 2019/2020 work programme items | The Parks and Places Specialist was in attendance to discuss the direction of two new items in the 2019/2020 work programme. This feedback will ensure the scope and intention align with the outcomes sought.  
The Sports and Recreation Lead was in attendance to discuss the key performance indicators for the Tennis Northern operational grant prior to a funding agreement being completed.  
The Activation Advisor was in attendance to provide a progress update on the 2019/2020 activation of parks, places and open spaces programme and gather feedback on the process moving forward. |
| **Presenters:** | | |
| • Jeff Lyford  
  Parks & Places Specialist | | |
| • Laura Bertelsen  
  Sports & Recreation Lead | | |
| • Sanjeev Karan  
  Activation Advisor | | |
| • Michelle Sanderson  
  PSR Portfolio Manager | | |
| North Shore Memorial Park development | Information only | The Senior Service Development Specialist was in attendance at the request of the local board to provide an overview on challenges and planning for the North Shore Memorial Park.  
A further update will be provided in early 2020 to discuss potential greenways connections through the park. |
| **Presenters:** | | |
| • Rosie Stoney  
  Senior Service Development Specialist | | |
| Work programme: Arts, Community & Events (ACE) | To present ideas to the board on the Community Arts work programme for Upper Harbour | The Arts and Culture Advisor, supported by various staff from Arts, Community and Events, was in attendance to discuss ideas for the board’s allocation towards a community arts programme in 2019/2020.  
A further update will be provided in February or March 2020 to discuss progress made on this work programme line item. |
| **Presenters:** | | |
| • Xenthe Jujnovich  
  Arts & Culture Advisor | | |
| • Monica Sharma  
  Strategic Broker | | |
| • Marilyn Kelly  
  Community Places Senior Relationship Advisor | | |
| • Ayr Jones  
  Specialist Advisor | | |
### Item 26

**Update on Albany library services**

**Presenters:**
- Darryl Soljan  
  Head of Community Libraries
- Tracey Williams  
  Service & Asset Planning Specialist
- Angela Yang  
  Service & Asset Planning Assistant

- To present the current state of findings about library services in Upper Harbour
- To seek feedback on proposed options for future provision

The Service and Asset Planning Specialist and the Head of Community Libraries were in attendance to discuss options for future library service provision in the local board area in the context of the current lease expiring in October 2023. Staff will present the findings of the detailed options investigation to the local board in April 2020 and confirm at that time, which options will be taken to business case.

---

The workshop concluded at 1.39pm
## Upper Harbour Local Board workshop record

Workshop record of the Upper Harbour Local Board held in the Upper Harbour Local Board office, Kell Drive, Albany Village, on 12 September 2019, commencing at 9.45am

### Chairperson:
Margaret Miles

### Deputy Chairperson:
Lisa Whyte

### Members:
Uzra Casuri Belouch, Nicholas Mayne, John McLean, Brian Neeson (until 10.52am)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maori Responsiveness budget Presenters:</td>
<td>To share the initial scope and potential focus for this line item</td>
<td>The Strategic Broker and Specialist Advisor from Arts, Culture and Events (ACE) were in attendance to discuss ideas for the board’s allocation towards the Maori Responsiveness line item in the 2019/2020 work programme. A further update will be provided at a workshop early in 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monica Sharma Strategic Broker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ayr Jones Specialist Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE update: Albany Placemaking / Newcomers Network Presenters:</td>
<td>Update on activity undertaken in this area and share insights to help inform future programming</td>
<td>Various ACE staff were in attendance to provide the local board with an update on the series of local activations held in the area over the past few weeks. Staff will continue to build connections and community capacity within Albany and surrounding areas. A further update will be provided to the new board early in 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monica Sharma Strategic Broker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marilyn Kelly Senior Relationship Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ayr Jones Specialist Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Naomi Layzell Specialist Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jamie Adkins Programme Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport (AT) updates: Presenters:</td>
<td>To inform and update</td>
<td>Auckland Transport staff were in attendance to provide board members with the latest information on the following projects:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rame Road project</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rame Road project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gills Road footpath</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gills Road footpath extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sreekantith Vidhyadharan AT Investigation &amp; Design Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Narinder Bassan AT Minor Capital Delivery Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Owena Schuster AT Elected Member Relationship Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 11.55am
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. An opportunity is provided for members to update the Upper Harbour Local Board on projects and issues they have been involved with since the last meeting.

   [Note: This is an information item and if the board wishes any action to be taken under this item, a written report must be provided for inclusion on the agenda.]

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) receive the verbal board members’ reports.

b) receive the attendance record of members as submitted by Deputy Chairperson L Whyte, in response to requests from residents via social media for more transparency on attendance.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Record of attendance for Upper Harbour Local Board members for the triennium 2016-2019</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Cindy Lynch - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Eric Perry - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Board members' reports - September 2019

### Item 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Balouch</th>
<th>Mayne</th>
<th>McLean</th>
<th>Mills</th>
<th>Nelson</th>
<th>Whyte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/11/2016</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/11/2016</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/11/2016</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/11/2016</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/11/2016</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/12/2016</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/12/2016</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/12/2016</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/12/2016</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/02/2017</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/02/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/02/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/02/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/02/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/02/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/04/2017</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/04/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/04/2017</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/04/2017</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/04/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/05/2017</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/05/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/05/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/05/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/06/2017</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/06/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/06/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/06/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/07/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/07/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/07/2017</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/07/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/08/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/08/2017</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/08/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/08/2017</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/08/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/09/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/09/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/09/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/09/2017</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/10/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2017</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/10/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/11/2017</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/2017</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/12/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/12/2017</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/01/2018</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/02/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/02/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/03/2018</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/04/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/04/2018</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/05/2018</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/05/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/05/2018</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/06/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2018</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/06/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/07/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/07/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/07/2018</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/08/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/09/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/09/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*On other council business*
## Board members' reports - September 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Boucher</th>
<th>Mayne</th>
<th>McLean</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Neeson</th>
<th>Whyte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/06/2018</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/06/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2018</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/06/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/07/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/07/2018</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/07/2018</td>
<td>“Workshop”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/07/2018</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/07/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/08/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/08/2018</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/08/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/08/2018</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/08/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/09/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/09/2018</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/09/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/09/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/09/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/10/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/10/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11/2018</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/11/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/11/2018</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/2018</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/01/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/01/2019</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/02/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/02/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/02/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/03/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/03/2019</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/03/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/2019</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/04/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/04/2019</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/04/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/04/2019</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/05/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/05/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/05/2019</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/05/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/06/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/06/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/06/2019</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/06/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/07/2019</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/07/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/07/2019</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/07/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/07/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/08/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/08/2019</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/08/2019</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/08/2019</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/09/2019</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NORTH SHORE ROWING CLUB “Te Wairua o Pupuke”
One Club, servicing a rapidly growing population of over 500,000

1 Rowing Club, established 1874
3 Training Venues
   A Lake Pupuke Clubhouse
   B Rame Road Boathouse
   C Hobsonville Annex

Provider of life long rowing opportunities
   • Beginners
   • Youth /Schools (9)
   • Club Competitive
   • Performance Pathway
   • Masters / Recreational

One of largest population catchments of any rowing club in NZ
Rowing NZ Award ‘Club of the Year 2018’
5 Current NZ Representatives

Storage of $3M+ rowing equipment
   • 113 rowing skiffs
   • 300 oars

Facilities at capacity (exceed)
North Shore Rowing Club: Auckland North
REGIONAL ROWING PATHWAY AND VENUES

“A world class rowing club, providing pathways for life long participation and excellence in rowing across the Auckland North region”

PATHWAY

Rowing NZ Auckland Regional Performance Centre
Senior Club Rowing
  Premier
  Senior
  Club
  Intermediate
Schools Rowing
  Westlake Boys High School
  Westlake Girls High School
  Albany Senior High School
  Birkenhead College
  Carmel College
  Kristin School
  Northcross College
  Rangitoto College
  Wienworth College
Learn to Row / Novice
Life Long Rowing (Masters)

VENUE / FACILITIES

Hobsonville Point
  AUT Millennium
NSRC Rame Road, Greenhithe
  Lucas Creek venue ARPASS endorsed
  Sub regional centre
NSRC Lake Pupuke

FACILITY STATUS

Unsecured
At capacity
At capacity

TO MEET ROWING DEMAND NSRC IS COMMITTED TO MAINTAINING THREE SITES FOR ROWING TRAINING IN THE NORTHERN SECTOR OF THE CITY - NSRC PUPUKE, RAME Rd AND HOBSONVILLE AND IMPROVEMENT OF FACILITIES INCLUDING:
1. Redevelop Rame Rd boathouse to meet growing demand
2. Development of a boathouse at Hobsonville Point (ARP, WBHS) as part of the Hobsonville Point Marine Sports and Recreation Centre to relieve existing capacity at Hobsonville Point
3. Maintenance of Lake Pupuke boathouse and club rooms and development of the “Rowingwise” learning centre