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Welcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

7.1 Silverdale Pony Club
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. The Silverdale Pony Club has requested a deputation to discuss the club’s recent activities at Green Road, Dairy Flat.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:

a) thank representatives from the Silverdale Pony Club for their presentation.

7.2 North West Toy Library
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Katherine Wilson from the North-West Toy Library has requested a deputation to inform the local board of its activities.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:

a) thank Ms Wilson from the North-West for her presentation.

7.3 Kaipara Flats Sports Club
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Peter Hudson from the Kaipara Flats Sports Club has requested a deputation to the local board.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:

a) thank Mr Hudson from the Kaipara Flats Sports Club for his presentation.

8 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.

9 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."
Approval of the reclassification of a portion of land at Goodall Reserve, Snells Beach from recreation reserve to local purpose (helipad and parking) reserve

File No.: CP2019/18979

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To approve the reclassification of a portion of land (0.1712Ha) at Goodall Reserve, Snells Beach from recreation reserve to local purpose (helipad and parking) reserve.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. The Mahurangi Community Trust occupies a portion of land (1033m²) at Goodall Reserve, Snells Beach under the terms of a community ground lease entered into with the former Rodney District Council. The community lease commenced 1 March 2000, providing for one term of 19 years expiring 28 February 2019. The underlying land is held in fee simple by Auckland Council and is subject to the requirements of the Local Government Act 2002. The trust sub-lease its building to Fire and Emergency New Zealand.

3. In addition to the portion of Goodall Reserve occupied under its community ground lease, the trust also occupies a portion of land adjacent to the lease area on which it has constructed a helipad and parking. The helipad and parking are integral to search and rescue and general emergencies which are the primary activities at the trust’s adjoining building operating as a fire station. The trust’s improvements are situated on land subject to the requirements of the Reserves Act 1977 and classified as recreation reserve.

4. This classification does not legally support the activities undertaken by the trust. As such, this particular portion of Goodall Reserve must be reclassified from recreation reserve to local purpose (helipad and parking) reserve to enable the progression of any new community lease to the trust for its entire area occupied.

5. In November 2018, council commissioned a survey of Goodall Reserve which created new land parcels to set apart the area occupied by the helipad and parking from the majority of the reserve legally described as Part Lot 3 DP 114828. Part Lot 3 DP 114828 is now redefined by SO 530069 comprising the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New legal description</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1 Survey Office Plan 530069</td>
<td>0.1712Ha</td>
<td>Trust-owned helipad and parking. The area must be reclassified from recreation reserve to local purpose (helipad and parking) reserve to enable the grant of a new community lease to the trust for its entire area occupied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2 Survey Office Plan 530069</td>
<td>10.2640Ha</td>
<td>Recreation reserve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. At its business meeting of 18 April 2019, the Rodney Local Board approved the public notification of Auckland Council’s intention to reclassify the portion of land at Goodall Reserve, Snells Beach from recreation reserve to local purpose (helipad and parking) reserve.
Rodney Local Board
20 November 2019

Item 10

Reserve legally described as Section 1 Survey Office Plan 530069 comprising 0.1712Ha from recreation reserve to local purpose (helipad and parking) reserve (resolution number RD/2019/31).

7. Council staff publicly notified and engaged with iwi on Auckland Council’s intention to reclassify a portion of land (0.1712Ha) at Goodall Reserve. All statutory requirements have now been satisfied. Subject to the Rodney Local Board approving the reclassification, council staff will seek the approval of the Minister of Conservation (delegated to the General Manager Community Facilities, Auckland Council) to publish the change in the New Zealand Gazette.

8. This report recommends that the Rodney Local Board approve reclassification a portion of land (0.1712Ha) at Goodall Reserve, Snells Beach from recreation reserve to local purpose (helipad and parking) reserve.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Rodney Local Board:

a) approve the reclassification of 0.1712Ha of part of Goodall Reserve legally described as Part Lot 3 DP 114828 redefined by survey as Section 1 Survey Office Plan 530069 from recreation reserve to local purpose (helipad and parking) reserve pursuant to section 24(1)(b) of the Reserves Act 1977 (Attachment A to the agenda report).

Horopaki
Context

9. This report considers land classification matters impacting on community leasing issues with respect to The Mahurangi Community Trust at Goodall Reserve.

10. Local boards hold delegated authority under Section 24(1) of the Reserves Act to approve reclassifications of this nature, subject to all statutory processes having been satisfied.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

History of land title

11. The history of land title with respect to Goodall Reserve is detailed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Land parcels</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>The property known as Goodall Reserve, described as Lots 1 - 3 DP 114828 and comprising a total area of 12.2792 hectares, was originally acquired by the Rodney County Council as a recreation reserve from William Ronald Goodall of Snells Beach, farmer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 114828 was classified as a local purpose (community facilities) reserve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Approval of the reclassification of a portion of land at Goodall Reserve, Snells Beach from recreation reserve to local purpose (helipad and parking) reserve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>A small portion of Lot 3 DP 114828 comprising 1033 square metres and sited at the south eastern boundary at 326 Mahurangi Road, was revoked of its Reserves Act status. This is the portion occupied by the trust (on which its community building is situated) under the terms of its current community lease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>An additional adjoining portion described as Lot 1 DP 103697 and comprising 2017 square metres was acquired by the Rodney District Council and again from William Goodall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 103697 was declared to be a local purpose (community buildings) reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Lots 2 and Part Lot 3 DP 114828 were classified as recreation reserve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. The copy of SO 530069 redefining Part Lot 3 DP 114828 into Sections 1 and 2 was approved as to survey by Land Information New Zealand on 23 November 2018 (Attachment A to the agenda report).

### Process for reclassification

13. The process for the reclassification is detailed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff attended and presented information about the proposal at a mana whenua forum requesting feedback from iwi representatives present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff emailed iwi identified as having an interest in the land with information on the proposal and requested a response (under Section 4 of the Conservation Act 1987).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff undertook public notification of Auckland Council’s intention to reclassify the portion of land (under Section 24(2) of the Reserves Act 1977).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As no objections were received during the public notification process, staff report to the local board recommending that it pass a resolution under Section 24(1) of the Reserves Act to reclassify the portion of land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff report to the General Manager, Community Facilities Department seeking him to act in his capacity as the Minister of Conservation’s delegate and sign the required gazette notice declaring the reclassification in terms of Section 24(1) of the Reserves Act.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff request council’s legal services to seek Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) registration of the published gazette notice against the title containing the reserve to obtain a permanent public record of the reclassification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public notification

14. To meet the statutory requirements, public notices were placed in the Rodney Times on 9 July and 16 July 2019, respectively and the Mahurangi Matters on 17 July 2019. The
proposal was also advertised on the Auckland Council website. Submitters were allowed one calendar month to make submissions or objections to the proposal. During this period, no submissions or objections were received.

New community lease
15. The Mahurangi Community Trust occupies a portion of land (1033m²) at Goodall Reserve, Snells Beach under the terms of a community ground lease entered into with the former Rodney District Council (Attachment B to the agenda report). The community lease commenced 1 March 2000, providing for one term of 19 years expiring 28 February 2019. The trust own the building and all associated improvements on the land and sub-lease its building to Fire and Emergency New Zealand.

16. The trust has formally applied to council for a new community lease for its entire area occupied (comprising the existing lease area and the area on which it has constructed its helipad and parking) with provision for a sub-lease to Fire and Emergency New Zealand. Council staff has, in a separate report, recommended that the local board grant a new community lease to the trust for its entire area occupied (Attachment C to the agenda report).

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement
17. The designated impact level of the recommended decision on GHG emissions is “no impact” because the proposal continues an existing activity and does not introduce new sources of emissions.

18. Climate change has an unlikely potential to impact the term proposed because the site does not sit directly within a flooding zone of 1-in-100 year rainstorm event by river or surface flooding (Attachment D).

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
19. Staff from council’s Service Strategy and Integration team support the proposed reclassification of 0.1712Ha of land at Goodall Reserve redefined by survey as Section 1 Survey Office Plan 530069.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
20. A proposed new community lease to the trust is contained within the list of community leasing projects (line item 1361) on the 2019/2020 Community Facilities, Community Leasing Work Programme as approved by the Rodney Local Board at its business meeting of 20 June 2019 (resolution number RD/2019/71).

21. At its business meeting of 18 April 2019, the Rodney Local Board resolved to approve the public notification of the proposed reclassification (resolution number RD/2019/31).

22. The recommendations in this report support the Rodney Local Board Plan 2017 outcome of ‘communities are influential and empowered’.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
23. Engagement about the proposal with iwi identified as having an interest in land in the Rodney Local Board geographical area was undertaken. Engagement involved:

- a presentation at the mana whenua north-west forum, held at Orewa on 1 May 2019 (at which time a number of iwi representatives in attendance deferred their interests to Ngāti Manuhiri)
• email contact containing detailed information and inviting iwi representatives to hui and or for a Kaitiaki site visit to comment on any spiritual, cultural or environmental impact with respect to the proposal.

24. During the email contact component of the engagement process, iwi representatives did not raise any specific concerns about the reclassification proposal.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
25. The cost of the survey was $6210.00 including GST and was borne by the Community Facilities Department.

26. The costs associated with public notification and engagement with iwi about council’s intention to reclassify 0.1712Ha of land at Goodall Reserve were approximately $600.00. This cost was borne by the Community Facilities Department.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
27. Should the Rodney Local Board resolve not to approve the reclassification, this decision:
   • will prevent council staff from recommending a new community lease to the trust for its helipad and parking under Section 61(2A)(a) of the Reserves Act 1977
   • may increase Auckland Council’s maintenance requirements in terms of maintaining the trust’s improvements.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
28. Council staff will report to the General Manager, Community Facilities Department seeking him to act in his capacity as the Minister of Conservation’s delegate and sign the required gazette notice declaring the reclassification in terms of Section 24(1) of the Reserves Act.

29. Council staff will request council’s legal services to seek Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) registration of the published gazette notice against the title containing the reserve to obtain a permanent public record of the reclassification.

30. Council staff will report to the Rodney Local Board at its business meeting in December 2019 recommending it grant a new community lease to The Mahurangi Community Trust for its entire area occupied.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
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Title Plan - SO 530069

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Number</th>
<th>SO 530069</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveyor Reference</td>
<td>20181747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyor</td>
<td>Ian Derek Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Firm</td>
<td>Ascension Surveyors Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Declaration</td>
<td>Ian Derek Walker, being a licensed cadastral surveyor, certify that: (a) this dataset provided by me and its related survey are accurate, correct and in accordance with the Cadastral Survey Act 2002 and the Rules for Cadastral Survey 2010, and (b) the survey was undertaken by me or under my personal direction. Declared on 23 Nov 2018 11:15 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset Description</th>
<th>Sections 1 and 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Approved as to Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land District</td>
<td>North Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted Date</td>
<td>23/11/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Territorial Authorities

| Auckland Council |

Comprised In

| RT NA65/619 |

Created Parcels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Parcel Intent</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>RT Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1 Survey Office Plan 530069</td>
<td>Legalisation</td>
<td>0.1712 Ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2 Survey Office Plan 530069</td>
<td>Legalisation</td>
<td>10.2640 Ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area A Survey Office Plan 530069</td>
<td>Easement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.4352 Ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule / Memorandum

### Land Registration District

North Auckland

### Territorial Authority (the Council)

Auckland Council

### Approval of the reclassification of a portion of land at Goodall Reserve, Snells Beach from recreation reserve to local purpose (helipad and parking) reserve

### Schedule of Existing Easements

- **Right to drain sewage**
  - Share: A
  - Section: 2
  - Deed: B481144.3

- **Right to drain water**
  - Share: A
  - Section: 2
  - Deed: B481144.3
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Approval of the reclassification of a portion of land at Goodall Reserve, Snells Beach from recreation reserve to local purpose (helipad and parking) reserve
Attachment B
GIS aerial view of a portion of Goodall Reserve showing the current community lease area to The Mahurangi Community Trust outlined in purple
Attachment C
GIS aerial view of a portion of Goodall Reserve showing the current area occupied by The Mahurangi Community Trust outlined in red
Attachment D
GIS aerial view from Auckland Council's Hazard Viewer showing The Mahurangi Community Trust lease area on Goodall Reserve, in relation to flood plains and flood prone areas.
Grant of new community lease and licence to occupy to Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust for land at 307 Leigh Road, Ti Point

File No.: CP2019/18999

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To grant a new community lease and a non-exclusive licence to occupy to Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust for the portion of land it occupies at 307 Leigh Road, Ti Point.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust occupies land at 307 Leigh Road, Ti Point. The land was originally leased to Omaha Outdoor Activities and Education Trust in 1999 which commenced on 1 June 1999 and expired 30 May 2018.

3. In 2005, Omaha Outdoor Activities and Educational Trust assigned the lease to Manuhiri Omaha Kaitiakitanga Ora Charitable Trust (Moko Charitable Trust). On 14 November 2013, Moko Charitable Trust was legally dissolved, thus there isn’t a current, or valid lease in place.

4. On 31 July 2013 Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust (with intrinsic links to Moko Charitable Trust) was formed. The trust occupies the lease area and has formally applied to council for a new community lease.

5. The land occupied by Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust at 307 Leigh Road Ti Point is a former landfill which has resulted in land contamination issues. Council’s land contamination team is currently scooping out investigation works to remediate the land.

6. The recommended lease term in accordance with the Auckland Council Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 for a group-owned building on council land is 10 years with one right of renewal for 10 years. As council’s land contamination team is scooping out remediation works, council staff recommend a community lease and non-exclusive licence to occupy for one term of two years with two options for renewal for two years each.

7. The lease and licence agreements will contain an early termination clause to enable council to make any decisions on the future use of the land.

8. The land is subject to the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002. In accordance with the Act, council staff has undertaken public notification and engagement with iwi on the new lease and licence to occupy proposals. All statutory requirements have been satisfied.

9. This report recommends that the Rodney Local Board grant a new community lease and a non-exclusive licence to occupy to Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust for the portion of land it occupies at 307 Leigh Road, Ti Point.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Rodney Local Board:

a) grant Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust a new community lease (270 square metres more or less) and a non-exclusive licence to occupy (9,170 square metres more or less) to be issued under the Local Government Act 2002 for a portion of the land legally described as Section 5 SO 431362 at 307 Leigh Road, Ti Point (Attachment A
Grant of new community lease and licence to occupy to Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust for land at
307 Leigh Road, Ti Point

to the agenda report) subject to the following terms and conditions:

i) term – an initial term of two years commencing 1 December 2019 with two
   options for renewal, for two years each

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

iii) early termination clause – a specific amendment to allow for early termination
    of the lease and the non-exclusive licence to occupy by either party, giving
    twelve (12) months’ written notice

iv) the community outcomes plan will be appended as a schedule to the lease
    agreement.

b) approve the Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust Community Outcomes Plan
   (Attachment B to the agenda report)

c) note that all other terms and conditions of the proposed new community lease and
   non-exclusive licence to occupy will be in accordance with the Auckland Council
   Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012.

Horopaki

Context
10. This report considers the lease and licence to occupy issues with respect to Manuhiri
    Kaitiaki Charitable Trust’s occupation of land at Ti Point.

11. The Rodney Local Board is the allocated authority relating to local, recreation, sport and
    community facilities, including community leasing matters.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

Land
12. The property located at 307 Leigh Road Ti Point is legally described as Section 5 SO
    431362 comprising 17.2015 hectares. Section 5 SO 431362 is currently held in fee simple
    by Auckland Council and is subject to the provisions of the Local Government
    Act 2002.

13. Until 2017, the land surrounding Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust’s lease area was utilised
    for forestation. Panuku Development Auckland managed the harvesting agreement.

Land contamination
14. The land at 307 Leigh Road Ti Point was formerly utilised as a land fill. As such, there are
    contamination issues. Council’s land contamination team is currently undertaking a project
    plan; scoping out the necessary investigation works, scheduling a timeline and forecasting a
    budget for remediation of the site. The team believes that it should be able to undertake
    remedial works without unduly disturbing Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust’s occupation of
    the site.

Public notification
15. In accordance with section 138 of the Local Government Act 2002, any lease or licence for a
    term in excess of six months must be publicly notified. This applies to Manuhiri Kaitiaki
    Charitable Trust’s application for a new community lease and non-exclusive licence to
    occupy for the area it occupies. Similarly, engagement with mana whenua is required under
    section 81 of the Act.

16. To meet the statutory requirements, public notices were placed in the Rodney Times on 9
    July and 16 July 2019, respectively and the Mahurangi Matters on 17 July 2019. The
    proposal was also advertised on the Auckland Council website. Submitters were allowed
one calendar month to make submissions or objections to the proposal. During this period, no submissions or objections were received.

Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust
17. Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust was incorporated under the Charitable Trusts Act 1957 on 31 July 2013. Included in the trust’s objects and purposes are:

- the promotion amongst Ngāti Manuhiri of the educational, spiritual, economic, health, social and cultural advancement or well-being of Ngāti Manuhiri
- ongoing maintenance and establishment of places of cultural or spiritual significance to Ngāti Manuhiri.

18. Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust owns its building, storage, water tank, associated connections and utilises its premises as a base for Ngāti Manuhiri’s Kaitiaki administration, hui and offices (Attachment C to the agenda report).

19. Council staff has worked alongside Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust to draft a community outcomes plan. Subject to the local board granting a new lease and non-exclusive licence to occupy, the approved plan will be appended as a schedule to the lease agreement.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement
20. Climate change has an unlikely potential to impact on the lease as the site does not sit within a flooding zone. Similarly, while the lease area is in close proximity to the coast, the term of the lease is for a maximum of six years and coastal inundation is unlikely during this timeframe (Attachment D to the agenda report).

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
21. Staff from council’s land contamination team support the proposed term of community lease and non-exclusive licence to occupy.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
22. At its workshop of 8 March 2018, the Rodney Local Board Parks and Recreation Committee was presented with and discussed a memorandum by council staff about the proposal. No specific concerns were raised at this time.

23. At its business meeting of 21 March 2019, the Rodney Local Board, Parks and Recreation Committee resolved to approve the public notification of the proposed new community lease and non-exclusive licence to occupy (resolution number RODPC/2019/6).

24. The recommendations in this report support the Rodney Local Board Plan 2017 outcome: communities are influential and empowered.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
25. As detailed in the community outcomes plan, Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust’s activities align with the Auckland Plan strategic direction 2 “enable Māori aspirations through recognition of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and customary rights” (Attachment B to the agenda report).

26. Engagement with iwi identified as having an interest in land in the Rodney Local Board geographical area was undertaken about the proposal. Staff presented the proposal to key representatives for mana whenua in attendance at the mana whenua north-west forum, held...
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Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

27. The costs associated with public notification about council’s intention to grant a new community lease and non-exclusive licence to occupy were approximately $600.00. This cost was borne by the Community Facilities Department.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

28. Should the Rodney Local Board resolve not to grant a new community lease and non-exclusive licence to occupy to Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust, this decision may:
   • affect the trust’s ability to undertake its core activities
   • increase Auckland Council’s maintenance and renewal responsibilities in terms of the land and improvements.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

29. Subject to the local board granting a new community lease and non-exclusive licence to occupy, council staff will draft the related documents for signing and sealing by the trust and subsequent execution by council.
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GIS aerial view of 307 Leigh Road, Ti Point showing lease area outlined in red comprising; building (220m² more or less), storage (31m² more or less) and water tank (19m² more or less) and non-exclusive licence to occupy area outlined in blue (9,170m² more or less) to Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust on a portion of the land legally described as Section 5 SO 431362.
**Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust COMMUNITY OUTCOMES PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Location of Land/Facility</th>
<th>307 Leigh Road, Whangateau 0985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of the Community it serves</td>
<td>Ngāti Manuhiri Rohe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Area</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Community Group</td>
<td>Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address</td>
<td>PO Box 57, Leigh, 0947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact person</td>
<td>Jessie Chapman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Community Lease Advisor</td>
<td>Karen Walby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Council and/or Local Board Priority</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enable Māori aspirations through recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi and customary rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Area 1 - Establish Papakainga in Auckland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Area 2 - Enable tangata whenua to participate in the co-management of natural resources</td>
<td>Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust to carry out cultural Site visits within the rohe</td>
<td>Minimum of 10 Site visits per annum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Area 3 - Explore partnerships with mana whenua to protect, identify and manage wahi tapu sites</td>
<td>Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust to participate in the Māori Cultural Heritage Programme</td>
<td>Complete set tasks in conjunction with the Māori Cultural Heritage Unit – Auckland Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Area 4 – Enable Māori aspirations for thriving and self-sustaining marae</td>
<td>Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust support the marae</td>
<td>Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust makes annual financial contribution to Te Kiri Marae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Area 5 – Support sustainable development of Māori outcomes, leadership, community and partnerships</td>
<td>Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust to carry out Partnership agreements</td>
<td>Commence Iwi-led Ngāroto Water Quality Restoration Project which includes community involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Protect and conserve Auckland’s historic heritage for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area 1 - Understand, value and share our heritage</th>
<th>Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust provides cultural blessings and Rahui where requested or required</th>
<th>Minimum of 5 per annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area 2 – Invest in our heritage</th>
<th>Upholding Oral Korero</th>
<th>Engage with local schools once per annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area 3 – Empower collective stewardship of our heritage</th>
<th>Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust to engage with the local community regarding our heritage</th>
<th>Engage with local schools once per annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Acknowledge that nature and people are inseparable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area 1 – Value our natural heritage</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area 2 – Sustainably manage natural resources</th>
<th>Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust to carry out Kaitiakitanga within the rohe</th>
<th>Upkeep Pā harakeke within the area One working bee per annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area 3 – Treasure our coastline, harbours, islands and marine areas</th>
<th>Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust to protect the customary rights within the rohe</th>
<th>Ngati Manuhiri members carryout Kaitiakitanga of the harbours, coastlines, islands and marine areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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GIS aerial view from Auckland Council's Hazard Viewer showing Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust lease and licence to occupy areas on land at 307 Leigh Road, Ti Point, in relation to flood plains, flood prone areas and coastal inundation
Grant of new community lease and licence to occupy to Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust for land at
307 Leigh Road, Ti Point
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval for the proposed mitigation work on tracks in local parks to protect healthy kauri and prevent kauri dieback spread within the Rodney Local Board area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

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

3. An interim report was presented to the Rodney Local Board on 21 March 2019 (RD/2019/17). 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.

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

5. 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 Rodney Local Board area tracks in five parks have been closed temporarily.

6. 46 local parks in Rodney were initially assessed and prioritised. 31 of these sites were subsequently removed from the list as they were deemed to be low risk. Detailed investigation was carried out in fifteen parks to determine the appropriate mitigation measures (Attachment A to the agenda report). Location maps are provided in Attachment B to the agenda report.

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

8. A community meeting was held on 24 July 2019, with key park stakeholders to discuss the proposed mitigation measures. A workshop was also held with the Rodney Local Board on 8 August 2019 to discuss the proposed detailed mitigation programme.

9. Further detailed design and procurement is planned for the next few months. Mitigation works will be undertaken on a priority basis across the region. The identified works are planned to be undertaken in stages from December 2019 to March 2020 and October 2020 to March 2021.

10. 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 Rodney Local Board:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Cost Estimate (physical works only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Brick Bay Reserve</strong></td>
<td>Close track indefinitely - provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Brick Bay Drive - Puriri Place Reserve</strong></td>
<td>Close track indefinitely - provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Currys Bush Reserve</strong></td>
<td>Determine one entry point at southern entrance and install hygiene station. Upgrade western track to kauri-safe standard with geoweb, BAM and fencing to protect kauri. Reopen track following mitigation.</td>
<td>$96,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. **Kowhai Park**                | Upgrade whole track network to kauri-safe standards including:  
                      • The track to retirement home (with approval, as on private land)  
                      • Mitigation around lone kauri on western track  
                      • Install new track surface across grass area from eastern track to carpark  
                      • Install high use hygiene stations.  
                      • Re-open closed track following mitigation. | $183,650                            |
<p>| 5. <strong>Leigh Harbour Cove Walkway</strong>  | No action required. The Department of Conservation have already upgraded the coastal track to kauri-safe standard. | $0                                  |
| 6. <strong>Martins Bay Holiday Park</strong>   | Close all tracks indefinitely to protect kauri - provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required. | $4,000                              |
| 7. <strong>Matheson Bay Reserve</strong>       | Minor mitigation works are required to bring track up to kauri-safe standard with geoweb, BAM and protection fencing. Install high use hygiene stations | $73,000                             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Omeru Scenic Reserve</td>
<td>Track on upper northern side of stream up to top of waterfall to be closed indefinitely - provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required. All other existing tracks to be upgraded to dry track standard. Fencing and mulch to be provided around large kauri next to bbq/picnic area. Alternative route is being investigated to access top of waterfall on southern side of stream away from kauri (not included in costing).</td>
<td>$206,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Parry Kauri Park</td>
<td>Upgrade whole track network in stages to kauri-safe standards including: • At entrance/carpark provide viewing platform and fencing for viewing of large kauri (to restrict access to grass area/kauri root zone). • Reduce access to single entry with high use cleaning station • Upgrade entire track network with boardwalk • Provide new track link connecting the central track to the western track • Indefinite closure of track at north eastern exit point (as there is a pocket of kauri here).</td>
<td>$0.8m - Entrance $1.5m - kauri dieback $1.5m - track renewals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Duck Creek Reserve</td>
<td>This park is infected with kauri dieback and public access should be discouraged (no existing formal tracks). Provide barrier planting, signage and barriers as required.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>McElroy Reserve</td>
<td>Close all tracks indefinitely to protect kauri (provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required)</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Whangateau Domain Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>Provide signage and/or barriers as required to restrict access.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Morrison Scenic Reserve</td>
<td>This park is infected with kauri dieback and public access should be discouraged. (no existing formal tracks). Provide barrier planting, signage and barriers as required.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Sesquicentennial Walkway</td>
<td>Mulch should be provided as required around the trees to restrict access. Possible signage to be considered.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Horopaki

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

12. 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.

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

14. An interim report (Resolution number RD/2019/17) regarding proposed kauri dieback mitigation in local parks was presented to the Rodney Local Board on 21 March 2019. The local board resolved the following:

That the Rodney 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:
      A) Brick Bay Drive, Sandspit
      B) Brick Bay Drive - Puriri Place Reserve, Sandspit
      C) Currys Bush Reserve, Wellsford
      D) Kowhai Park, Warkworth
      E) Leigh Harbour Cove Walkway
      F) Martins Bay Holiday Park Recreation Reserve (a part of which includes the Martins Bay Holiday Park)
      G) McElroy Reserve, Mahurangi West
      H) Omeru Scenic Reserve, Makarau

   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:
      A) Matheson Bay Reserve
      B) Parry Kauri Park, Warkworth
      C) Duck Creek, Warkworth (noting that this is an identified priority route in the Puhoi to Parkiri Greenways Plan, and there is a live proposal to undertake detailed feasibility into a new trail connection.

   iii) discourage public access through barrier planting and signage in the following Category B parks: A) Kiwitahi Road, Paehoka iv) discourage

| 15. Green Road, Dairy Flat Highway | Protection fencing to be provided around kauri locations to restrict stock and public accessing roots of kauri. | $25,000 |
Item 12

public access through barrier planting and signage in the following Category C park:
A) Whangateau Domain Recreation Reserve (bush area only)

v) install hygiene station(s) at strategic locations in the following Category C parks:
A) Buckleton Beach Reserve
B) Sesquicentennial Walkway, Warkworth

vi) note that Kauri dieback may be discovered in parks and reserves at any time, such as the reserve behind Mahurangi College in Warkworth, where Kauri dieback was discovered recently, and additional sites may need to be closed or investigations undertaken to protect Kauri in the future

vii) note that funding for the works in our high value Kauri ecosystems will come from the Natural Environment Targeted Rate

viii) note that the remaining Category C and 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

ix) request that biosecurity staff work with council’s parks, sport and recreation and community facilities departments to ensure that any mitigation measure proposed that impacts on Rodney’s greenways connections is well understood and is communicated to local communities, especially those who are undertaking work to develop or maintain our greenways

x) request that biosecurity staff work closely with local iwi on their proposed mitigation on local parks and reserves in Rodney particularly Makarau Bridge Reserve which is managed by iwi

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

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

15. The interim report provided to the Rodney Local Board on 21 March 2019 (RD/2019/17) included the results of the prioritisation of local parks and sought endorsement of the recommended high-level kauri protection actions prior to the development of the detailed programmed of works.

16. 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. In the Rodney area tracks in five parks have been closed temporarily. The tracks are in the following parks:

- Kohwai Park
- Omeru Scenic Reserve
- McElroy Reserve
- Martins Bay Holiday Park
- Currys Bush

17. 46 local parks in Rodney were initially assessed and prioritised. 31 of these sites were subsequently removed from the list as they were deemed to be low risk. Detailed investigation was carried out in fifteen parks to determine the appropriate mitigation measures (Attachment A).
18. 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.

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

20. Consultation has been undertaken with the local board, key park stakeholders and mana whenua.

21. 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.
22. The mitigation options for the identified parks are described in detail in Attachment A as well as the precautionary mitigation measures for the low risk parks. Location maps are provided in Attachment B.

The recommended mitigation works are summarised as follows:

1. **Brick Bay Drive Reserve**: Close track indefinitely - provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required. The estimated cost is $2,000. The estimated timeframe for completion of the works is March 2020, subject to contractor availability and weather conditions.

2. **Brick Bay Drive - Puriri Place Reserve**: Close track indefinitely - provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required. The estimated cost is $2,000. The estimated timeframe for completion of the works is March 2020, subject to contractor availability and weather conditions.

3. **Currys Bush Reserve**: Determine one entry point at southern entrance and install hygiene station. Upgrade western track to kauri-safe standard with geoweb, BAM and fencing to protect kauri. The estimated cost is $96,300. The estimated timeframe for completion of the works is March 2020, subject to possible consent requirements, contractor availability and weather conditions.

4. **Kowhai Park**: Upgrade whole track network to kauri-safe standards including the track to retirement home, mitigation around lone kauri on western track, install new track surface across grass area from eastern track to carpark, install high use hygiene stations. The estimated cost is $183,650. The estimated timeframe for completion of the works is March 2020, subject to possible consent requirements, contractor availability and weather conditions.

5. **Leigh Harbour Cove Walkway**: There is no action required as the track is already mitigated.

6. **Martins Bay Holiday Park**: Close tracks indefinitely - provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required. The estimated cost is $4,000. The estimated timeframe for completion of the works is March 2020, subject to contractor availability and weather conditions.

7. **Matheson Bay Reserve**: Minor mitigation works are required to bring track up to kauri-safe standard with geoweb, BAM and protection fencing. The estimated cost is $73,000. The estimated timeframe for completion of the works is March 2020, subject to contractor availability and weather conditions.

8. **Omeru Scenic Reserve**: Track on northern side of stream up to top of waterfall to be closed indefinitely - provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required. Alternative route is being investigated to access top of waterfall on southern side of stream away from kauri. All other existing tracks to be upgraded to dry track standard. Fencing and mulch to be provided around large kauri next to bbq/picnic area. The estimated cost is $206,200 (not including new track). The estimated timeframe for completion of the works is March 2020, subject to contractor availability and weather conditions.

9. **Parry Kauri Park**: Upgrade whole track network to kauri-safe standards including, at entrance provide viewing platform and fencing for viewing of large kauri. Reduce access to single entry with high use cleaning station. Upgrade entire track network with boardwalk. Provide new track link connecting the central track to the western track. Indefinite closure of track at north eastern exit point. This project will be staged over two to three years. Estimated cost is $3.8m. The estimated timeframe for completion of stage one works is March 2020, subject to possible consent requirements, contractor availability and weather conditions.
10. **Duck Creek – Warkworth**: The park is infected with kauri dieback and public access should be discouraged. Provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required. The estimated cost is $2,000. The estimated timeframe for completion of the works is March 2020, subject to contractor availability and weather conditions.

11. **McElroy Reserve**: Close all tracks indefinitely - provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required. The estimated cost is $4,000. The estimated timeframe for completion of the works is March 2020, subject to contractor availability and weather conditions.

12. **Whangateau Domain Recreation Reserve**: Provide signage and/or barriers as required to restrict access. The estimated cost is $2,000. The estimated timeframe for completion of the work is March 2020, subject to contractor availability and weather conditions.

13. **Morrison Scenic Reserve**: The park is infected with kauri dieback and public access should be discouraged. Provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required. The estimated cost is $25,000. The estimated timeframe for completion of the works is March 2020, subject to contractor availability and weather conditions.

14. **Sesquicentennial Walkway**: Mulch should be provided as required around the trees to restrict access. Possible signage to be considered. The estimated cost is $25,000. The estimated timeframe for completion of the works is March 2020, subject to contractor availability and weather conditions.

15. **Green Road, Dairy Flat Highway**: Protection fencing to be provided around kauri locations to restrict stock and public accessing roots of kauri. The estimated cost is $25,000. The estimated timeframe for completion of the works is March 2020, subject to contractor availability and weather conditions.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

23. Mitigation measures to protect kauri from being exposed to kauri dieback infection contribute to climate change mitigation in that they seek to protect the health of kauri, and resilience of kauri ecosystems. Kauri are keystone species that influence their environment and in addition their presence plays an important carbon sequestration function throughout the natural span of their long life-cycle.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

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

25. 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.

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

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

27. On 21 March 2019, an interim report was presented to Rodney Local Board where multiple high-level kauri protection measures for local parks and reserves were endorsed.
28. Community meetings were held with key park stakeholder groups on the 17 July and also 24 July 2019. The purpose of the meeting was to gain feedback on the proposed detailed mitigation works.

29. On 8 August 2019, a workshop was held with the Rodney Local Board to discuss the proposed detailed mitigation programme.

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

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

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

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

34. Mana whenua were involved during the site walkovers for the initial site scoping of the parks and provided valuable feedback on the use of the reserves.

35. On 7 August 2019, a presentation was made to the North West Mana Whenua forum regarding the proposed mitigation works. There was general support of the proposed options to protect kauri.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

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

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

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

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

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

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

41. 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.

42. 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.

43. 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).

44. Risk mitigation includes the provision of appropriate information and effective implementation of track closures, including signage and physical barriers. Surveillance equipment and intelligence gathering may be used for compliance purposes.

45. 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

46. 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.

47. 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.

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

Ngā tāpirihanga
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### ATTACHMENT A: Description of proposed mitigation works for local parks in Rodney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Site information</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Proposed Mitigation</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick Bay Drive Reserve</td>
<td>There are a number of healthy kauri within this reserve and a large stand located along the roadside of the reserve. This reserve has a track located through the central of the reserve running parallel to Brick Bay Drive. The track is informal and overgrown with limited recreational use.</td>
<td>Kauri forest ecological value - Medium Recreational value - Low</td>
<td>Close track indefinitely - provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick Bay Drive - Puriri Place Reserve</td>
<td>Big stand of healthy kauri on the reserve to the south of Brick Bay Rd and one stand adjacent to road as it ascends the hill. The track is informal and overgrown with limited recreational use.</td>
<td>Kauri forest ecological value - Medium Recreational value - Low</td>
<td>Close track indefinitely - provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currys Bush Reserve</td>
<td>Bush area well used by locals in Wellsford. Limited alternatives. Has metal-covered loop track in good condition. Some recent renewals works have been completed. There are large numbers of kauri along the western boundary of the park, some have ill thrift and other infection.</td>
<td>Kauri forest ecological value - High Recreational value - High</td>
<td>Determine one entry point at southern entrance and install suitable hygiene station. Upgrade western track along rear of houses to kauri-safe standard with geoweb, BAM and fencing to protect kauri. Reopen track following mitigation.</td>
<td>$96,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Name</td>
<td>Site information</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Proposed Mitigation</td>
<td>Cost Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowhai Park</td>
<td>Native bush area with historic sites. High use tracks for recreation and commuter route, with potential to increase. Recent investment to construct swing bridge and tracks have been board-walked in part. There are several small stands of kauri and some single trees scattered through the reserve. Most of the kauri are located along the upper eastern track and several located near the track to the retirement village. The lower western track has one large kauri.</td>
<td>Kauri forest ecological value - Medium Recreational value - High</td>
<td>Upgrade whole track network to kauri-safe standards including: - The track to retirement home (with approval, as on private land) - Mitigation around lone kauri on western track - Install new track surface across grass area from eastern track to carpark - Install high use hygiene stations. - Re-open closed track following mitigation.</td>
<td>$183,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Harbour Cove Walkway</td>
<td>There are a number of healthy kauri alongside the track. This is all DOC land. The main track is mostly in good condition with the majority of kauri appropriately mitigated. There are two inland tracks, both providing similar experience and same entry point, both over private land and similar poor condition requiring renewal work.</td>
<td>Kauri forest ecological value - Medium Recreational value - Medium</td>
<td>No action required.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martins Bay Holiday Park</td>
<td>Area of native bush and farmland with motor camp, beach, boat ramp and playground. There are a substantial number of kauri alongside the bush tracks. The majority of the kauri are healthy except for some with ill thrift and other infections. The track network is generally overgrown and in poor condition.</td>
<td>Kauri forest ecological value - High Recreational value - Low</td>
<td>Option 1 - Close all tracks indefinitely to protect kauri (provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required) Option 2 - Close northern track and upgrade southern track (mitigated with geoweb and boardwalks to protect kauri with hygiene stations)</td>
<td>Option 1- $4,000  Option 2- $338,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Name</td>
<td>Site information</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Proposed Mitigation</td>
<td>Cost Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matheson Bay Reserve</td>
<td>Provides a mixture of coastal and bush experiences. The Kohura stream gully leads away from the beach and is popular with visitors and locals as a recreational trail and off-road walking access to the beach. Most of the kauri are non-symptomatic and are located at the northern end of the reserve. Track was recently upgraded by community group to dry track standard. Although the work was not to kauri-safe standard the track is of a standard that can remain open. Bridge renewal required.</td>
<td>Kauri forest ecological value - Medium Recreational value - High</td>
<td>Recommendation is Option 1 - due to low use and high cost. This will protect healthy kauri and create a sanctuary. Some minor mitigation works will be required to bring track up to kauri-safe standard with geoweb, BAM and protection fencing. Hygiene stations required</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omeru Scenic Reserve</td>
<td>High use native bush reserve used by both tourists and locals, particularly in summer as there are waterfalls and swimming holes. A historic pā site and kumara pits are located within the reserve. Healthy mature kauri trees of high ecological value located in close proximity to the track surface, which is typically in poor condition.</td>
<td>Kauri forest ecological value - High Recreational value - High</td>
<td>Track on northern side of stream up to top of waterfall to be closed indefinitely (provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required) as would be extremely difficult and costly to upgrade and make safe. Alternative route is being investigated to access top of waterfall on southern side of stream away from kauri (not included in costing). All other existing tracks to be upgraded to dry track standard. Fencing and mulch to be provided</td>
<td>$206,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Kauri Dieback Disease local park track mitigation in the Rodney Local Board area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Site information</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Proposed Mitigation</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Parry Kauri Park| This park is a major tourist attraction and has a volunteer group managing and maintaining the historic buildings/museum and the bush tracks. The reserve has a very dense kauri population and most of the trees are non-symptomatic. Existing mitigation measures include a well-developed boardwalk network and cleaning stations however further upgrade is required to meet kauri-safe standards. Access to the 1000-year-old kauri at the entrance has been moved back due to potential failure of the decking and to provide some protection from kauri dieback. This project is in progress with ongoing discussions with the community group and iwi to identify the best options to protect the kauri trees in this forest. The access to Parry Kauri is being considered as you presently walk over the feeding roots of the tree. Also, the boardwalks within the park are getting to the end of their life and are very narrow requiring people to step off the boardwalks onto the roots of the kauri trees. | Kauri forest ecological value - High
Recreational value - High | Upgrade whole track network in stages to kauri-safe standards including:
- At entrance/carpark provide viewing platform and fencing for viewing of large kauri (to restrict access to grass area/kauri root zone).
- Reduce access to single entry with high use cleaning station
- Upgrade entire track network with boardwalk
- Provide new track link connecting the central track to the western track
- Indefinite closure of track at north eastern exit point (as there is a pocket of kauri here). | $0.8m - Entrance
$1.5m - kauri dieback
$1.5m - track renewals |
Kauri Dieback Disease local park track mitigation in the Rodney Local Board area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Site information</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Proposed Mitigation</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duck Creek Reserve</strong></td>
<td>Council owns the eastern part of the reserve, and the adjoining section is owned by DOC. A greenway link is planned in the vicinity. Nearly all the kauri in this park have potential kauri dieback symptoms or are confirmed with kauri dieback. This park has no formal tracks and access should be discouraged to prevent the spread of kauri dieback to parks with healthy trees.</td>
<td>Kauri forest ecological value - High</td>
<td>This park is infected with kauri dieback and public access should be discouraged. Provide barrier planting, signage and barriers as required.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McElroy Reserve</strong></td>
<td>This scenic bush reserve is a 200ha mixed kauri/broadleaf forest. There are multiple kauri trees throughout the reserve with the majority located near the track entry and the track runs through the dense kauri zone in the north-western corner of the reserve. The track is not well formed and generally overgrown with low usage. Most of the kauri are healthy except for some with ill thrift and other infections. There is no kauri known to have kauri dieback in this park. There is some private land to the west with confirmed kauri dieback.</td>
<td>Kauri forest ecological value - High</td>
<td>Option 1 - Close all tracks indefinitely to protect kauri (provide buffer planting and/or signage and barriers as required) Option 2 – Upgrade northern track to kauri-safe standards Recommendation is Option 1 - due to low use and high cost. This will protect healthy kauri and create a sanctuary.</td>
<td>$4,000 $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Name</td>
<td>Site information</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Proposed Mitigation</td>
<td>Cost Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>park.</td>
<td>Recreational value - Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison Scenic Reserve</td>
<td>Kauri trees are predominantly in north east of reserve off entrance from Kaipara Hills Rd. This park is infected with kauri dieback. There are no formed tracks and the reserve is not accessible to the public.</td>
<td>Kauri forest ecological value - Medium Recreational value - Low</td>
<td>This park is infected with kauri dieback and public access should be discouraged. Provide barrier planting, signage and barriers as required.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesquicentennial Walkway</td>
<td>There are three single kauri specimen trees along walkway.</td>
<td>Kauri forest ecological value - Low Recreational value – Medium</td>
<td>Mulch should be provided as required around the trees to restrict access. Possible signage to be considered.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Road, Dairy Flat Highway</td>
<td>Green Road is council land and set aside as a future park. There are two blocks of land, with the southern block currently administered by Panuku as a farm and the northern area has a pony club and model air club. The Panuku land will shortly be handed back to parks to manage and develop. There are a number of individual kauri and small stands of young trees scattered across the land. The waterfall has a few surrounding kauri also.</td>
<td>Kauri forest ecological value - Medium Recreational value - Medium</td>
<td>Protection fencing to be provided around kauri locations to restrict stock and public accessing roots of kauri.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Green Road – Dairy Flat
ATTACHMENT B: Rodney - Local Parks location map

**Whangateau Domain Rec Reserve**

- Kauri Dieback Locations
  - Kauri with confirmed kauri dieback
  - Kauri with severe kauri dieback symptoms
  - Kauri with possible kauri dieback
  - Kauri with ill thrift
  - Kauri with infection other than kauri dieback
  - Non symptomatic kauri
  - Inaccessible kauri
  - Kauri (not field verified)
ATTACHMENT B: Rodney - Local Parks location map

Sesquicentennial Walkway

Kaupiie Dieback Locations
- Kauri with confirmed kauri dieback
- Kauri with severe kauri dieback symptoms
- Kauri with possible kauri dieback
- Kauri with ill thrift
- Kauri with infection other than kauri dieback
- Non symptomatic kauri
- Inaccessible kauri
- Kauri (not field verified)
Attachment B: Rodney - Local Parks location map

Morison Scenic Reserve

Kauri Dieback Locations
- Kauri with confirmed kauri dieback
- Kauri with severe kauri dieback symptoms
- Kauri with possible kauri dieback
- Kauri with ill thrift
- Kauri with infection other than kauri dieback
- Non symptomatic kauri
- Inaccessible kauri
- Kauri (not field verified)
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Local board governance work management for the 2019-2022 triennium

File No.: CP2019/19017

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To outline the options for efficiently and effectively managing the governance work of the Rodney Local Board for 2019-2022 triennium.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. At the end of each triennium the Local Board Services department delivers a review of local board work practices, including the organisational support they require and how well they support the boards in their governance role. The 2016-2019 triennium review gathered feedback from local board members, staff from local board services and other council departments including Council-controlled Organisations.

3. In response to the review, this report outlines a recommended approach for local boards to manage their governance workload as follows:

   • maintain a key focus on annual work programmes and their implementation through quarterly reporting and regular workshops with the whole local board, with decisions made at business meetings
   • appoint nominated local board members who will be consulted on landowner consents and events, and who will provide feedback on liquor licences and resource consents
   • appoint nominated local board members to external organisations.

4. These practices support the local board to undertake their governance role in an efficient and effective way, reflect the priority work of the local board and help the organisation focus its resources. Some of these practices require a decision of the local board, such as specific appointments of local board members, and separate reports cover these recommendations and associated advice.

5. Local boards are also able to identify topic area leads who would act as a champion with the local board on specific topic areas. Leads would focus on work programme activities/projects within their topic areas and understanding relevant community needs and preferences enabling other members to focus their time on other parts of the board’s workload.

6. The review feedback suggests the following advantages for having a full board involved in direction-setting discussions on issues, rather than identifying topic area leads:

   • staff are confident that the direction is the view of the whole board rather than one member
   • knowledge and information is retained by the full local board rather than one member
   • discussions with staff are less likely to enter into management or operational level detail
   • it avoids inefficient duplication, when conversations are held between staff and a lead, and then repeated with the full local board.

7. The feedback from the review highlighted that if a local board does appoint topic area leads, the risks should be mitigated by providing a clear scope for that role and ensuring it does not lead to inefficiency or adversely affect staff receiving clear direction from the full local board.

8. In the last electoral term, the Rodney Local Board established a structure of “project leads, which was designed to appoint individual local board members to be the “lead” on specific
projects or initiatives. The “lead” was then responsible for liaising with staff, outside of formal local board meetings, to progress and keep a focus on the delivery of a project and to take a degree of ownership and responsibility for ensuring that the local board received updates on a regular basis.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Rodney Local Board:

a) agree to establish and appoint local board members as project leads for local board projects or initiatives that align with the Rodney Local Board Plan outcome areas and annual work programme

b) confirms that project lead requests must be submitted to the local board, on the project lead request form, for confirmation and approval

c) note that the following project leads are proposed, subject to completion and approval of the project lead documentation:

i) Green Road (Rangitapuni) – Member Louise Johnson

ii) Rodney Transport Targeted Rate – Member Phelan Pirrie

iii) Kumeu-Huapai Centre Plan Activation – Member Brent Bailey

iv) Accelerated Rodney Seal Extension programme – Member Colin Smith.

Horopaki
Context

9. The governance role of an elected member is to:

- set direction and policy
- set priorities
- make significant decisions
- test advice
- monitor performance and risk
- connect with and represent the community
- be accountable to the public.

10. At the end of each triennium Local Board Services (LBS) undertakes a review of the work practices of, and organisational support provided for, local boards and how this supports them in their governance role. Previous reviews have noted the progress the organisation has made in supporting the governance role of local boards over the past nine years. Improved support and delivery from the organisation have enabled local board members’ time to be used in a more effective and efficient manner as the governance model has matured.

11. During the 2016-2019 triennium review, feedback was gathered from local board members and staff from LBS and other council departments and council-controlled organisations (CCOs) who work with local boards.

12. Key themes from local board members related to having topic area leads. Both positives and negatives were identified.

13. Key themes from staff were that clear direction is given from the full local board and local board members operate at the governance level. Staff identified both positive and negatives aspects of having topic area leads.

14. The findings from the review have informed the content of this report.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Work practices supporting the governance role of local boards (recommended approach)

15. There are established work practices in place which support the governance role of local boards as follows:
   - Local boards adopt an annual work programme each June for implementation by the council organisation in the next financial year (July-June). Local boards maintain a key focus on these annual work programmes and their implementation through quarterly reporting and regular workshops with the local board, with decisions made at business meetings.
   - Local boards appoint a nominated local board member who will be consulted on landowner consents and events by staff carrying out their delegations. Local boards can also appoint a nominated local board member to provide feedback and attend hearings on liquor licences and notified resource consents to ensure that local board views are taken into account in these timebound processes. These appointments are made via a separate report.
   - Local boards appoint nominated local board members to external organisations (via separate report) to exercise their role in the external organisation as per the relevant constitution on behalf of the local board. These appointments are to be confirmed via a separate agenda report.

16. Together these practices constitute the recommended approach for managing the governance work of the local board for the 2019-2022 triennium, reflect the priority work of the local board and are the focus of the organisation’s staff and resources.

17. This approach allows all members to have an overview and collective understanding of work programme matters, and for the whole local board to be able to provide direction to staff and track performance and delivery throughout the financial year. It also enables collective discussions that utilise individual member’s skills and knowledge and ensures elected member and staff time are used effectively and efficiently.

18. Transparency to the public is ensured by local board decisions occurring through the formal business meeting process with associated standing orders.

Optional addition: Topic area leads (not recommended)

19. An optional addition to the recommended approach is that the local board identifies topic area leads. Leads would:
   - act as a champion for the topic area in full local board conversations
   - focus on work programme activities/projects within their topic area
   - maintain relationships with key stakeholders
   - understand relevant community needs and preferences.

20. Leads may also:
   - be appointed as the nominated local board member to provide feedback on behalf of the board on relevant matters (e.g. landowner consents) and appointed to related external organisations
   - undertake learning and development opportunities and attend conferences (using their individual development budget provided as part of the Kura Kāwana development programme) relevant to the topic area
   - highlight relevant issues and emerging priorities during local board plan and work programme development
   - act as a key contact for community groups and members of the public on the topic area.
21. Topic area leads would enable individual local board members to use existing or build new knowledge and expertise in the topic area and enable other members to focus their time on other parts of the governance workload.

22. Should the local board identify topic area leads, there are the following risks to consider:
   • a member may provide direction or views which do not reflect those of the full local board
   • staff may seek direction from a topic area lead instead of the full local board, or seek direction from a topic area lead prior to the full local board, resulting in duplication of work
   • key knowledge and information on a topic may be retained with the topic area lead and not shared with the whole local board
   • a topic area lead may enter into discussions at the management or operational level if meeting regularly with staff without a clear governance purpose for the discussion.

23. These risks can be addressed by:
   • using the workshop process as the mechanism for all local board members to receive updates and provide governance direction on approved work programme projects
   • clarifying the limited resources available to any topic area lead.

24. Staff resourcing is focussed on work programme development and delivery, along with advice to support workshops and business meetings. Topic area leads can be supported by staff to undertake the following responsibilities:
   • when issues arise at a local board workshop, the lead can be directed to meet with staff on that issue and explore solutions; staff would report back to the full board for direction, and the lead can assist with explanation and support during that discussion
   • develop local board feedback on regional policies, plans and strategies relevant to the topic area, for full local board approval
   • respond to constituent enquiries relevant to the topic area
   • report back to the local board at workshops, and publicly via local board member reports at business meetings, on the activities undertaken as the topic area lead.

25. If a local board does want to appoint topic area leads, it may wish to consider identifying alternates. The role of the alternate would be to support the topic area lead in their responsibilities and undertake any roles the lead has been formally appointed by the whole board when the lead is unavailable. Having an alternate means that the information, knowledge, skills and workload can be shared by more than one member, but it could also lead to confusion between the two roles where the alternate acts as a co-lead.

26. If a local board’s preference is to appoint topic area leads, this will require a local board decision via a resolution to this report.

**Rodney Local Board Project Lead**

27. The Rodney Local Board established project leads in the 2016-2019 term. This was to provide local board members to progress local board initiatives and projects outside of formal business meetings. This enabled staff to work alongside local board members to progress projects prior to reference back to the full local board for decisions.

28. In a number of instances the project leads were able to speed up and progress work programme items while ensuring good lines of communication between local board members and staff. Project leads were appointed by the local board. The parameters around the responsibilities and powers of a project lead were developed and confirmed on a case by case basis although the local board confirmed a number of mandatory requirements for all project leads.

29. The mandatory requirements included:
   a) Completion of a written application to be a project lead on a particular project/ initiative and submit to the local board for its consideration and approval
b) Ensure that any application for a project lead relates to a project set out in the local board approved work programme

c) Project leads must include the chairperson into all correspondence relating to the project/initiative for which they are the project lead

d) Project leads must operate a ‘no surprises’ policy with the chairperson and notify them immediately of any issues, conflicts or any other problems with the project/initiative.

e) Report regularly to the local board on the project/initiative activities at scheduled reporting times.

f) Involve other local board members where necessary

g) Act responsibly at all times

h) Treat all council and agency staff with respect

i) Adhere to the terms of their project lead appointment at all times.

30. Project leads must not, unless explicitly stated in a local board resolution:

a) Approve any expenditure

b) Imply or promise that the local board or council will commit to any future expenditure

c) Give landowner approval for any projects to process or confirm the details of any final placement or design of any structure

d) Sign off a project as complete

e) Change the scope of a project from what was agreed in the project lead appointment.

31. The project lead framework is set out in Attachment A to the agenda report.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

32. This report is procedural in nature so does not have direct climate impacts. However, a key focus for the council in the current term will be how it responds to the climate emergency and this may be a consideration for how local boards manage their governance work.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

33. Feedback was gathered from staff from the LBS department, and other departments and CCOs who work with local boards, about practices to manage the local board governance work through the 2016-2019 triennium review.

34. The practices used by a local board to manage their governance work can impact on the efficiency of staff engagement with members. Some variation in practices is required to reflect local differences, but overall large differences in work practices is challenging and consistency is beneficial.

35. In light of this, LBS has provided consistent advice and recommendations on work practices to all local boards to consider when making decisions on how they will manage their governance work for the 2019-2022 triennium.

36. The Rodney Local Board has developed a project lead approach which has proven to be effective in the last term and will continue with that approach for the 2019-2022 triennium.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

37. Feedback was gathered from local board members about practices to manage local board governance work through the 2016-2019 triennium review. This included: a workshop
attended by 13 local board members from 10 local boards; and a survey to all members, with responses provided by 29 members, from 13 local boards.

38. The practices used by a local board to manage their governance work can impact efficiency and effectiveness of engagement with communities and the opportunities that members have to provide local leadership beyond the formal decision-making process.

39. The topic of managing the governance work of the local board was discussed at a workshop on 13 November 2019, as part of the Rodney Local Board induction programme for the 2019-2022 triennium. The Rodney Local Board has confirmed its intention to establish project leads for the 2019-2022 triennium.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

40. This decision is procedural in nature so does not have immediate impacts on Māori.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

41. This decision is procedural in nature so does not have any financial implications.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

42. The risks and mitigations of having topic area leads are outlined in the ‘Analysis and Advice’ section of this report.

43. Risks relating to any specific decision required for the work practices that form the recommended approach are outlined in the respective separate reports relating to those decisions.

44. The risks and mitigations of project leads have been explored in the last local board term and refinements to the process will be incorporated into the new triennium.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

45. Staff from the Local Board Services department will work with staff from other departments and CCOs to ensure the practices of the local board are implemented.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

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

**Ngā kaihaina**
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Rodney Local Board project lead guidelines

Overview

1) Project leads are appointed by agreement of local board using the template appointment form.

2) Being a project lead allows members to pursue particular priorities and initiatives of the local board without the need to require staff or officers to meet with the entire local board in a formal setting. It is anticipated this will speed up projects while ensuring good lines of communication exist between members and that developments are reported back to the local board regularly.

3) By allowing members to operate with a degree of trust it is hoped that will enable projects to progress quicker and members to take a degree of ownership and responsibility for projects and initiatives.

4) The local board will set parameters around the responsibilities and powers of a project lead on a case-by-case basis. Certain requirements are mandatory for all project leads. The powers and responsibilities of project leads are set out below.

What project leads must do

5) All project leads must:
   a) Complete a written application to be a project lead on a particular project and present this to the full local board for approval
   b) Ensure that any application to become a project lead relates to a project set out in a departmental work programme that has been approved by the Rodney Local Board
   c) Include the chairperson(s) in all correspondence relating to the project/initiative for which they are the project lead
   d) Operate under a ‘no surprises’ policy with chairperson(s) and notify them immediately of any issues, conflicts or any other problems with the project
   e) Report regularly to the local board on their activities in a defined project leads reporting time at workshops
   f) Involve other local board members where deemed necessary
   g) Act responsibly at all times
   h) Treat all council, agency staff, and members of the public with respect.
   i) Adhere to the terms of their project lead appointment at all times.

What project leads may do

6) If approved by the local board, project leads may:
   a) Meet with staff, the public and agencies to progress the goals stated in their project lead appointment
   b) Request an officer report to the local board (as required)
   c) Comment to the media specifically around the project, at the chairperson’s discretion.

What project leads must not do

7) Project lead’s must not, unless explicitly stated otherwise in a local board resolution:
   a) Approve any expenditure
b) Imply or promise that the local board or council will commit to any future expenditure.

c) Make landowner approval for any project to proceed or confirm the details of any final placement or design of any structure.

d) Sign off on a project as complete.

e) Change the scope of a project from what was agreed to in the project lead appointment.

**Review**

8) This project leads framework will be reviewed by the local board within 12 months to assess its effectiveness.
Local board appointments and delegations for the 2019-2022 electoral term

File No.: CP2019/19018

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To recommend that the Rodney Local Board appoints a local board member to:
   - be the nominated local board member for landowner consents (including affected party approvals)
   - be the nominated local board member for film applications
   - be the nominated local board member for events
   - provide formal reports on liquor licence applications and attendance at hearings
   - provide formal views on whether a resource consent should proceed as a non-notified, limited notified or fully notified application
   - provide formal views (feedback) on notified resource consents and attend the council hearings.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. In order to enable effective and efficient decision-making, the council delegates some responsibilities to staff or individual elected members. This report seeks to appoint nominated local board members who will be consulted on landowner consents and events, and who will provide feedback on liquor licences and resource consents.

3. If local boards choose not to appoint a nominated board member for landowner consents staff will consult with the local board chairperson, as outlined in the Local Board Delegation Protocols.

4. District Licensing Committees consider, and grant or renew applications for liquor licences and manager’s certificates. These applications are publicly notified and local boards can provide views on an application to the District Licensing Committee. A delegation to a nominated local board member is recommended to allow local boards to provide formal views as part of the liquor licensing process.

5. Local boards can provide feedback on whether resource consent applications should be publicly notified. Local boards can also provide written feedback once the applications are notified and can subsequently speak to their feedback to support their views at the council hearing. A delegation to a nominated local board member is recommended

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Rodney Local Board:

a) appoint member Brent Bailey the nominated local board member and member Tim Holdgate as an alternate, for landowner consents (excluding landowner consents for filming) and authorise them to:
   i) be the point of consultation for staff on all applications for landowner consent and, at their discretion, refer any application for landowner consent to the local board for a local board decision, and
   ii) to be the point of consultation for staff on proposed asset renewal works and,
at their discretion, refer any proposed asset renewal works to the local board for a local board decision

iii) receive staff notifications of areas that may involve reputational, financial, performance or political risk.

b) appoint member Brent Bailey the nominated local board member and member Tim Holdgate as an alternate, for landowner consents for filming and authorises them to:
   i) to be the point of consultation with staff on all applications for landowner consent for filming and, at their discretion, refer any applications for landowner consent for filming to the local board for a local board decision
   ii) receive notifications from staff of areas that may involve reputational, financial, performance or political risk.

c) appoint member Brent Bailey the nominated local board member and member Tim Holdgate as an alternate, for events and authorises them to receive staff notifications of areas that may involve reputational, financial, performance or political risk

d) delegate to the chairperson Phelan Pirrie the authority to prepare and provide local board views and speak to those local board views at any hearing on applications for liquor licences

e) delegate to member Danielle Hancock and chairperson Phelan Pirrie, as an alternate, the authority to provide the local board views on whether a resource consent should proceed as a non-notified, limited notified or fully notified application

f) delegate to member Danielle Hancock and chairperson Phelan Pirrie, as an alternate, the authority to prepare and provide local board views and speak those local board views at any hearings on notified resource consents.

Horopaki Context

Background

6. Decision-making within Auckland Council is shared between the Governing Body and local boards. Local boards have made a general delegation to the chief executive of all of their responsibilities, duties and powers subject to the exclusions, restrictions and clarifications set out in the Chief Executive’s Delegations Register. The Chief Executive has in turn delegated those responsibilities, duties and powers to staff. The exercise of those responsibilities, duties and powers is subject to a set of delegation protocols. These protocols provide a set of expectations and directions to staff and require a number of actions that are relevant to all local activities. These delegations help Auckland Council to operate efficiently and effectively.

7. In some cases, delegations are given to individual local board members, usually due to short timeframes constrained by operational requirements, customer expectations and deadlines set by statute. Having a delegation in place to one local board member helps to ensure that council can continue to undertake its normal business practices without undue delays.

8. Local boards have allocated responsibility for decision-making with respect to local parks and have delegated landowner consent decisions to staff subject to a number of delegation protocols. The delegation protocols require that the nominated local board member is consulted on every landowner consent. Landowner consents encompass a broad range of activities, including affected party approvals, filming and events. Local boards also are able to provide their formal views in a report at liquor licence hearings.

9. Under the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 the Governing Body must consider any views and preferences expressed by a local board, where a Governing Body decision affects or may affect the responsibilities or operation of the local board or the well-
being of communities within its local board area. Local boards’ ability to provide local views can be affected because of statutory timeframes or external agency deadlines. Delegating authority for providing local board views to individual members provides local boards the opportunity to give local views within prescribed timeframes.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

**Landowner consents**

10. Under Auckland Council’s Combined Chief Executive Delegations Register, council staff are delegated authority to approve landowner consents on behalf of local boards. This delegation is subject to the Local Board Delegations Protocols. These protocols require that before exercising their delegations, staff must consult with a nominated local board member for landowner consents. If required, by the nominated local board member, the staff member must refer the landowner consent decision to a local board business meeting for a decision.

11. It is therefore recommended that the local board appoint a nominated local board member for landowner consents to enable staff to exercise their delegation.

**Landowner consents for filming**

12. Screen Auckland (Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development) processes requests for filming in the Auckland Region, and seeks landowner consent from local boards. Over 600 permits are granted each year, with the largest number of permits being granted in Waitematā, Wāitakere Ranges and Rodney Local Board areas.

13. Screen Auckland must process the applications within three to five working days, and therefore require feedback from local boards within two working days. These timeframes are short because filming activities often have a fast turnaround for productions from concept to delivery. To keep filming in Auckland, in a competitive international market, film crews often have to work within short timeframes.

14. Due to the extremely short timeframes for film applications, where local boards have a large number of filming applications, it may be beneficial for this subset of landowner consents to be referred to a different nominated local board member, to manage workloads.

**Events**

15. Under the Local Board Delegations Protocols staff must consult with and obtain the views of the nominated local board member on:

- applications to hold events on council-owned land in the local board area that require regulatory approval and involve one or more of the following matters:
  - Complete or substantial closure of the public open space
  - More than 500 people
  - Road closure
  - Liquor
  - Ticketed event.

- Any regulatory decision to set fees and charges for holding local events on council-owned local parks and reserve (and refer the matter to the local board to obtain local board views and input where required by the delegated local board member).

- Staff are also required to notify the nominated local board member of:
  - Areas that may involve reputational, financial, performance or political risk
  - Decisions to approve events on council owned land in the local board area.

16. The appointment of a nominated local board member for events is therefore recommended to enable staff to exercise their delegation.
17. Under the Local Board Delegations Protocols landowner consent is also required for all event proposals on local parks. To avoid double-handling of applications, it is recommended that the local board member nominated for events is the same as that local board member nominated for landowner consents.

**Formal submissions at liquor licence hearings**

18. District Licensing Committees consider, and grant or renew applications for liquor licences and manager’s certificates. When a business applies for an on-licence, off-licence, or club licence, new or renewed, they are publicly notified. On 25 September 2014, the Governing Body (GB/2014/103) agreed to a process where local boards can provide views on an application in a report to the District Licensing Committee. If the District Licensing Committee considers that the local board’s report has raised issues that it needs to hear more about, it can call a hearing and invite the local board to appear and talk to its report and respond to questions as a witness.

19. Once the public notice has been posted online, the local board has 15 working days to provide their report to council.

20. This report recommends a delegation to a nominated local board member to allow local boards to provide formal views as part of the liquor licensing process.

**Notified resource consents**

21. Local boards can provide feedback, within the statutory timeframes, on whether resource consent applications should be publicly notified. This was resolved by the Governing Body on 28 July 2011 (GB/2011/156). Resource consent planners email the planning lead copies of applications that meet the triggers set by the local boards (last reviewed in 2017). The planning leads have three working days to provide comment on the matter of whether the application should be publicly notified or limited notified to particular persons who may be adversely affected by the proposal. Where comments are provided, these are included verbatim as part of the reporting planner’s notification report to the decision-maker.

22. Local boards can also provide written feedback once resource consent applications have been notified. Written feedback needs to be provided prior to the submission closing date (usually 20 working days after public notification). Local boards can subsequently speak to their feedback to support their views at any hearing.

23. This report recommends a planning lead for each local board to provide the local board’s formal views on whether or not resource consents should be notified or limited notified and to provide written feedback on notified applications and speak on the local board’s behalf at the council hearing.

**Options considered**

24. Options available for local boards to input into landowner consents, events, planning processes and liquor licences have been summarised in Tables 1 and 2.

25. It is recommended that local boards select both a nominated local board member and an alternate. The alternate is available to act when the nominated local board member is unable to act (e.g. leave of absence, illness) and has agreed (via written communication) that the alternate take the role of nominated local board member for a specified time period.

26. We recommend that local boards appoint one nominated local board member (and alternate). Appointing more than one nominated local board member increases administration for staff and can create unnecessary confusion where local board members provide differing views to staff.

**Nominated local board members under the Local Board Delegations Protocol**

27. The preferred option is that a nominated local board member is appointed for landowner consents and events (option two in Table 1). This option is preferred because it aligns with council’s existing delegations and local board delegation protocols and allows for council to
undertake core business in a timely manner. There is reputational risk to council if it is unable to administer landowner consents in a timely manner.

Table 1: Options for local boards to address requirement for nominated local board members under the Local Board Delegations Protocol for landowner consents and events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. There are no nominated local board members and staff must consult with the local board chairperson as a primary point of contact | - The local board chairperson will become the subject matter expert for the local board on landowner approvals and events  
- Local boards can provide their views in a timely way that better meets organisational deadlines | - The local board chairperson’s work-load will be increased  
- Decisions are not made by the full local board  
- Decisions are not made at a public meeting |
| 2. Nominated local board members appointed for landowner consents and events (preferred option) | - The nominated local board member will become subject matter expert for local board on topic they are nominated for  
- Local boards can provide their views in a timely way that better meets organisational deadlines | - Decisions are not made by the full local board  
- Decisions made under delegation are not made at a public meeting |

Notified applications (resource consents and liquor licences)

28. Local boards normally provide their formal views at business meetings (option two in Table 2). Because local board reporting timeframes do not usually align with process and statutory timeframes outlined above, in most instances reporting at a business meeting will not be a viable option. Providing a delegation to one local board member and one alternate (option three in Table 2) is considered the most efficient way of providing formal views for the matters discussed in this report.

Table 2: Options for local boards to provide their formal views on notification of resource consents and liquor licences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No formal local board views are provided</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Local board views will not be considered by the hearing commissioners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Formal local board views are provided at a business meeting | - All local board members contribute to the local board view  
- Provides transparent decision making | - Local board meeting schedules and agenda deadlines are unlikely to align with statutory deadlines imposed by the planning process |
| 3. Formal local board views are provided by way of delegation to one local board member for all applications (preferred option) | - Nominated local board member will become subject matter expert for local board on topic they are nominated for  
- Local boards can provide their views in a timely way that meets statutory deadlines  
- Any feedback can be reported back to the local board | - Decisions are not made by the full local board  
- Decisions made under delegation are not made at a public meeting (decisions are made public once submitted via the planning process) |
Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement
29. These decisions are procedural in nature and any climate impacts will be negligible. The decision is unlikely to result in any identifiable changes to greenhouse gas emissions. The effects of climate change will not impact the decisions.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
30. This report recommends the appointment of nominated local board members to ensure that council can undertake its operational and statutory duties in a timely manner, while receiving local board input and decision-making in matters that are of local importance.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
31. This report seeks to appoint nominated board members to perform particular functions.
32. Any local board member who is appointed should ensure that they represent the wider local board views and preferences on each matter before them.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
33. A decision of this procedural nature is not considered to have a positive or negative impact for Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
34. A decision of this procedural nature is not considered to have financial implications on Auckland Council.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamarurutanga
Risks and mitigations
35. If local boards choose not to appoint a nominated board member for landowner consents (including film applications) and events, staff will need to seek feedback from the chairperson. This could potentially lead to a busy workload for the local board chairperson, in addition to their existing duties.
36. If local boards choose not to delegate to provide views on notified applications, there is a risk that they will not be able to provide formal views prior to submission closing dates and miss the opportunity to have their feedback presented and heard at a hearing.
37. If local boards choose not to delegate to provide their views on liquor licences, there is a risk that they will not be able to provide formal views prior to closings dates for submissions not coinciding with political meetings.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
38. Nominated local board members providing feedback on landowner consents and events will engage with staff acting in accordance with the Local Board Delegation Protocols.
40. Nominated local board members (and alternates) who are delegated to provide reports and speak at District Licensing Committee Hearings should sign-up to receive alcohol notices. This will ensure that they hear about new applications as soon as they are open for comment.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
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<tr>
<td></td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
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Appointment of local board members to external community organisations

File No.: CP2019/19019

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To appoint local board members to external organisations in the Rodney Local Board area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Elected members participate as representatives of the local board on a number of external community, regional and national organisations.

3. The beginning of the new electoral term and establishment of the new local board for the 2019-2022 triennium generates the need for new local board member appointments. This report provides details of the external organisations in the local board and requests that the local board nominates a lead and, where relevant, an alternate member to represent the local board on those external organisations for the 2019-2022 triennium.

4. In addition, there are a small number of appointments, due to legislation or the terms in a deed, that are the responsibility of the Governing Body, and as the relationship between the council and the organisation is local, the Governing Body has delegated this responsibility to nominate an elected member to the relevant local board.

5. If both the legislation and the external organisation permits, the local board may delegate that their nomination be transferred to a community member.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:

a) appoint the following board members to the external community groups and organisations listed below for the 2019-2022 triennium:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External organisation</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te Poari o Kaipatiki (Parakai Recreation Reserve Board)</td>
<td>Phelan Pirrie</td>
<td>No alternate required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brenda Steele</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipara Moana Working Party</td>
<td>Phelan Pirrie</td>
<td>No alternate required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redvale Landfill Community Liaison Committee</td>
<td>Louise Johnston</td>
<td>No alternate required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Business Improvement District</td>
<td>Vicki Kenny</td>
<td>Brent Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puhoi to Pakiri Trail Leadership Group</td>
<td>Tim Holdgate</td>
<td>Steven Garner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 15

Horopaki

Context

6. A number of external organisations provide for the formal participation of Auckland Council elected members in their affairs. Elected member appointees will have a variety of duties and liabilities depending on the individual organisation.

7. At the commencement of each triennium, the Governing Body and local boards recommend appointments to external organisations and co-governance entities.

8. As local board representatives, the nominated members represent the local board, rather than acting in a personal capacity. Local board member representatives will provide regular updates at local board business meetings to keep the local board informed of their activities unless good reasons exist for confidentiality.

9. The reasons for elected member participation in external organisations can be described in a number of ways:
   - a trust deed, that requires Auckland Council to make an appointment to an organisation
   - an organisation of interest to the local board is inviting elected member representation at its meetings
   - associations entered into by the council which provide for elected member representation
   - organisation governance, or project or programme oversight, such as regional or local parks management groups
   - a statutory or regulatory provision (e.g. a regulation providing for a community liaison committee)
   - a resource consent requiring the formation of a committee or hearing panel.

10. It is suggested that the following general criteria be considered when appointing members of co-governance and co-management entities:
   a) a strong interest in and commitment to the key principles that underpin the co-governance relationship, being a relationship of partnership with its foundations in Te Tiriti o Waitangi/the Treaty of Waitangi
   b) a track record or commitment to managing whenua consistent with mana whenua values
   c) a good understanding of the local communities surrounding the land managed through the entity
   d) a good understanding of Tikanga Māori and traditions linked to the land managed through the entity
   e) promoting continuity in the boards of each entity.

11. In making decisions about these appointments, it is suggested that local boards are mindful of:
   - the local board member’s availability
   - any conflict of interests, including whether the local board provides funding to the entity
   - whether the work of the organisation fits with the local board’s objectives and priorities
   - the historical relationship between the organisation and the local board.

12. Members are delegated to participate in the external organisations in their capacity as elected local board members. Should they no longer be a local board member, their
nominations would be automatically repealed, unless the process for appointment of the organisation in question provides otherwise.

13. Where it is permitted by the external organisation, community members may be appointed as the local board representative. It is suggested that Brenda Steele by appointed to Te Poari o Kaipatiki (Parakai Recreation Reserve Board). As a former elected member, Brenda has an understanding of the local boards views as well as an historical relationship with the external organisation.

14. Local board members may be part of any organisation in their private capacity and are encouraged to disclose memberships of external organisations in the conflict of interest register.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

15. The details of the organisations and co-governance entities relevant to the Rodney Local Board are detailed below.

Te Poari o Kaipatiki (Parakai Recreation Reserve Board)

16. The Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara Claims Settlement Act 2013 (the Act) came into force in June 2013. Under that Act the administration of Kaipātiki (formerly the Parakai Recreation Reserve) is carried out by Te Poari o Kaipātiki ki Kaipara (officially known in the legislation as the Parakai Recreation Reserve Board), a co-governance entity that was also established by the Act. The Reserve includes the Parakai Springs, a geothermal pool complex (managed by a private lessee) and a campground.

17. The board consists of six members, half of whom are appointed by the Auckland Council. The current Auckland Council appointed members are Brenda Steele (former Rodney Local Board member), Phelan Pirrie (Rodney Local Board member), and Councillor Greg Sayers (appointed by the Governing Body). The Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara appointed members have been Margaret Kawharu (Chairperson), Tracey Hill and Trisya Hemana. The maximum term of office of members is three years.

18. The term of the current Auckland Council appointments end on 9 November (Governing Body appointed member, see GB/2016/255) and 17 November (Rodney Local Board appointed members, RD/2016/146). Appointments are for three years and will commence the date appointments are made by the Governing Body and Rodney Local Board.

19. We recommend following the same composition as the previous term by appointing a councillor from the Governing Body to the Reserve Board and confirming the delegation to the Rodney Local Board to make the additional two appointments. This composition reflects the fact that Kaipātiki is an important reserve locally.

20. The Rodney Local Board is asked to nominate Phelan Pirrie and Brenda Steele (as a community representative) to the Parakai Recreation Reserve Board with effect from 20 November 2019.

Kaipara Moana Working Party

21. The Crown is in Treaty settlement negotiations with Ngāti Whātua iwi/hapū to settle outstanding historical Treaty claims over the Kaipara Harbour. Redress proposed by the Crown includes a co-governance regime involving councils and iwi.

22. In November 2015 the Governing Body agreed to establish a joint working party with the Northland Regional Council, the Kaipara District Council and the Whangarei District Council to better coordinate engagement with the Crown and Ngāti Whātua during Treaty settlement negotiations. A memorandum of understanding between councils was signed in January 2016 confirming this agreement and setting out the shared aspirations of councils. Decision-making powers are retained by the respective councils.
23. The Kaipara Moana Working Party met four times in 2019, including with Ngāti Whātua. It is expected to meet next in December 2019.

24. The Governing Body previously appointed two representatives to the working party: Councillor Greg Sayers and Councillor Linda Cooper. The Governing Body delegated authority to the Rodney Local Board to make one appointment. The Northland Regional Council, Kaipara District Council and Whangarei District Council each appoint one or two representatives.

25. The Governing Body confirmed the appointment of Councillor Greg Sayers and Councillor Linda Cooper to the Kaipara Moana Working Party at its 12 November 2019 business meeting and has confirmed that the Rodney Local Board is delegated the responsibility to make one appointment.

26. The previous Rodney Local Board representative on the working party was former local board member Brenda Steele.

27. The Rodney Local Board is requested to appoint local board member Phelan Pirrie to the Kaipara Moana Working Party.

Redvale Landfill Community Liaison

28. The Redvale Community Liaison Committee was established in 1993 to provide a forum between the Redvale Energy Park operation and the community where it is based. The committee is independently chaired and is made up of elected members or members appointed by the community to represent particular interest groups including local residents, business owners, and staff from the local primary school, as well as Auckland Council technical officers and Waste Management staff. The previous local board representative was local board member Louise Johnston as the local board member from the Dairy Flat subdivision.

29. The committee meets five times a year to discuss matters raised by community members and issues relating to landfill operations.

30. The local board is asked to appoint member Louise Johnston to the Redvale Landfill Community Liaison Committee.

North West Business Improvement District

31. There are 46 Business Improvement District Partnership Programmes (BID) operating within the Auckland region. There is one business improvement district, namely the North West Business Improvement District (North West BID), in the Rodney Local Board area.

32. The local board has a day-to-day relationship with the North West BID as a joint partner in the BID Partnership Programme. The local board will work with the North West BID to align the direction for the BID programme and local priorities expressed in the local board plan. The local board will receive regular reporting on the BID Partnership Programme and review progress against objectives.

33. The BID may invite the appointed member onto the BID Governance Board or Executive Committee. The discretion as to whether the local board member has voting rights will lie with the BID under the rules of their constitution. However, if voting rights are exercised the local board member could have a conflict of interest in subsequent local board decisions on BID matters.

34. The previous local board representative on the business association was local board member Cameron Brewer.

35. It is recommended that the local board appoint member Vicki Kenny, with member Brent Bailey as an alternate, to the BID to represent the local board regarding all matters relating to the BID.
Puhoi to Pakiri Trail Leadership Group

36. The Rodney Local Board adopted the Pūhoi to Pakiri paths and trails plan in June 2017. This plan was developed over multiple phases including engagement with local board members, iwi, internal council departments, external stakeholders, targeted (specific interest groups) and open public feedback sessions.

37. Alongside development and finalisation of the Pūhoi to Pakiri paths and trails plan the Walking Access Commission and council officers developed a proposal to secure walking and related access opportunities (e.g. cycling, bridle) through a multi-agency partnership. Resourcing to support this three-year initiative has been secured by the Walking Access Commission through allocation of a recent settlement with the New Zealand Transport Agency for impacts to the Moirs Hill walkway.

38. A Programme Manager - Pūhoi to Pakiri Trails commenced in the role in January 2019, to support the three-year programme for the project, with the Leadership Group meeting twice in 2019. The overall project is progressing positively supported by additional Rodney Local Board specific project investment.

39. Strategic direction and governance decision-making to oversee the Pūhoi to Pakiri paths and trails plan implemented is proposed to be overseen by a multi-agency leadership group. This group includes representation from the Walking Access Commission, the Department of Conservation, the Matakana Coast Trails Trust, Mana Whenua, Auckland Transport and the New Zealand Transport Agency and the Rodney Local Board.

40. The previous local board appointee, to this multi-agency leadership group to oversee implementation of the Pūhoi to Pakiri paths and trails plan, was former local board member Tessa Berger.

41. It is recommended that the local board appoint member Tim Holdgate, with member Steven Garner as an alternate to the Puhoi to Pakiri Trail Leadership Group.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

42. These appointments are procedural in nature and any climate impacts will be negligible. The decision is unlikely to result in any identifiable changes to greenhouse gas emissions. The effects of climate change will not impact the decisions’ implementation.

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

43. The Auckland Council has strong relationships with its co-governing partners within the co-governance and co-management entities. The entities themselves are independent to the council and connect with other parts of the council group as required.

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

44. One of the functions of local boards is to communicate with community organisations within their areas. Local board members often attend meetings of community organisations to facilitate that communication.

45. Where a document, such as a trust deed, provides for the Auckland Council to make an appointment to an organisation, the appointment is the responsibility of the Governing Body unless it is delegated.

46. Where an appointment is delegated to local board members this reflects council’s shared decision-making model and provides a useful bridge between local communities and the work of the co-governance and co-management entities.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori  
Māori impact statement

47. The Auckland Council has strong relationships with its co-governing partners within the co-governance and co-management entities. The entities themselves are independent to the council and connect with other parts of the council group as required.

48. The Crown has committed to provide Treaty settlement redress over Kaipara Moana to mana whenua, including Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara, Te Uri o Hau, Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei and Te Runanga o Ngāti Whātua. Continued representation and engagement from council is essential to allow this settlement redress to be finalised, including to help promote environmentally beneficial outcomes for the Kaipara Harbour.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea  
Financial implications

49. There are no additional financial implications attached to the making of this decision.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga  
Risks and mitigations

50. No particular risks have been identified.

Ngā koringa ā-muri  
Next steps

51. These appointments need to be made immediately due to upcoming meetings of the respective entities.

52. Staff will enable any appointment in terms of the governing legislation or trust deed as the case may be.

Ngā tāpirihanga  
Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Lesley Jenkins – Relationship Manager</th>
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</thead>
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<tr>
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Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To approve the process for making the local board representative appointment to the Local Government New Zealand) National Council and inform elected members of changes to the Local Government New Zealand rules.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. Local Government New Zealand amended its rules at its Annual General Meeting on 7 July 2019 and these were confirmed at a meeting of the National Council in September. There are some key changes affecting Auckland.

3. There are now three dedicated seats on the Local Government New Zealand National Council for Auckland Council representatives. These will be filled by the Mayor of Auckland (or his alternate) and representatives to be appointed by local boards’ and the Governing Body.

4. Local Government New Zealand rules require these appointments to be made within eight weeks of the triennial local government elections.

5. This report outlines a process to appoint the local boards’ representative. Nominations will be open to all local board elected members and this can be done in November. Local boards are being asked to delegate authority to select the representative by nominating one of its members, preferably the chairperson, to be part of a local board selection panel. This process will enable the representative to be appointed as quickly as possible.

6. The Local Government New Zealand rules now excludes Auckland from Zone 1. Although not officially a member of a Local Government New Zealand zone group, the expectation is that Auckland Council will schedule regular meetings with the president and chief executive (or their representatives) and organise itself as if it were a zone group. These meetings could be co-chaired by the councillor and local board member who are appointed to the Local Government New Zealand National Council.

7. Other arrangements such as the sector-based groups remain unchanged. Auckland Council is eligible to be a member of the metropolitan and regional Groups and the Governing Body will be asked to select representatives to these groups.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Rodney Local Board:

a) note the amended Local Government New Zealand rules

b) endorse Option A (selection panel made up of representatives from each local board) as the process for appointing the local board representative to the Local Government New Zealand National Council

c) delegate to the chairperson Phelan Pirrie to be part of the selection panel to appoint the local board representative to the Local Government New Zealand National Council

d) agree in principle to two annual meetings of Auckland Council and Local Government
New Zealand (or their representatives) with the arrangements to be decided by the three Auckland Council representatives to the Local Government New Zealand National Council and staff

e) endorse the proposal that the meetings of the Auckland Council/Local Government New Zealand meetings be co-chaired by the Governing Body and local board representatives appointed to the Local Government New Zealand National Council

Horopaki

Context

Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ)

8. LGNZ is an incorporated society (New Zealand Local Government Association Inc) which represents the national interests of councils around New Zealand and leads best practice in the local government sector.

9. The objectives of LGNZ include promoting and advocating matters affecting the national interests of local government. LGNZ holds regular dialogue with government, parliamentarians and government agencies and provides thought leadership and research on matters of interest to local authorities.

10. LGNZ is governed by a national council made up of members elected to represent geographic zones, representatives of various sector groups, Chair of Te Maruata (LGNZ’s national collective of Māori in local government governance roles), the President and three seats reserved for representatives of Auckland Council.

11. The establishment of dedicated Auckland seats were made as part of amendments to the LGNZ Rules agreed at its AGM in July 2019 (available online). The amended rules stipulate that the composition of the National Council will include the Mayor of Auckland (or an alternate) and two further persons: one to represent the Governing Body and one to represent local boards. The appointments are for three years.

12. LGNZ members are organized in zones and sectors generally. These zones and sectors make appointments to the National Council, provide advice on issues affecting their geographical or sector areas and provide information to their members.

13. Auckland Council is no longer a member of any zone group. Due to its size and governance structure, it is expected that the council will organise itself as if it were a zone.

14. The amendments did not change arrangements for sector groups. Auckland Council remains eligible to be a member of the Metro Sector Group and the Regional Sector Groups. The Governing Body usually appoints Auckland Council’s representatives to these groups and will be asked to do so again.

15. Auckland Council’s benefits from its interactions with LGNZ include keeping abreast of national issues affecting local government, advocating for and influencing local government issues on the national agenda and providing a forum where elected representatives connect and network with their peers from across the country.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

Appointment of local board representative to LGNZ National Council

16. The appointment of a local board representative will need to be decided by local boards. This is outlined in LGNZ Rule E1A “(b) one person appointed by Auckland Council local boards, from Elected members of the local boards”.

Process for appointment of Local Government New Zealand National Council representative
17. The restricted timeframes (eight weeks from start of the term) requires an agile selection process. Staff considered several options and recommend Option A as detailed in the following table:

**Process for selection of local board representative to the LGNZ National Council**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Details of process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Selection panel made up of representatives from each local board</td>
<td>• Each local board delegates authority to one of their members to be part of a selection panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The selection panel can be called to meet once all candidates are confirmed and they will agree the voting system to be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One vote per local board is considered a fair way to select a single representative for all 21 local boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Members can utilise an existing meeting to get the selection panel together (such as the Chair’s Forum).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Process can start in mid-November with a two-week nomination period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Reports to local boards seeking decision/preference (may require urgent decisions)</td>
<td>• This would involve seeking a vote/preference from each local board through a formal report and resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The report can only be produced once nominations have closed and the candidates list is available – this will delay the report to early December.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Where there is a tie between candidates based on local board votes, staff will need to be delegated authority to resolve the candidate by lot or go back to local boards for a decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This process is unlikely to produce an agreed appointment in a timely fashion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Staff also considered the option of a popular vote of all local board members. This would involve setting up an online voting system, where each local board member would have one vote. However, this option may not comply with the LGNZ Rules which anticipates a selection by local boards rather than by individual members.

19. The recommended Option A will enable a fair process by giving each local board a vote and an opportunity for their representatives to properly consider each nominee. This selection can take place at the planned meeting of the Chairs’ Forum on 9 December 2019 to avoid arranging an additional meeting.

**Nominations for the local board representative**

20. The LGNZ anticipates that all local board elected members are eligible to be a candidate for the LGNZ National Council. The nominations process will therefore need to allow self-nominations.

21. To facilitate this process in the timeframes required, staff will call for nominations on Friday 15 November and will allow a two-week period closing on 29 November 2019.

**Auckland Council / LGNZ meetings**

22. The role of a zone includes receiving reports from LGNZ about matters of national interest to local authorities and communicating to LGNZ the issues and concerns. The key item of interest at Zone meetings is the national update from LGNZ. The president and chief executive of LGNZ (or their representatives) attend to present the update.
23. Auckland Council could continue to meet with the president and chief executive (or their representatives) of LGNZ on a regular basis. Although not expressly set out in the changes to the LGNZ Rules, there is an understanding that Auckland Council will continue with these meetings in order to ensure an ongoing regional dialogue and continue to identify and advise LGNZ on issues and concerns affecting the Auckland region.

24. Staff recommend these meetings are co-chaired by the councillor and local board member appointed to the LGNZ national council. A co-chair approach recognises the shared governance role of local boards. Following discussions with LGNZ, staff also recommend that the meetings be open to all elected members.

25. The proposed meeting dates for the Auckland Council/LGNZ meetings are 13 March 2020 and 11 September 2020.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**  
Climate impact statement

26. These decisions are procedural in nature and any climate impacts will be negligible. Staff will look to schedule meetings of the Auckland/LGNZ on days where there are other city-based activities and meetings for elected members in order to minimise travel requirements. Staff will also explore the use of skype and livestreaming so elected members may choose to avoid travel.

27. Regarding engagement with the LGNZ, Auckland Council has declared a climate emergency, along with other councils around the country, so there will be an opportunity for partnership and joint leadership on this issue.

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

28. Secretariat support for the Auckland Council/LGNZ meetings will be provided by the Governance Division.

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

29. The changes to the LGNZ Rules and the designated seat on the LGNZ National Council acknowledges the role of local boards and gives it greater recognition in LGNZ.

30. Local board chairs were briefed on anticipated changes at the May 2019 Chairs’ Forum.

31. The amended rules were confirmed at a meeting of the LGNZ National Council in September. Due to the elections and end of term timeframes, staff were unable to seek the views of local boards on the process for appointing a representative.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**  
Māori impact statement

32. These decisions are procedural in nature and do not impact on Māori.

33. At the LGNZ level, the LGNZ has provided for representation on the National Council by the Chair of Te Maruata.

34. Te Maruata is LGNZ National Council sub-committee which has the role of promoting increased representation of Māori as elected members of local government, and of enhancing Māori participation in local government processes. They provide support for councils in building relationships with iwi, hapu and Māori groups and provides Māori input on development of future policies or legislation relating to local government.

35. Appointments to Te Maruata are not made by councils. In the previous term Councillor Alf Filipaina was invited to be a member of the sub-committee.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

36. Membership of LGNZ incurs a cost to ratepayers. Auckland Council’s annual subscription to LGNZ in 2019/2020 is $340,148 excluding GST.

37. The establishment of Auckland Council/LGNZ meetings will incur expense currently unbudgeted for. Staff from the Governance Division will support the first meeting using existing resources.

38. As the Auckland Council/LGNZ meetings are expected to bring together all elected members from across the region including the islands, this will impact on governance administration budgets over time.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

39. The LGNZ Rules require persons appointed to the LGNZ National Council to assume office within eight weeks of the triennial local government elections. This creates some difficulties in designing a process for all 21 local boards to agree their single representative. The recommended option (Option A) proposed in this report will enable the process to be completed as quickly as possible, on the first working day after the eight-week period. The LGNZ secretariat has indicated this would be acceptable.

40. If all local boards do not endorse the same process (Option A), this would affect how quickly the appointment is able to be made.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

41. The Governing Body will be making their appointment in November 2019 including appointment of Auckland Council representatives to the sector groups.

42. Appointments of Auckland Council seats to the LGNZ National Council will be communicated to the LGNZ by 6 December 2019.

43. Staff will work with the appointed representatives of Auckland Council to make arrangements for the first Auckland Council/LGNZ meetings.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.
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Urgent decision-making process

File No.: CP2019/19023

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek the Rodney Local Board’s agreement to use the urgent decision-making process when appropriate.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The urgent decision-making process enables the local board to make decisions to manage unforeseen and urgent circumstances when it is not practical to call the full local board together and meet the requirements of a quorum. By agreeing to this process, the local board delegates decision-making authority to the chairperson and deputy chairperson, or any person acting in these roles.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:

a) adopt the urgent decision-making process for matters that require a decision where it is not practical to call the full board together and meet the requirements of a quorum.

b) delegate authority to the chairperson and deputy chairperson, or any person acting in these roles, to make urgent decisions on behalf of the local board.

c) agree that the relationship manager, chairperson and deputy chairperson (or any person/s acting in these roles) will authorise the urgent decision-making process by signing off an authorisation memo.

d) note that all urgent decisions will be reported to the next ordinary meeting of the local board.

Horopaki
Context
3. The urgent decision-making process enables the chairperson and deputy chairperson, or any person acting in these roles, to make decisions to manage unforeseen and urgent circumstances when it is not practical to call the full board together and meet the requirements of a quorum. Examples include during the Christmas and New Year period or for providing input to the council’s central government submission process in tight timeframes.

4. By agreeing to this process, the local board delegates decision-making authority to the chairperson and deputy chairperson, or any person acting in these roles during that period.

5. The Local Government Act 2002 provides for local boards to delegate to committees, members of the local board or Auckland Council staff any of its responsibilities and powers, with some specific exceptions (clause 32, Schedule 7). This legislation enables the urgent decision-making process.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

6. The urgent decision-making process provides an alternative decision-making mechanism to an extraordinary meeting. An extraordinary meeting is called when an urgent decision is required on matters that cannot wait until the next scheduled business meeting of the local board.

7. Urgent decisions are different from emergency decisions, which are only made if there is a risk to public health and safety.

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

9. The local board relationship manager will use the information in this memo to determine whether or not to authorise the urgent decision-making process.

10. A number of factors will be considered by the relationship manager before approval to use the urgent decision-making process is given, such as:
   - the timing of the next scheduled meeting
   - confirmation that the local board has the delegation to make the decision
   - consideration of the rationale for the urgency
   - the significance of the decision and whether the urgent decision-making process is appropriate.

11. Once the relationship manager authorises the use of the urgent decision-making process, the chairperson and deputy chairperson (or any person/s acting in these roles) also need to approve the use of the urgent decision-making process by signing the same memo.

12. Once the authorisation memo has been approved, the chairperson and deputy chairperson will refer to the substantive report for advice and staff recommendations to inform their decision. This report will meet Auckland Council quality advice standards and adhere to the report authorisation processes.

13. Any decision made using the urgent decision-making process will be reported as an information item to the next ordinary meeting of the local board and the signed approval memo will be attached.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

14. This decision is procedural in nature and any climate impacts will be negligible. The decision is unlikely to result in any identifiable changes to greenhouse gas emissions. The effects of climate change will not impact the decision.

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

15. The urgent decision-making process proposed in this report enables the council group to progress urgent decisions efficiently, when it is not practical to call the full local board together.

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

16. This report outlines the local board urgent decision-making process, and seeks the local board’s agreement to adopt this process.
17. 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.

18. There are no financial implications arising from the procedural decision sought by this report.

19. To mitigate any risk that the urgent decision-making process could be used inappropriately, the relationship manager will assess a number of factors including timing of the next scheduled meeting, the reason for urgency, and significance of the decision. If a matter is of major significance, an extraordinary meeting can be called instead.

20. If the local board adopts the use of the urgent decision-making process, the local board relationship manager and delegated members will execute the urgent decision-making process outlined in this report if the need arises.

There are no attachments for this report.
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Urgent decision-making process