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1 Welcome

2 Apologies

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

3 Declaration of Interest

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

4 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 3 December 2019, including the confidential section, as a true and correct record.

5 Leave of Absence

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

6 Acknowledgements

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

7 Petitions

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

8 Deputations

Standing Order 7.7 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board. This means that details relating to deputations can be included in the published agenda. Total speaking time per deputation is ten minutes or as resolved by the meeting.

8.1 TEEF - Julie Chambers

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. Providing Julie Chambers of Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum the opportunity to present to the board on the work planned for the term in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki region, and to address any questions that the board may have.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. As per standing orders the Chairperson has approved the deputation request from Julie Chambers.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:
a) thank Julie Chambers for her attendance.

8.2 YMCA - Adam Brown-Rigg

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Providing Adam Brown-Rigg of YMCA the opportunity to present to the board with an update on the events delivered, and the Raise Up 2020 year plan. The YMCA would also like to determine how they can support the local board in 2020 within the youth development space.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. As per standing orders the Chairperson has approved the deputation request from Adam Brown-Rigg.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) thank Adam Brown-Rigg for his attendance.

9 Public Forum

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

9.1 Mens Shed Auckland East

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide Terry Moore and Bernie Ward of Mens Shed Auckland East the opportunity to update the board on the progress of developing their groups, and their planned community activities in Tāmaki in 2020 during the public forum segment of the business meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Terry Moore and Bernie Ward will be in attendance to present to the local board.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) thank Terry Moore and Bernie Ward for their attendance.
10 Extraordinary Business

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

File No.: CP2020/01835

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board an update on local activities that the Governing Body representative is involved with.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Opportunity for the Governing Body representative to update the Maungakiekie- Tāmaki Local Board on projects, meetings, events and issues of interest to the Maungakiekie- Tāmaki Local Board and its community.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) receive the Governing Body Member’s update.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tracey Freeman - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Puketapapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairperson's Report

File No.: CP2020/01833

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To keep the Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board informed on the local activities that the Chairperson is involved with.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. Providing the Chairperson with an opportunity to update the local board on the projects and issues they have been involved with since the last meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) receive the Chairperson’s report.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Chairperson's monthly report - February 2020</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tracey Freeman - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Puketapapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chair Chris Makoare, Board Member Report

Chris.Makoare@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz  Ph 021 0206 2990

November 2019 – February 2020

Your Local Board – Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Area

(Top Left) – N Henry, D Allan, P McGlachan, T Woodcock (Bottom Left) – M Meredith, C Makoare (Chair), D Burrows (Deputy Chair)

Roles assigned by the local board

- Manukau Harbour Forum (lead)
- Aircraft Noise Committee Consultation Group (lead)
- Old Māngere Bridge Replacement Project (deputy Lead)
- Tāmaki College Community Recreational Centre Trust (deputy Lead)
- Citizen Advice Bureau – Panmure-Ellerslie, Sylvia Park and Glen Innes, deputy Lead

General / assigned roles

- Tūpuna Maunga Authority (lead)

Meetings / Events Attended: November 2019 - February 2020

26 Nov - Chair/ Deputy Chair/ Senior Local Board Advisor/Local Board Advisor/Strategic Broker catch
28 Nov - Service/Customer Mapping Workshop - GIFC & TRC
28 Nov – Agenda run through – Business Meeting
29 Nov - Transform Onehunga: Fixed Stakeholder Advisory Group
29 Nov - Onehunga Christmas Lights - It’s time to light the tree again!
3 Dec - Business meeting
5 Dec - Update on Tamaki Employment Precinct Project
7 Dec – Panmure street party
10 - Dec MTLB workshop
12 Dec - LB Chair / MTLB Senior Advisor / Amy Cameron Tamaki Regeneration
13 Dec - Te Pane a Mataoho/ Te Ara Pueru/ Mangere Mountain, Karakia
13 Dec - Manukau Harbour Forum
16 Dec - Elected member training
17 Dec - Chair/ Deputy Chair/RM/ Senior Local Board Advisor
Annual leave Thursday 19th Dec to 21st Jan 2020
21 Jan - Chair Chris Makoare / Deputy Chair Debbie / Tia Engagement Advisor
28 Jan - Catch up - Chair / Deputy Chair / LBSA / LBA
3 Feb - Chair/ Deputy Chair/ Senior Local Board Advisor/Local Board Advisor/Strategic Broker
4 Feb – MTLB workshop
13 Feb - Chair Makoare / Panuku Interview
14 Feb - Manukau Harbor Forum

Recommendation
That this report be received.
Board Member's Reports

File No.: CP2020/01836

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To keep the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board informed on the local activities that the local board members are involved with.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. Providing board members with an opportunity to update the local board on the projects and issues they have been involved with since the last meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) receive the board members report.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Deputy Chairperson report February 2020</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tracey Freeman - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie- Tāmaki and Puketapapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deputy Chair Debbie Burrows, Board Member Report

debbie.burrows@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz  Ph 021 534 930

Roles assigned by the local board
- Old Māngere Bridge Replacement Project (lead)
- Onehunga BID - Business Improvement District (deputy lead)
- Aircraft Noise Committee Consultation Group (deputy lead)
- Citizen Advice Bureau – Onehunga (deputy lead)

Meetings / events attended
- Thursday 30th January
  - Mana Whenua Hui – Ngati Otara Marae
- Tuesday 4th February
  - LB workshop
  - Constituent Meeting
- Thursday 6th February
  - Waitangi Day with Ngati Whatua o Orakei at Okahu Bay
- Saturday 8th February
  - Portage Crossing at Mangere Bridge
- Tuesday 11th February
  - LB Workshop
  - Chair & Deputy Chair Meeting

Recommendation
That this report be received.
Regional Facilities Auckland First Quarter Performance Report for the Quarter Ending 30 September 2019

File No.: CP2020/01247

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To update the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board on the performance of Regional Facilities Auckland for the quarter ending 30 September 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report provides the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board with relevant information on the various Regional Facilities in the Auckland region.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) receive the Regional Facilities Auckland quarterly performance report for the quarter ending 30 September 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Regional Facilities Auckland First Quarter Performance Report for the Quarter Ending 30 September 2019</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Judy Lawley – Manager, Local Board Engagement, RFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Puketapapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Facilities Auckland

Quarter 1 Performance Report

For the period ending 30 September 2019

This report outlines the key performance of Regional Facilities Auckland.
Regional Facilities Auckland Q1 summary

Highlights, issues & risks for the quarter:

Highlights:
1. Auckland Stadiums: Mt Smart Stadium played host to the first ever standalone NRL Women’s Premiership (NRLW) fixture, Warriors v Dragons (crowd circa 3,000). Key Western Springs announcements for the summer concert season included massive headline acts for Friday Fams return, Festival X Rising and Fat Freddy’s Drop.
2. Auckland Conventions: 113 events were delivered across our venues, attracting around 59,000 attendees. The biggest was New Zealand Fashion Week, which returned to Auckland Town Hall after 16 years and attracted over 24,000 people. North Harbour Stadium hosted 32 events and Aotea Centre hosted 27 (welcoming 29,000 people).

Issues/Risks:
1. Auckland Stadiums: The two Metallica concerts were cancelled by the band for reasons of ill health.
2. Auckland Live: Queens Wharf closed to the public to enable repairs to the roof of The Cloud and doors and walls of Shed 10 following two mini-tornadoes in August.
3. Auckland Conventions: Ongoing construction of the Queens Wharf ferry terminal means The Cloud is unavailable for bookings until 29 February 2020.
4. Auckland Zoo: 71 rain days in Q1 had a significant impact at the Zoo, both on visitation and the complex South East Asia development.

Financials (million)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YTD actual</th>
<th>YTD budget</th>
<th>Actual vs Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital delivery</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct revenue</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>🔴 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct expenditure</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>🔴 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net direct expenditure</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>🔴 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Commentary

Capital delivery: The RFA capital programme for Q1 delivered $18.2m of works and is forecast to achieve total spend to budget for the year. The delivery is primarily in two major projects: the Aotea Centre refurbishment and the South East Asia Precinct.

Net direct expenditure: The $0.4m unfavourable variance relates in part to the grants paid by RFA.

Forecast FY20: Current indications are that RFA will miss the FY20 revenue target in particular as a result of the exceptionally wet weather in the first quarter and business interruption impacts of construction at the zoo through the remaining months of the year. Although an allowance was made in the budget for business interruption, the shortfalls being experienced are greater than previously estimated. Direct expenditure is also anticipated to exceed budget due to higher than expected staffing costs and professional fees.

Key performance indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous</th>
<th>FY20 Quarter 1</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of people who experience RFA’s arts, environment and sports venues and events</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>778,688</td>
<td>925,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The net promoter score for Regional Facilities Auckland’s audiences and participants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of operating costs funded through non-rates revenues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programmes contributing to the visibility and presence of Māori in Auckland, Tamaki Makaurau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic focus area – Stadia

Key commentary
For three months ended 30 September 2019, a total of $1.6m was spent towards stadia against a budget of $3.2m.

Highlights
1. North Harbour Stadium: works to reconfigure the main field to accommodate baseball have commenced and are on schedule for completion by November 2019. Planning for renewal of the main stand roof is underway, following a delay to the programme to enable the team to expand the project scope to include additional seismic strengthening.
2. Mt Smart Stadium: works are completed on the lower west stand and the upper south stand aside from minor outstanding detail work.
3. Western Springs: upgrade works to the entry road commenced in July 2019. Stages 1 and 2 will be complete and operational for the start of the speedway season in November. Building consents for the four building renewal projects have been received.

Issues/Risks
1. Stand strengthening and renewals works at Mt Smart and North Harbour stadia: In early 2019, RFA received preliminary findings from seismic surveys of building structures at Mt Smart and North Harbour stadiums, which prompted further detailed assessments. These were received in late FY19 and indicated low seismic ratings, albeit within tolerance. Further strengthening works, particularly at North Harbour Stadium were identified to improve the seismic ratings of these structures, and these works are now in the planning stage. For North Harbour Stadium, the RFP for a larger renewals project will be released shortly. This will encompass not only seismic strengthening, but also the general renewal of a roof approaching the end of its useful life.
2. Toilet, works facility and entry road renewals at Western Springs Stadium: $2.4m of works focussed on renewing main road, toilet and works facilities at the existing stadium were re-phased into early FY20. These works are contracted and ongoing. The discovery of unknown services near the surface and unexpectedly rocky ground conditions have delayed progress on the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key programme of works</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Harbour Stadium – baseball reconfiguration</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Reconfiguration and construction to enable the hosting of the Auckland Tuatara home games for next season at North Harbour Stadium</td>
<td>This project is currently in the construction phase, with work on track for completion by November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Harbour Stadium – main stand roof renewal</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>To construct access to the grandstand roof and undertake roof repairs (renewals)</td>
<td>The stand’s seismic assessment has been confirmed as 34%NB, the package of upgrade and renewal works for the stand is being progressed with works expected to be completed in FY21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Springs Stadium renewals</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>The replacement of two toilet blocks, gate entry building, maintenance shed, concourse and Stadium Road upgrade works</td>
<td>The road upgrade has commenced, and the four building replacements will commence shortly. The discovery of unidentified services and difficult ground conditions has delayed the project, with further delays now likely in working around the upcoming event season. The major elements of the project are expected to be delivered in FY20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic context
- Much of Auckland’s network of stadia are aging and do not respond to the evolving interests of Aucklanders, including the growth of interest in a wider range of sports.
- RFA is working to improve the amenity and health and safety standards in the stadia under its stewardship, in order to improve their financial sustainability and provide better facilities for both community sports activities and professional sports teams and their fans. RFA also aims to provide venues to support Auckland’s emerging sports.
### Strategic focus area – Auckland Zoo development

#### Key commentary
For the three months ended 30 September 2019, a total of $7.6m was spent towards zoo development against a budget of $9.8m.

#### Highlights
1. Construction of the South East Asia Precinct and new café is well underway. The project is being managed in zones, with the first zone due for completion in December 2019. The overall programme is scheduled for completion by mid-2020.
2. A significant programme of general renewals and infrastructure upgrades is also progressing well.

#### Issues/Risks
1. The extent of the construction work currently underway at the Zoo (the South East Asia project is currently impacting on more than 20% of the site) is impacting on the visitor experience and perception of value at the Zoo. A range of mitigation strategies is in place, the most significant of which is the implementation of an adjusted pricing strategy, reducing the cost of entry by as much as 30%. Although the new pricing strategy resulted in the Zoo achieving 718,027 visitors in FY19, the reduced price impacted on revenue. Visitor numbers are down in quarter one, with visitors less likely to commit to multiple visits until the South East Asia construction is completed.

#### Key programme of works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key programme of works</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South East Asia Precinct development</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Redevelopment of the central area within the Zoo to provide modern standards of housing and care for the Zoo’s South East Asian species, and new catering facilities</td>
<td>Largest renewals project in the Zoo’s history. Tracking to budget and expected to be completed in the 2019/20 financial year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strategic context
RFA is continuing with development of a world-class zoo and wildlife conservation facility by addressing aging infrastructure at Auckland Zoo and long-term under-investment through a phased programme of works.

These works constitute essential renewals aimed at ensuring Auckland Zoo meets the modern standards of animal welfare, visitor amenity, wildlife exhibition and health and safety obligations.
**Strategic focus area – Aotea precinct development**

**Key commentary**

For the three months ended 30 September 2019, a total of $6.4m was spent towards the Aotea Centre development against a budget of $6.3m. This project remains substantially challenged by delays associated with the need for a comprehensive redesign to meet new standards.

**Highlights**

1. Refurbishment of the interior of the Aotea Centre (Centre) is drawing to a conclusion, with significantly upgrading facility as a result.
2. Working with the Auckland Design Office, a draft Aotea Square precinct master plan has been incorporated into Council’s proposed refresh of the City Centre Master Plan, and a programme of consultation with key partners and stakeholders is underway.

**Issues/Risks**

1. New external cladding standards and associated Council consenting processes have caused significant delays to the Aotea Centre refurbishment project. To somewhat mitigate the impact on the operation of the Centre and the ongoing project risks, the original refurbishment project has been split into two projects – internal works and external works. Internal refurbishment works are scheduled for completion in November 2019. Re-design of the weather tightness project is ongoing.
2. A review of escalating project costs, following an assessment of on-going delays identified the need for an additional $14m to complete the project, funding which was been approved by Council in FY19. The project now has a total budget of $66.8 million allocated to dealing with the Centre’s underlying structural problems and refurbishing its interior spaces.
3. Delays to completion of the project will reduce revenue potential from the Centre for a longer period than previously anticipated.
4. The need to work around Centre bookings continues to compromise the delivery of the renewal project, further exacerbating time delays and budget pressures.
5. There will be some negative impact on the customer experience caused by ongoing construction works until completion.

**Strategic context**

The refurbishment and further proposed development and expansion of the Aotea Centre are aimed at creating a vibrant cultural and civic centre for Auckland focussed on the Aotea Square precinct and as part of a wider Aotea Arts Quarter. This will include a significantly upgraded and expanded Aotea Centre and Integrated Aotea Square, providing a home for the development and presentation of performing arts in Auckland.

---

**Key programme of works**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aotea refurbishment</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>The first significant refurbishment of the 30-year-old Centre, aiming to upgrade foyer and functions spaces and address long-standing weather-tightness issues</td>
<td>NZ’s growing understanding of the safety implications of building façades and cladding standards has required substantial changes to this project mid-programme. Council has approved an additional $14m in funding for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotea Square master plan</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>A precinct planning approach to the development of the Square and its surrounds to ensure the precinct meets its potential as a key lively and active space for Aucklanders</td>
<td>A consultation draft of the masterplan has been completed and is being used to inform discussions with partners and stakeholders, and the design for the Aotea Studios project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotea Centre expansion (Aotea Studios)</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Developing concept plans for expanding the current Aotea Centre to provide a home for performing arts organisations and to foster the work of performing arts groups</td>
<td>This project is in its early stages – the concept, funding and potential timing of this proposed development will be discussed with Council in 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Statement of Intent focus areas

**Arts & Culture Strategy**
- In July, Auckland Live presented its first Relaxed Performances for Māori for Tamariki and Room on the Broom. Auckland Live also hosted the NZ International Film Festival in July.
- NZ Maritime Museum hosted a sold-out event that brought a new and diverse audience to the Museum, While the Light Lasts, an interactive, late-night mystery-style game for 200+ visitors.
- Nearly 400 patrons came to Auckland Art Gallery’s popular and lively Art After Hours in July. Inspired by the exhibition Frances Hodgkins: European Journeys, the Gallery transformed into a European courtyard, with a packed schedule including drawing classes, dance performances and demonstrations, a popular talk by Mary Kisler, live music and bespoke food and drink.
- In August, Auckland Art Gallery hosted the Pat Hanly Creativity Awards, recognising 36 exceptional Year 13 art students from 28 Auckland secondary schools. The awards, supported by AUT, acknowledge Pat Hanly’s contribution to New Zealand contemporary art and his passion for art education and supporting young artists.
- The new exhibition A Place to Paint: Colin McCahon in Auckland opened on 10 August at Auckland Art Gallery, and was officially launched a week later by Prime Minister the Rt Hon Jacinda Ardern.

**Sustainability and Climate Change**
- Reports have been received from the waste services provider for the Aotea Centre and Auckland Zoo refurbishment projects, demonstrating waste diversion rates of over 80% across both construction sites.
- The North Harbour Stadium Baseball project saw 800 stadium seats recycled, and a rescaping of the project during the design stage prevented the use of 250 tonnes of concrete and 22 tonnes of reinforcing steel, equivalent to around 40 tonnes of CO2e.
- A new waste compound has been constructed at Mt Smart Stadium to enable enhanced management and sorting of waste streams, including a hand-sorting area and wash-down facilities.
- New water metering equipment has been installed at the Gallery to enable a more refined level of understanding of water usage within the building.
- A sustainability workshop was held with 23 staff members from across RFA’s business units to discuss opportunities for cross-collaboration on sustainability initiatives, knowledge sharing and staff engagement. In addition, Auckland Stadiums re-invigorated their Green Team, meeting to compile a list and initiate work on various sustainability initiatives across Stadiums’ sites.

**Contribution towards Māori Outcomes**

**Te Reo Māori**
- RFA in partnership with Auckland Council’s People and Performance Group have successfully received Te Otao Tākūti funding to resource capability and development training for staff, with foundational level training will start in November. This is a positive step towards achieving goals related to “An empowered Organisation”. This will also increase the ability of our staff to work effectively with Mana Whenua and Māori communities in the delivery of our business activities.

**Identity and Culture**

New Zealand Maritime Museum:
- The Talking Portrait project stage 1 has been completed with Te Tiki Voyaging Trust. A young female sharing her story. Stage 2 is in progress where public can interact and ask questions and the portrait will respond from a diverse, Te Ao Māori perspective.
- Building collections for the future was able to purchase three taonga from the Webber Collection and registered to purchase taonga of New Zealand.
- Tea-Tākiri (unfurling) Exhibition opens in October. Working in collaboration with Local government, Ngāti Whātua and artists. The waka from Tahiti has left bound for Aotearoa.

**Auckland Zoo**
- The leadership team undertook a marae visit to Orakei as part of a commitment and efforts to build stronger relationships with Ngāti Whātua.

**Local Board Engagement**
- The Quarter 4 Performance Report for the period ending 30 June will not be distributed to the local boards until December, after the local government elections, as this is a year-end report requiring confidentiality until the financial results are released.
- After the new Council term begins on November 1, all local board members will be fully informed of RFA facilities and activities through the Auckland Council training programme, and through visits to the boards. These visits will include an overview presentation, as well as the fourth quarter 2018-19 and first quarter 2019-20 performance reports.
- A presentation of the ongoing work on the Aotea Precinct Master Plan was positively received by the Waitāmata Local Board.
- Upper Harbour Local Board members enthusiastically endorsed the concept plans that aim to significantly increase the use of North Harbour Stadium.
## Regional Facilities Auckland Q1 financials

### Direct operating performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 19 Actual</th>
<th>FY 20 YTD Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>FY 20 Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net direct expenditure</strong></td>
<td>A 39.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct revenue</strong></td>
<td>B 53.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; user charges</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating grants and subsidies</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct revenue</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct expenditure</strong></td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>101.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits</td>
<td>C 51.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, contributions &amp; sponsorship</td>
<td>D 1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct expenditure</td>
<td>E 40.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other key operating lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 19 Actual</th>
<th>FY 20 Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC operating funding</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC capital funding</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vested assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net interest revenue</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Commentary

A: The $0.4m unfavourable variance reflects in part the grants paid by RFA, refer to Note D below.
B: Direct revenue unfavourable variance is due to $433k of Spark Arena rental revenue transferred to offset costs in other direct expenditure however the budget remains in revenue.
C: Employee Benefits contains $2.9m staff costs that are recharged against events. These recharges are budgeted under Cost of Goods Sold (COGS) within other direct expenses. Actual staff costs are favourable to budget due to recruitment for vacancies being put on hold for non-essential roles.
D: Grants, contributions and sponsorships: RFA converted the MOTAT loan to a capital grant recognising $280k in quarter one for the FY20 financial year. Other grants related to capital spend programmes.
E: Other direct expenditure contains COGS which includes salary recharges of $2.9m. The $2.9m recovery should be offset against employee benefits (where the budget is held). This has resulted in a misalignment between actuals and budget which will be corrected in the next LTP process.
### Regional Facilities Auckland Q1 performance measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key performance indicators</th>
<th>Previous Year</th>
<th>FY 20 Quarter 1</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YTD Actual</td>
<td>YTD Target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The number of people who experience Regional Facilities Auckland’s arts, environment and sports venues and events | 3,363,323 | 778,688 | 925,000 | Not met | The original target for RFA visitors/patrons was set prior to Council’s decision to lease the Viaduct Events Centre to Team NZ. This removed a key venue from RFA’s events programme and will continue to impact on RFA’s expected visitor/patron numbers. In addition:  
  - Major construction programme and 71 rain days during the quarter have had a significant impacted on visitation.  
  - The Gallery saw a continued reduction in international visitor numbers, possibly related to the international visitor levy.  
  - The Maritime Museum is also impacted by construction within the vicinity, and the loss of Ted Ashby for sailings for five weeks. |
| Auckland Zoo visitation   | 718,027       | 138,270         | 182,500 | Not met |            |
| Auckland Art Gallery visitation | 401,883 | 102,145 | 128,750 |            |            |
| NZ Maritime Museum visitation | 157,091 | 32,799 | 42,500 |            |            |
| The net promoter score for Regional Facilities Auckland’s audiences and participants | 43 | 44 | 19 | Met | RFA did not achieve its revenue targets this quarter due to $433k Spark Arena rental revenue transferred against the rental expenses (budget remained in revenue) and tight controls over expenditure were offset by un-budgeted MOTAT grant-related expenses |
| Percentage of operating costs funded through non-rates revenues | 57% | 54% | 60% | Not met | RFA’s community value score shows a 5% improvement on the previous year. An increasing percentage of the community consider that RFA’s activities enrich their lives in Auckland. |
| Percentage of Auckland residents surveyed who value RFA venues and events | 69% | 74% | 69% | Met |            |
| Number of programmes contributing to the visibility and presence of Maori in Auckland, Tamaki Makaurau | 68 | 20 | 4 | Met |            |
Regional Facilities Auckland Q1 non-financial performance

778,688 patrons/fans participated in 917 event days

384,323 people experienced free or subsidised events

2,104 people participated in RFA's outreach programmes

17,225 school students participated in RFA's curriculum-based learning programmes

Inspiring volunteers contributed 11,379 hours supporting RFA activities.
Auckland Transport February 2020 update

File No.: CP2020/01803

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board on transport matters in their area and an update on its Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report covers:
   a) a summary of Auckland Transport projects and operations in the local board area;
   b) a summary of the board’s Transport Capital Fund and Community Safety Fund projects;
   c) a summary of general information items.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:
a) receive the Auckland Transport February update report.

Horopaki
Context
3. This report addresses transport related matters in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area.
4. Auckland Transport (AT) is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. Reports are provided on a monthly basis to local boards, as set out in the Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important role local boards play within and on behalf of their local communities.
5. Other matters, such as road closures, are reported to the board on an as needed basis for timeliness.
6. The LBTCF is a capital budget provided to all local boards by Auckland Council and delivered by AT. Local boards can use this fund to deliver transport infrastructure projects that they have identified as a priority but are not part of AT’s work programme. Projects must:
   a) be safe;
   b) not impede network efficiency;
   c) be in the road corridor (although projects running through parks can be considered if there is a transport outcome).
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

7. There was $739,391 left in the LBTCF from 2016-2019 Political term. The LBTCF for the 2019-2022 political term is $2,019,339.

8. The local board allocated $50,000 out of the LBTCF towards driver feedback signs (resolution MT/2018/152). However, this is now being funded through the local boards Community Safety Fund (resolution MT/2019/118). Therefore, the amount of $50,000 will be reconciled back into the LBTCF at a later date.

9. The new total available budget for the LBTCF is $2,808,730. The table below outlines the LBTCF financial summary for the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

### Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board Transport Capital Fund Financial Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Funds Allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated funds from term 2016-2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>$739,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds allocated for 2019-2022 term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,019,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Feedback Signs reconciliation to be added</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining budget left</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,808,730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Projects which have had funding allocated to them are noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Funds Allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee Shared Bridge</td>
<td>Construction of shared path and bridge.</td>
<td>Auckland Council have engaged in a new vendor to get this project underway. A further update can be given at the next meeting in March 2020.</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāmaki Shared Paths</td>
<td>In Stage 2 for the link to the existing Tāmaki Path from Kotae Road – in feasibility stage.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line/Taniwha Raised Crossings</td>
<td>Located on Line Road, between Eastview and Taniwha Reserves, and Taniwha Road, between Taniwha and Maybury Reserves</td>
<td>This work will be actioned as part of the Glen Innes Cycleway project.</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripoli Road Raised Crossing</td>
<td>Upgrading of existing pedestrian crossings</td>
<td>Work to start between March and April 2020.</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onehunga Mall Raised Crossing</td>
<td>Two pedestrian crossing to provide a better connection to Laneway 2, 4 &amp; 5.</td>
<td>Awaiting final options from Panuku. Will report in March 2020.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Driver feedback signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn St pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>Scheme design being finalised for a raised zebra crossing and refuge island. Consultation expected to start prior to Easter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farringdon pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>Scheme design development for raised zebra crossing. Consultation expected to start prior to Easter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elstree Ave pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>Scheme design development for bus friendly speed tables. Consultation expected to start prior to Easter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Rd pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>Scheme design development for bus friendly speed tables. Consultation expected to start prior to Easter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama Rd School pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>High friction surfacing to be applied. Delivery by Early March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Rd pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>High friction surfacing to be applied. Delivery by Early March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic speed feedback signs at Apirana Ave and Dunkirk Rd</td>
<td>Investigating locations again as new driver feedback signs have been recently installed on these roads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Safety Projects

11. An update on the Community Safety Fund projects is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn St pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>Scheme design being finalised for a raised zebra crossing and refuge island. Consultation expected to start prior to Easter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farringdon pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>Scheme design development for raised zebra crossing. Consultation expected to start prior to Easter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elstree Ave pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>Scheme design development for bus friendly speed tables. Consultation expected to start prior to Easter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Rd pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>Scheme design development for bus friendly speed tables. Consultation expected to start prior to Easter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama Rd School pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>High friction surfacing to be applied. Delivery by Early March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Rd pedestrian safety improvements</td>
<td>High friction surfacing to be applied. Delivery by Early March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic speed feedback signs at Apirana Ave and Dunkirk Rd</td>
<td>Investigating locations again as new driver feedback signs have been recently installed on these roads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accessibility Action Plan

12. The AT board at its December 2019 meeting adopted an Accessibility Action Plan for the period 2020 to 2022. The plan provides details what actions AT will undertake over the next three years to improve accessibility.

13. The plan is reviewed every three years.

14. Current measures include:

- in accordance with the principles set out in the Transport Design Manual take steps to ensure the transport network is safe and accessible for all users by designing, building and maintaining infrastructure (including roads, footpaths, wharves, stations, interchanges and buildings) to ensure that all transport users have equal opportunities to travel;

- conduct an accessibility audit when public transport routes are reviewed or redesigned, to include infrastructure and walking access, to identify any accessibility shortfall and recommend areas for improvement as part of the overall network design, and to ensure that information is provided before changes are implemented.
15. This year’s programme includes:
   - explore possible pilot on Link buses and potential to develop for all modes with
     potential external partners e.g. Deaf Foundation and Ministry of Social Development,
     and ascertain funding requirement;
   - explore concept and estimated costs and prepare a case – a public transport
     concession fare to support people starting or returning to work; possible link with trade
     training schemes; possible liaison with Ministry of Social Development.

Annual Public Transport Fares Review from 9 February 2020

16. AT reviews public transport (PT) fares annually, taking into account such factors as contract
    price indexing (operator cost increases), agreed fare policies and the need to fund any extra
    services. The AT board has agreed some modest changes to bus, rail and ferry fares in
    2020.

17. Building on input from councillors at a Planning Committee workshop on 5 May 2019 and the
    Mayor’s budget proposal, which was adopted by the Governing Body and provided for
    targeted fare reductions including ‘Child Fare Free Weekends’ and ‘Ferry Fare Integration’,
    this fare review will support AT achieving operational financial performance in line with its
    budget and the Statement of Intent (SOI) Performance Target for the Farebox Recovery
    Ratio.

18. Fare increases have been able to be contained through financial support from Auckland
    Council and NZTA and as a result of efficiency savings made by AT.

19. Key points to note are:
   a) the average fare increase has been held to just 2.34% (or five cents per trip);
   b) these modest increases will help fund a portion of AT’s annual cost increases and
      enable AT to target additional funding on:
      i. increase peak time frequencies
      ii. expansion into new growth areas
      iii. free child weekend fares
   c) for some journeys, the cost will decrease;
   d) there will be no change to cash fares, some longer zone fares and monthly bus and
      rail passes;
   e) not increasing fares would slow down the rate of future investment in public transport;
   f) the changes will see a farebox recovery ratio of 42.14% to 42.71% against a 43-46%
      SOI target;
   g) the fare review quantum was identified in the 2019/2020 budget and was part of
      deliberations by Council and Governing Body in setting the budget.

20. AT is increasing the ferry monthly passes (inner-harbour, mid-harbour, outer-harbour) by
    $10 due to the pending implementation of ferry fare integration, which will provide additional
    value for money for customers who purchase a ferry monthly pass, with the new fare
    including free travel in the zone of origin and arrival.

21. An annual PT fare review is a requirement under the Regional Land Transport Plan. In the
    SOI, the target of the percentage of PT costs recovered through fares for 2019-2022 is 43-
    46%. However, the main driver for fare increasing is investing back into public transport and
    ensuring a safe and reliable public transport system that supports Auckland’s growing
    population.

22. Public transport fares also provide revenue that allows AT and Auckland Council to provide
    initiatives such as ‘Home Free’, free public transport after 4pm on the last Friday before
    Christmas, and fare free days such as the one held in June 2019.
Chair and Director Appointed to Auckland Transport Board

23. Auckland Council has appointed Adrienne Young-Cooper as the new chair of Auckland Transport and Darren Linton as a board director starting from 1 January 2020.

24. The council’s Appointments and Performance Review Committee approved the two appointments at its 5 December meeting. The Appointments and Performance Review Committee is responsible for all appointments to the boards of council-controlled organisations.

25. Adrienne Young-Cooper’s past and present governance roles span large infrastructure projects, housing and urban growth and transport. She is the chair of Panuku Development Auckland and will keep that position in the short term, alongside her new role as chair of Auckland Transport.

The two appointments are for a three-year term beginning from 1 January 2020 until 31 October 2023.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

Vector and AT sign Memorandum of Understanding

26. On 20 January 2020 Auckland Transport and Vector announced a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to explore the impacts of a full implementation.

27. The MoU is a direct response to AT’s Low Emission Bus Roadmap, published in late 2018, that outlined its commitment to have all new buses in Auckland being electric from 2025, with the whole fleet fully electric by 2040.

28. A faster transition to electric buses requires a detailed assessment of the future demand on the electricity network.

29. Two reports will be produced as part of the MoU, the first exploring a route and service profile, which will model the electricity demand that a fully electrified bus fleet will require. The second report will provide guidance on the electricity network infrastructure upgrades required at each bus depot, as well as likely timings and costs. These two reports are expected to be delivered by June 2020.

30. Buses make up 87 per cent of the carbon emissions produced from public transport, so converting them from diesel to electric will also be a significant step towards meeting New Zealand’s 2050 zero-carbon emissions goal.

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

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

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

32. The Board receive an update report as part of the monthly business meeting agenda and issues are workshopped or brief by memo as necessary between meetings.

33. Auckland Transport Consultations

AT provides the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board with the opportunity to comment on transport projects being delivered in their area. The consultations below were sent to the Board in September – November period for comment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Wellington Highway</td>
<td>Improvements to interchange and southbound onramp from Mt Wellington Highway to State Highway 1 in Mt Wellington.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central crosstown buses</td>
<td>Changes affect Outerlink and 650 routes to improve reliability of Outerlink and increase frequency of the 650 every 15 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Innes Cycleway project</td>
<td>Dedicated cycleways in the suburbs of Glen Innes, Stonefields, Saint Johns, and Point England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks Road – Broken yellow lines</td>
<td>Broken yellow lines to be put on section of Banks Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sollum road – Broken yellow lines</td>
<td>Broken yellow lines to be put on section of Banks Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. **Traffic Control Committee Resolutions**

The decisions to the Traffic Control Committee that affected the board area in December 2019 and January 2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Traffic and Parking changes</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Street, Onehunga</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes</td>
<td>No Stopping At All Times / Loading Zone / P120 Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripoli Road / Hinaki Street / Torino Street / Parata Street / Road 1, Pt England</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes</td>
<td>No Stopping At All Times / Road Hump / Footpath / One-Way Give-Way Slow Point / Stop Control / Give-Way Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Street/Jordan Avenue, Onehunga</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes</td>
<td>No Stopping At All Times / Bus Stop / Bus Shelter / Give-Way Control / Removal Of Bus Stop / Removal Of Bus Shelter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

35. Consideration of impacts and opportunities for engagement will be carried out on an individual project basis.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

36. The recommendation to receive this report has no financial implications.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

37. The recommendation to receive this report has no risks. AT has risk management strategies in place for the transport projects undertaken in the local board area.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

38. Auckland Transport will provide another update report to the board in March 2020.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
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</tr>
</thead>
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<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon – Elected Member Relationship Team Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Puketapapa</td>
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Approving Reserves Act 1977 classifications for Waikaraka Park following public notification

File No.: CP2020/01425

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve classification of reserve land in Waikaraka Park under the Reserves Act 1977, following the close of the period for public submissions.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Classification of reserve land is an essential step in preparing the Waikaraka Park Reserve Management Plan and a statutory requirement under the Reserves Act 1977 (RA).
3. Classification will make clear the primary values of these reserves and the types of activities that can take place on that land into the future. It will create better consistency in the management of those primary values across adjacent parcels and clarify the legal status of the land.
4. On 27 August 2019, the local board resolved to publicly notify the declaration and classification of three land parcels in Waikaraka Park (Resolution number MT/2019/115, Attachment A).
5. The period for public notification has ended and no submissions were received on the proposals, which means that no hearing is required.
6. A resolution from the local board is now required to approve the classification for the following parcels:
   • Part Lot 1 DP 25356
   • Part Allotment 80 Small Lots Near Onehunga
   • Allotment 87 Small Lots Near Onehunga
7. Once approved, we will seek the approval of the Minister of Conservation (delegated to the General Manager Community Facilities, Auckland Council) to publish the changes in the New Zealand Gazette.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) approve Part Lot 1 DP 25356 to be declared a reserve and classified as recreation reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

b) approve Part Allotment 80 Small Lots Near Onehunga to be declared a reserve and classified as recreation reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

c) approve Allotment 87 Small Lots Near Onehunga to be declared a reserve and classified as local purpose (community use and access) reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977.
Horopaki

Context

Classification programme

8. A review of the land status and classification of land at Waikaraka Park has been undertaken as part of the development of the Waikaraka Park Reserve Management Plan and was reported to the local board’s business meeting on 27 August 2019.

9. At that meeting, the local board approved four parcels of land to be declared reserve and classified under the Reserves Act 1977 and approved the classification of 13 unclassified reserve parcels. Attachment A includes a copy of those resolutions (Reference MT/2019/115).

10. In addition, the local board approved the public notification of the intention to declare three land parcels as reserve and classify this land under the RA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Survey Area (sqm)</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part Lot 1 DP 25356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Allotment 80 Small Lots Near Onehunga</td>
<td>NA5D/49</td>
<td>1.5269 ha</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotment 87 Small Lots Near Onehunga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Purpose (Community Use and Access) Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment B shows the location of these land parcels on Waikaraka Park.

11. These were publicly notified on 24 October 2019 in the Central Leader in accordance with the requirements outlined in section 119(1)(b) of the RA. The notice was also digitally published on the council website and promoted on Facebook and Neighbourly. The submission period closed on 24 November 2019.

12. A further resolution from the local board is now required to confirm the declaration and classification now that public notification has closed.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

13. No submissions were received on the proposals to declare and classify the Waikaraka Park land parcels. There were no requests received to speak to these proposals and therefore, no hearing is required.

14. The local board may choose to approve the proposed declaration and classification as they were publicly notified; or to change those actions.

15. In this case, there have been no public submissions. We therefore recommend that the local board approve the declaration and classification of the three land parcels as proposed in Table One (paragraph 9 of this report).

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi

Climate impact statement

Potential impact of proposed decisions on greenhouse gas emissions
16. While the decisions in this report are administrative and will have no impact on greenhouse gas emissions, decisions on land use and protection are a factor in managing climate impacts.

17. However, future management and potential development of park land, which is determined by its purpose, could have a potential positive or negative impact on greenhouse gas emissions. The degree and nature of the impact is dependent on the specific management and development of each park. An example of a potential impact includes:

- A potential increase in emissions through increased traffic, following the development of any community facility; the development of facilities could be enabled through the classification of local purpose (community use and access) reserve or recreation reserve.
- A recreation reserve can also enable a range of positive impacts, including the planting of trees and vegetation which can contribute to habitat restoration and offsetting carbon emissions.

**Effect of climate change over the lifetime of the proposed decisions**

18. Classification recommendations in this report consider the potential impacts of climate change in the context of current and future use and values of a park. An example of this is the consideration of whether a park could be affected by coastal inundation or sea level rises in the future. This can influence a recommendation on how to classify the land and would therefore be built into the advice provided to the local board as part of the classification process.

19. The lifetime of classification decisions is indefinite, except where the local board chooses and has the discretion under RA to change the classification in the future.

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

20. The impacts and views of declaring and classifying the three parcels on council groups was outlined in the report to the 27 August 2019 business meeting. No additional impacts arise from the decisions proposed in this report.

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

21. Local board views were described in the report to the business meeting on 27 August 2019. Resolution MT/2019/115 reflects the amendments made to the land classification recommendations in response to mana whenua feedback.

22. The local impacts of declaring and classifying the three parcels was also outlined in the report, and no additional impacts have been identified.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement**

23. Extensive mana whenua engagement has been a feature of the Waikaraka Park land classification programme. This has included hui with mana whenua representatives from Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei, Te Ākitai Waiohua, Ngāti Tamaoho, Te Patukirikiri, Ngātiti Whanaunga, Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Tai Ki Tāmaki and Ngāti Te Ata o Waiohua in 2019. Mana whenua representatives from Te Ahiwaru and Te Kawerau a Maki were unable to attend any of the hui but have expressed interest in the project.

24. For parcels held under the Local Government Act 2002, mana whenua have expressed a desire to declare and classify land in order to give them a higher level of protection offered by the RA. The reasons for this include safeguarding the land from inappropriate use and development, maintaining access to the coast and protecting public open space.

25. In December 2019, we updated all interested mana whenua on the land classification recommendations presented in this report.
26. Mana whenua supported the proposed actions and did not make any submissions to oppose the declaration and classification of those parcels during the notification period.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

27. The land will be formally declared as reserve and classified under the RA when a gazette notice describing each land parcel has been published in the New Zealand Gazette.

28. There are no financial implications associated with the gazette costs as this is funded through the operational budget of the council’s Community Facilities department.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

29. The following table outlines the risks associated with proposed classification actions as identified in the 27 August 2019 business meeting report, with an update following the public notification period closing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-notification risk</th>
<th>Post-notification update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA classifications constrain the range of uses for that land</td>
<td>The lack of submissions on the proposed classifications mean no additional risks around the ranges of uses contemplated have been identified through public feedback. Mana whenua feedback also supported the classification approach and the appropriateness of the recommended classification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public objections to proposed classifications delaying the reserve management plan process</td>
<td>There have been no submissions, meaning no delays will eventuate as a result of the public notification and submission process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. The absence of public submissions could indicate a lack of community awareness about the public notification of these classifications as members of the community may not frequent council’s website and the local board’s social media pages. However, it is considered the risk of potential objections to these proposals to be minor given that the changes align the classifications with the current or appropriate use of the land parcels being considered in this report.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

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

32. Approval of gazette notices has been delegated from the Minister of Conservation to the General Manager Community Facilities. A report will be prepared seeking approval for the gazette notices.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>27 August 2019 resolution</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Parcels to be declared and classified</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
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Resolution MT/2019/115 from the 27 August 2019 Maungakiekie–Tāmaki Local Board business meeting

Classifying land at Waikaraka Park

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson D Burrows, seconded by Member D Allan:

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) confirm Part Lot 1 DP 25356 will continue to be held under the Local Government Act 2002

b) confirm Part Allotment 80 Small Lots Near Onehunga will continue to be held under the Local Government Act 2002

c) approve public notification of the intention to declare and classify Allotment 87 Small Lots Near Onehunga as local purpose (community use and access) reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

d) approve Allotment 96 Small Lots Near Onehunga to be declared a reserve and classified as local purpose (community buildings) reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

e) approve Section 1 SO 410849 to be declared a reserve and classified as recreation reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

f) approve that part of Part Allotment 86 Small Lots Near Onehunga shown as Area A in Attachment D to be declared a reserve and classified as recreation reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

g) approve that part of Part Allotment 86 Small Lots Near Onehunga shown as Area B in Attachment D to be declared a reserve and classified as local purpose (community buildings) reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

h) approve that part of Lot 3 DP 329311 shown as Area A in Attachment D to be declared a reserve and classified as local purpose (cemetery) reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

i) approve that part of Lot 3 DP 329311 shown as Area B in Attachment D to be declared a reserve and classified as recreation reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

j) approve the proposed classification of 13 parcels of reserve land under sections 16(1) and 16(2A) of the Reserves Act 1977 as described in Attachment E.
MOVED by Chairperson C Makoare, seconded by Member A Verral:

Chairperson C Makoare moved an amendment to the original recommendation as follows:

a) approve public notification of the intention to declare and classify Part Lot 1 DP 25356 as recreation reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977
b) approve public notification of the intention to declare and classify Part Allotment 80 Small Lots Near Onehunga as recreation reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977.

The amendment was put and declared **CARRIED**

Note: As per standing order 1.9.7 Deputy Chairperson D Burrows and Member D Allan requested that their assenting votes be recorded.

The Chairperson put the substantive motion

Resolution number MT/2019/115

MOVED by Chairperson C Makoare, seconded by Member A Verral:

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) approve public notification of the intention to declare and classify Part Lot 1 DP 25356 as recreation reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977
b) approve public notification of the intention to declare and classify Part Allotment 80 Small Lots Near Onehunga as recreation reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977
c) approve public notification of the intention to declare and classify Allotment 87 Small Lots Near Onehunga as local purpose (community use and access) reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977
d) approve Allotment 96 Small Lots Near Onehunga to be declared a reserve and classified as local purpose (community buildings) reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977
e) approve Section 1 SO 410849 to be declared a reserve and classified as recreation reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977
f) approve that part of Part Allotment 86 Small Lots Near Onehunga shown as Area A in Attachment D to be declared a reserve and classified as recreation reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977
g) approve that part of Part Allotment 86 Small Lots Near Onehunga shown as Area B in Attachment D to be declared a reserve and classified as local purpose (community buildings) reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977
h) approve that part of Lot 3 DP 329311 shown as Area A in Attachment D to be declared a reserve and classified as local purpose (cemetery) reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

i) approve that part of Lot 3 DP 329311 shown as Area B in Attachment D to be declared a reserve and classified as recreation reserve, under section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

j) approve the proposed classification of 13 parcels of reserve land under sections 16(1) and 16(2A) of the Reserves Act 1977 as described in Attachment E.

The substantive motion was declared.

CARRIED
Parcels to be declared reserve and classified under Reserves Act 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Part Lot 1 DP 25356</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Part Allot 80 Small Lots Near Onehunga</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Allot 87 Small Lots Near Onehunga</td>
<td>Local Purpose (Community Use and Access) Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appointment of LGNZ Lead and nominee for LGNZ Conference 2020

File No.: CP2020/01000

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To appoint a lead for Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) matters and nominate a representative to attend the 2020 LGNZ Annual Conference and General Meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Local boards are invited to appoint a lead (and alternate) on Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) matters. The lead will be the main contact for all LGNZ issues and will represent the local board at meetings of Auckland/LGNZ zone and any related meetings.

3. The LGNZ Annual Conference and General Meeting (AGM) takes place at the ASB Theatre Malborough in Waiharakeke Blenheim from 8am Thursday 16 July to 3pm Saturday 18 July 2020.

4. Local boards are invited to nominate a representative to attend the LGNZ conference. This can be the local board appointed LGNZ lead or another member of the local board. Given the cost of and overall numbers of elected member attendance, staff recommend that one member per local board attend.

5. In addition to the official delegates, LGNZ requires prior notice of which local board members plan to attend the AGM. Members wishing to attend are asked to provide their names to the Democracy Services Business Hub team by Friday 17 April 2020 so that this information can be provided to LGNZ.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) appoint a lead and alternate for LGNZ related matters for the 2019-2022 triennium and task these members with representing the local board at Auckland/LGNZ meetings.

b) nominate one elected member per local board to attend the Local Government New Zealand 2020 Conference and Annual General Meeting in Waiharakeke Blenheim, Thursday 16 July to Saturday 18 July 2020.

c) confirm that conference attendance including travel and accommodation will be paid for in accordance with the current Auckland Council Elected Member Expense Policy.

d) note that any members who wish to attend the AGM must provide their names to the Democracy Services Business Hub team by Friday 17 April 2020 to ensure that they are registered with Local Government New Zealand.

Horopaki
Context
6. LGNZ is an incorporated society of local government organisations whose primary objective is to represent and advocate for the interests of local authorities in New Zealand. LGNZ
champions policy positions on key issues that are of interest to local government and holds regular meetings and events throughout the year for members. The schedule of meetings includes an annual conference and meetings of local government geographical clusters (known as LGNZ zones) and sectors.

7. LGNZ is governed by a National Council made up of representatives from member authorities as outlined in the constitution. Some of its work is conducted through committees and working groups which include representatives from member authorities.

8. Elected members who have been formally appointed to LGNZ roles are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elected member</th>
<th>Appointed role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Phil Goff</td>
<td>National Council representative for Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council representative on the Metropolitan Sector Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Pippa Coom</td>
<td>National Council representative for Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Member Richard Northey</td>
<td>(appointed by Governing Body)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Council representative for Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(appointed by local boards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore</td>
<td>Auckland Council representative on Regional Sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meetings of Auckland/LGNZ (Auckland Zone)

9. As part of recent changes to the LGNZ Rules, Auckland Council is no longer part of LGNZ Zone 1 but is expected to organize itself, with its multiple local boards and Governing Body, as an informal LGNZ zone.

10. Meetings of the Auckland/LGNZ zone have been scheduled on a biannual basis. These meetings will be co-chaired by the two Auckland representatives appointed to the LGNZ National Council by the Governing Body (Councillor Pippa Coom) and local boards’ (Member Richard Northey).

11. Meetings of the Auckland/LGNZ zone will be open to all elected members but formal representation will sit with the nominated leads.

LGNZ Annual conference and AGM 2020

12. This year the LGNZ conference and AGM will be held at the ASB Theatre Marlborough, Waiharakeke Blenheim, Thursday 16 July to Saturday 18 July 2020.

13. The conference takes place over the first two days commencing at 9.30am on Thursday 16 July and closing with the LGNZ Excellence Awards on the evening of Friday 17 July.

14. The conference programme has the theme “Natural Capital”. The final programme will be publicly available at the end of February however we have had indication from LGNZ that the programme is expected to include addresses from the Prime Minister, various political leaders and President of LGNZ as well as sessions on the following topics

- Natural capital - the Marlborough story
- Fishes in the river, fishes in the sea (Water, aquaculture and the Resource Management Act)
- Tourism – working together to care for people, place and culture
- Building towards sustainable supply (housing)
- Resilience in the face of natural hazards (infrastructure and communities)
Item 17

- Cultural wellbeing plenary session
- Interactive workshops on cultural, economic, environmental and social well-being
- Tours, showcases and dinners

15. The AGM takes place on the last day of the conference from 9.30am to 12.30pm. The LGNZ constitution permits the Auckland Council to appoint four delegates to represent it at the AGM, with one of the delegates being appointed as presiding delegate.

16. Traditionally the four AGM delegates have been the Mayor, the Chief Executive and two Governing Body members who hold LGNZ roles. Delegates in 2019 were Mayor Phil Goff, Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore, Councillor Penny Hulse and Local board Chair Pippa Coom.

17. The Governing Body will consider an item on AGM attendance at its meeting on 27 March 2020 which includes the recommendation that Mayor Phil Goff be the presiding delegate and the other three delegates be comprised of either:
   
   a) two members of the Governing Body who hold a formal representation role with LGNZ and the Chief Executive; or
   
   b) one member of the Governing Body who holds a formal representation role with LGNZ and the Chief Executive, and a local board member; or
   
   c) two members of the Governing Body who hold a formal representation role with LGNZ and a local board member.

18. In addition to the official delegates, LGNZ requires prior notice of which local board members plan to attend the AGM. Attendance at the AGM is not compulsory for conference participants.

Pre-conference meetings

19. On Wednesday 15 July there will be a pre-conference meeting of the National Council as well as a Te Maruata Hui. Elected members that are on these two groups and wish to attend these meetings would need to arrive earlier than other meeting participants.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Meetings of Auckland/LGNZ (Auckland Zone)

20. Local boards are requested to appoint a lead for the 2019-2022 triennium. The lead’s responsibilities include:
   - attend and represent the local board at meetings of Auckland/LGNZ zone and other LGNZ meetings, as appropriate
   - be the main contact for the local board on all LGNZ matters
   - share information from Auckland/LGNZ and other LGNZ-related meetings attended with the local board

LGNZ Annual conference and AGM 2020

21. In 2020, with the venue in Waipara, Blenheim and given the cost and overall numbers of elected member attendance, it is recommended that one member per local board attend. Having one attendee per local board means a maximum of 21 Auckland Council local board members would attend the conference.

22. The annual conference and AGM are two separate meeting sessions.

23. Local board members are invited to attend and take part in the conference.

24. For the AGM, member authorities will be represented by officially appointed delegates. Members who are not appointed delegates can attend as observers provided they are included in the AGM registration form. Local board members who wish to attend the AGM as
observers must register their intention with the Democracy Services Business Hub team by Friday 17 April so that their names can be included on the AGM registration form.

25. Local board members who attend the conference and/or AGM are strongly encouraged to report back to their local boards on proceedings at the conference. This ensures members who do not attend can still benefit from this opportunity.

### Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi

#### Climate impact statement

26. Conferences and events involving multiple participants especially those requiring long distance travel can generate a sizable carbon footprint. This is due to emissions associated with flights, car and taxi travel, hotel and event site emissions.

27. Estimates for emissions associated with travel to Blenheim or travel within Auckland for local meetings have not been calculated at the time of writing this report. Emissions, when known, can be offset through a verified carbon offset programme at a small cost.

28. Other opportunities to reduce emissions include:
   a) reducing the number of delegates to the Blenheim conference as recommended
   b) encouraging participants to opt for public transport options when attending meetings in Auckland
   c) encouraging delegates to provide updates to their local boards, including the option of daily updates from the conference and meetings via the local board facebook pages, so that non-attendance does not disadvantage other members
   d) ensuring elected members are aware of the session recordings that LGNZ will make available after the conference. LGNZ have advised that they don’t webcast or live stream any parts of the conference as they try to encourage as many people as possible to attend in person.

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

#### Council group impacts and views

29. There are no impacts for CCOs or departments of council as the focus is on elected members attendance at meetings including the LGNZ conference.

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

#### Local impacts and local board views

30. LGNZ advocates for issues that are important to local government. Many of these issues are aligned with local board priorities e.g. climate change. As such, there is interest at local board level in staying across the work of LGNZ and in identifying and harnessing opportunities to progress other advocacy areas that local boards may have.

31. Having a dedicated lead who can attend Auckland meetings on LGNZ matters and who can be part of future discussions about remits and other topics, will enable local boards and their communities to continue to be informed and give considered input to work being led by LGNZ.

32. The LGNZ Annual conference is always of interest to local board members. They provide a unique networking opportunity for local government leaders from around the country and the agenda of these meetings are designed to support local leaders in their roles and responsibilities. This is in line with the purpose of the elected member development programme which is to support elected members as governors and decision-makers.
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**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

33. The work of LGNZ is expected to impact positively on Māori. LGNZ advocates on a variety of issues that are important to Māori including Māori housing, various environmental issues and Council-Māori participation/relationship arrangements. In addition, LGNZ provides advice including published guidance to assist local authorities in understanding values, aspirations and interest of Māori.

34. The LGNZ National Council has a sub-committee, Te Maruata, 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. It also provides support for councils in building relationships with iwi, hapu and Māori groups. Te Maruata provides Māori input on development of future policies or legislation relating to local government. In the previous term Councillor Alf Filipaina was a member of the sub-committee. Te Maruata will hold a hui on Wednesday 15 July 2020 from 10am to 4.30pm.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

**Meetings of Auckland/LGNZ (Auckland Zone)**

35. Meetings of Auckland/LGNZ are a new initiative being introduced this triennium following amendments to LGNZ zones. The two meetings for 2020 are scheduled for 13 March and 11 September and are not currently budgeted for. Staff will use existing resources and liaise with Kura Kāwana to identify combined opportunities for these meetings dates.

36. Managing attendance numbers by only requiring attendance of leads, with others as optional attendees if they wish, should contribute towards keeping meeting costs down.

**Annual conference and AGM 2020**

37. The normal registration rate for the LGNZ Conference and AGM is $1,410 (early bird) or $1,510 (standard). The total cost for early bird registration for 21 local board members is $29,610, with flights and accommodation additional.

38. Costs of attendance for one member from each local board are to be met from the elected members’ development budget as managed centrally by the Kura Kawana Programme.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

**Meetings of Auckland/LGNZ (Auckland Zone)**

39. The inaugural meeting of the Auckland Zone is planned for 13 March 2020. If a local board has not chosen an LGNZ lead by this date, they would need to select a member to attend this meeting as their official representative.

**Annual conference and AGM 2020**

40. The key risk is of delayed decision-making which can impact costs and registration choices. The sooner the registration for the nominated local board member can be made, the more likely it is that Auckland Council can take advantage of early bird pricing for the conference and flights, all done via bulk booking. Delayed information may also impact registration into preferred conference streams or events.

41. There is always a level of reputational risk associated with any financial expenditure. Large delegations to conferences can be costly hence the advice that only one per local board attend.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

Meetings of Auckland/LGNZ (Auckland Zone)

42. There are two planned meetings for the Auckland Zone in 2020. The inaugural meeting is scheduled for 13 March and the second meeting is on 11 September.

43. Preparations for the inaugural meeting are being made by staff with guidance from the co-chairs. The agenda will include a report from LGNZ Executive and will also include an update on the Localism project. The agenda will be made available to members closer to the time of the meeting.

Annual conference and AGM 2020

44. Once members are confirmed to attend, the Democracy Services Business Hub team will co-ordinate and book all conference registrations, as well as requests to attend the AGM.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
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<th>Shirley Coutts - Principal Advisor - Governance Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linda Gifford – Programme Manager – Elected Member Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Auckland Council's Quarterly Performance Report:
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board for quarter two 2019/2020

File No.: CP2020/01830

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board with an integrated quarterly performance report for quarter two, 1 October – 31 December 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report includes financial performance, progress against work programmes, key challenges the board should be aware of and any risks to delivery against the 2019/2020 work programme.

3. The work programme is produced annually and aligns with the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Plan outcomes.

4. The key activity updates from this quarter are:
   • public notification of the classification proposals for Waikaraka Park has been completed and the second round of consultation is planned for quarter three.
   • the overlapping interest step in the Te Kete Rukuruku naming process will take longer than initially planned. Due to this, the gifting of names process will now occur in quarter one of the 2020/2021 financial year.
   • the capability and capacity development of local community groups being delivered by Kāinga Ora is now underway after taking longer than anticipated to begin.

5. All operating departments with agreed work programmes have provided a quarterly update against their work programme delivery. Activities are reported with a status of green (on track), amber (some risk or issues, which are being managed) or grey (cancelled, deferred or merged).

6. The financial performance report for the quarter is attached but is excluded from the public. This is due to restrictions on the release of half year financial information until the Auckland Council Group results are released to the NZX on 28 February 2020.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) receive the performance report for quarter two ending 31 December 2019.

b) note the financial performance report in Attachment B of the report will remain confidential until after the Auckland Council Group half year results are released to the NZX which are expected to be made public by 28 February 2020.

Horopaki
Context
7. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board has an approved 2019/2020 work programme for the following operating departments:
8. Work programmes are produced annually, to meet the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board outcomes identified in the three-year Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Plan. The local board plan outcomes are:
   - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is an active and engaged community
   - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is a community that cares about its environment
   - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is the place to be
   - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki has quality infrastructure to match growth.

9. The graph below shows how the work programme activities meet Local Board Plan outcomes. Activities that are not part of the approved work programme but contribute towards the local board outcomes, such as advocacy by the local board, are not captured in this graph.

   Graph 1: Work programme activities by outcome

---

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Local Board Work Programme Snapshot

10. The graph below identifies work programme activity by RAG status (red, amber, green and grey) which measures the performance of the activity. It shows the percentage of work programme activities that are on track (green), in progress but with issues that are being
managed (amber), activities that have significant issues (red) and activities that have been cancelled/deferred/merged (grey).

**Graph 2: Work programme performance by RAG status**

11. The graph below shows the stage of the activities in each departments’ work programmes. The number of activity lines differ by department as approved in the local board work programmes.

**Graph 3: Work programme performance by activity status and department**

**Key activity updates from quarter two**

12. **Industrial pollution prevention – Penrose and Mt Wellington**: the delivery of this programme has been delayed until quarter three due to a scheduling conflict.

13. **Glen Innes Pool and Leisure Centre operations**: the centre has experienced a fifteen per cent decrease in centre visits when measured against the same period last year. This is largely a result of casual swimmers and likely resulting from the road works currently occurring outside the facility.

14. **Lagoon stadium**: the centre has experienced a ten per cent decrease in centre visits when measured against the same period last year. The change is likely related to the AMETI road works and YMCA is continuing to work with the contractor to manage road access to the centre.
15. **Te Kete Rukuruku (Māori naming of parks and places):** the overlapping interest step in the naming process will take longer than initially planned, pushing the process out across quarter three and four, with the gifting of names process occurring in quarter one of the 2020/2021 financial year.

16. **Mt Wellington planning investigation:** an area plan for Mt Wellington will commence at the earliest, in July 2021 (FY2021/2022) due to the Plans and Places Department's full work programme for this financial year as well as the 2020-2021 financial year. The local board has requested that an area plan for Mt Wellington be commenced during 2020-2021 rather than 2021-2022 and a meeting is scheduled to take place in quarter three.

17. **Youth connections:** the capability and capacity development of local community groups being delivered by Kāinga Ora is taking longer than expected but is now in progress. Once this is completed, Kāinga Ora will advise the two community groups that will be further funded this financial year to provide strong employment skills and post placement support to local youth.

18. **Waikaraka Park – improve sports park and extend sports field:** the start of this activity is currently delayed as this land currently has a Notice of Requirement from New Zealand Transport Agency for the East West Link project. A Waikaraka Precinct Master Plan alongside a Waikaraka Park Reserve Management Plan are being developed and will inform scope of works within the sports park.

19. **Dunkirk Activity Centre – renew roof and refurbish interior:** project timelines have been extended due to contamination and seismic issues with the building. Staff will provide an update to the local board in quarter three.

20. **Taniwha Reserve – general park development:** physical works for this project are not able to proceed until next earthworks season in October due to delays in the land exchange process.

21. **Te Oro programme delivery:** an array of shows was delivered by young Māori and Pasifika artists including, Young, Single and Samoan, Faces of Oceania with Plantations conversations, and the Pao Pao Pao Showcase.

22. **Programming in community places:** together with key community groups, organisations and businesses, staff delivered the Onehunga Community Day that had over 450 community members attend.

23. **Strategic partnerships:** staff held two funding capability workshops and one drop-in funding clinic, where the community were able to talk with funding advisors and the community grants team. The community impact evaluation toolkit was finalised and shared with organisations that assisted with its development. This will be shared with other groups in 2020.

24. **Engaged communities:** staff facilitated a session with the Panamasians and local organisations to create and enhance the shared identity known as Panama culture. As part of the Rent Smart programme, the Sylvia Park Citizens Advice Bureau delivered a *Rent Smart Information Hub* at the community centre.

25. **Youth Empowerment:** Synergy Projects, alongside staff have delivered an entrepreneurship programme that supported young people to build life and work skills. Flipping East supported the Tāmaki Youth Council and the development of the student council toolkit. The 312 Hub was awarded the Youth Enterprise and Innovation Award at the Maungakiekie Youth Awards and is preparing to launch a new line of merchandise.

26. **Onehunga sustainability development programme:** fifteen businesses in the Onehunga Town Centre have proceeded with a detailed waste assessment and received reports outlining potential opportunities for waste diversion.

27. **Waikaraka Park Reserve Management Plan:** the public notification of classification proposals has been completed and the second round of consultation is planned for quarter three.
28. **Local Parks Management Plan:** the land status investigation commenced which considers the Reserves Act status of each of the parks to inform classification decisions.

29. **Love your neighbourhood:** one application of $500 was approved in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, leaving $9,000 for quarter three and four.

30. **Low carbon lifestyles:** the target of engaged households was exceeded, with 223 households engaged and 180 of those households reported taking one or more of the suggested actions.

31. **Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum:** the forum has continued discussions with Plastics New Zealand on an industry partnership to address plastic waste in the estuary.

32. **Support customer and community connection and celebrate cultural diversity and local places, people and heritage:** Diwali and Christmas celebrations were held at all the libraries in the local board area. Glen Innes and Panmure Library also celebrated Tongan and Niuean Language Weeks.

33. **The following activities are now complete:**
   - Local Events Programme – Onehunga Christmas Lights Event
   - Panmure Basin - implement masterplan priorities
   - Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve - renew coastal wall
   - Onehunga Library - renew furniture fixtures and equipment
   - Onehunga War Memorial Pool - remove tree & renew boundary wall.
   - Glen Innes Community Hall - Citizens Advice Bureau - refurbish interior
   - Glen Innes Community Hall - renew community places facility
   - Mount Wellington War Memorial Reserve, 50 Dunkirk Road, Panmure – Lease to Mt Wellington Tennis Club Incorporated
   - Konini Park, Waiohua Road Greenlane – Lease to Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated
   - Ruapotaka Reserve, 92-106 Line Rd Glen Innes – Lease to RNZ Plunket Society.

**Activities on hold**

34. The following work programme activities have been identified by operating departments as on hold:
   - **Mt Wellington War Memorial Park – provide new dual toilet facility:** this activity is currently on hold as there is ongoing discussion with the rugby club regarding the location and layout of the facility. Staff will recommend a way forward after further investigation
   - **Stone Cottage – renew roof and joinery:** the activity is currently on hold due to seismic implications. The seismic team will undertake an investigation and recommend a way forward
   - **175-243 Neilson St, Onehunga – Lease to Auckland Stock and Saloon Car Club Incorporated:** this lease is on hold until the completion of the Waikaraka Park Reserve Management Plan. Staff will provide further advice after the completion of the plan, which is estimated for the end of 2020
   - **Waikaraka Park, 246 Nielson St, Onehunga – Lease to Auckland Canine Agility Club Incorporated:** this lease is on hold until the completion of the Waikaraka Park Reserve Management Plan. Staff will provide further advice after the completion of the plan, which is estimated for the end of 2020
   - **Waikaraka Park, 175-243 Nielson St, Te Papapa – Lease to Onehunga Combined Sports Trust:** this lease is on hold until the completion of the Waikaraka Park Reserve
Management Plan. Staff will provide further advice after the completion of the plan, which is estimated for the end of 2020.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**  
Climate impact statement

35. Receiving performance monitoring reports will not result in any identifiable changes to greenhouse gas emissions.

36. Work programmes were approved in June 2019 and delivery is already underway. Should significant changes to any projects be required, climate impacts will be assessed as part of the relevant reporting requirements.

37. The local board is currently investing in a number of sustainability projects, which aim to build awareness around individual carbon emissions, and changing behaviour at a local level. These include:

- **Industrial prevention pollution programme – Penrose and Mt Wellington**: this is an educational programme aimed to inform industries and businesses about the impacts on local waterways

- **Low carbon lifestyles**: this project supports and empowers households to lead low carbon lifestyles through its two objectives to reduce residential energy use and associated carbon emissions, as well as to improve residential health by keeping houses warmer and drier.

- **Onehunga sustainability development programme**: this project focuses on retail and services businesses, providing a free on-the-spot waste assessment, envisioned to improve waste minimisation practices.

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

38. When developing the work programmes, council group impacts and views are presented to the boards.

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

39. This report informs the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board of the performance for quarter two ending 31 December 2019.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**  
Māori impact statement

40. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board remains committed to integrating and supporting work that contributes to outcomes for Māori. This includes enhancing partnerships and collaborative ways of working with mana whenua and mataawaka.

41. Some of the activities in the local board’s 2019/2020 work programme (Attachment A) have specific impact on the wider community, this includes:

- continued collaboration with Ruapōtaka Marae and their marae redevelopment. The marae alongside staff is continuing to work on its business plan which is planned to be completed by 2020.

- the local board is supporting the programme, Te Kete Rukuruku (Māori naming of parks and places). The local board approved its first tranche of parks at its 27 August 2019 business meeting and invited mana whenua to provide a Māori name and narrative for these parks. Mana whenua received the tranche list in December 2019. It
is anticipated that the gifting of names process will occur in quarter one of the 2020/2021 financial year.

- all three libraries in the local board area are committed to ‘celebrating Te Ao Māori and strengthening responsiveness to Māori. Whakatipu i te reo Māori’. Panmure library is investigating community interest in starting a Te Reo Korero group based at the library, and Glen Innes library has started a Te Reo class that will continue to be delivered in 2020.
- Te Oro supported the delivery of the Pao Pao Pao Showcase, where sixteen young emerging Māori musicians performed and were also filmed by Māori television.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

42. There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Financial Performance

43. Auckland Council (Council) currently has a number of bonds quoted on the NZ Stock Exchange (NZX). As a result, the Council is subject to obligations under the NZX Main Board & Debt Market Listing Rules and the Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013 sections 97 and 461H. These obligations restrict the release of half year financial reports and results until the Auckland Council Group results are released to the NZX on 28 February 2020. Due to these obligations the financial performance attached to the quarterly report is excluded from the public.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

44. While the risk of non-delivery of the entire work programme is rare, the likelihood for risk relating to individual activities does vary. Capital projects for instance, are susceptible to more risk as on-time and on-budget delivery is dependent on weather conditions, approvals (e.g. building consents) and is susceptible to market conditions.

45. Community Facilities are currently going through a departmental restructure to provide better support and guidance for decision makers. There is a risk that the work programmes could be disrupted or delayed. To mitigate this risk a transition plan is in place to ensure that the local board’s work programmes are delivered, and disruptions are kept to a minimum. The local board will be kept informed throughout the transition.

46. The approved Community Facilities 2019/2020 work programme and 2020-2022 indicative work programme include projects identified as part of the Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP). These are projects that the Community Facilities delivery team will progress, if possible, in advance of the programmed delivery year. This flexibility in delivery timing will help to achieve 100 per cent financial delivery for the 2019/2020 financial year, by ensuring that if projects intended for delivery in the 2019/2020 financial year are delayed due to unforeseen circumstances, that other projects can be progressed while the causes for delays are addressed.

47. Information about any significant risks and how they are being managed and/or mitigated is addressed in the ‘Activities with significant issues’ section.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

48. The local board will receive the next performance update following the end of quarter three (31 March 2020).
Ngā tāpirihanga
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## Work Programme 2019/2020 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CCO</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td><strong>Apply the empowered communities approach – connecting communities (MTE)</strong></td>
<td>Broker strategic collaborative relationships and resources within the community. This includes five key activity areas:</td>
<td>CS: ACE</td>
<td>LD: Opex</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>In Q1 staff worked with community stakeholders, including the:</td>
<td>Staff supported community stakeholders to strengthen community led planning initiatives by: collaboration with the Riverstone Community Centre, Panorama Road School and Kauria Aho Housing to settle new residents in the community through networking meetings; facilitating Onepunga Combined Sports Trust, Blossoms Early Childhood Centre, the Onepunga Royal Oak Collective, Orange Collective and the Panmure/Pt England Dan Blank Activity Centre to improve operational and technical expertise to allow better communication with council colleagues; providing input to the Mt Wellington Rugby League club and Council maintenance team to address safety concerns in Thompson Park to increase safety for the community by participating in community decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Engaging communities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reaching out to less accessible and diverse groups - Focussing on capacity building and inclusion - Supporting existing community groups and relationships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Strengthen community-led placemaking and planning initiatives - Empowering communities to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide input into placemaking initiatives - Influence decision-making on place-based planning and implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This includes urban revitalisation activities, collaborating with relevant council departments and council-controlled organisations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Enabling council:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Supporting groups to gain access to operational and technical expertise and identify and address barriers to community empowerment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Responding to the aspirations of mana whenua, māori, māori and māori organisations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- This does not replace or duplicate any stand-alone local board Māori responsiveness activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Reporting back to local board members on progress in activity areas 1 – 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td><strong>Ruapotaka Marae support</strong></td>
<td>Support Ruapotaka Marae in progressing the marae redevelopment project by liaising with the marae on behalf of council and coordinating the council response, and providing capability building opportunities, professional advice and liaison services to the marae as required (e.g. liaison coordinator, funding advisor). This activity will deliver on the local board’s objective: ‘Our suburbs and town centres are sought-after destinations to live, work and play’.</td>
<td>CS: ACE</td>
<td>LD: Opex</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Staff met with the Ruapotaka Marae Board of Trustees in September 2019 to present the work completed to date and a proposed approach to develop the marae business plan. The marae board endorsed the approach and confirmed they will form a working group to support the development of the business plan. The first meeting with the working group will take place in October 2019, with the business plan to be finalised in 2020. The General Manager of the Marae approved the videos of the history and stories of Ruapotaka Marae, with three videos being gifted to the Marae. The marae development toolkit is under development and staff expect to be completed in Q2.</td>
<td>Staff continued to work with the general manager of Ruapotaka Marae to align current services of the marae with their financial statements. This provided an insight as to its financial sustainability and possible growth areas. Staff identified the functional needs of the marae and future opportunities for growth and development which may include local enterprise initiatives. The manager has advised the marae working group will be holding its inaugural meeting in 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td><strong>Local Events Programme</strong></td>
<td>- Glow in the Park $10,000 (Mauriwhenua Community Trust)</td>
<td>CS: ACE: Events</td>
<td>LD: Opex</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Funding agreements have been completed for the following two events with $25,000 either paid out or currently awaiting the return of funding agreements or payment:</td>
<td>Funding agreements have been completed for four events with $55,000 either paid out or currently awaiting payment. This includes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Oranga Community Christmas Event $5,000 (Synergy Project Trust)</td>
<td>- Onepunga Festival $25,000 (Onepunga Festival Committee)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Glow in The Park $10,000</td>
<td>- Glow in The Park $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Matamaki Light Trail $30,000 (Glen Innes Business Association)</td>
<td>- Panmure Family Fun Day $15,000 (Panmure Business Association)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Panmure Festival $25,000</td>
<td>- Panmure Festival $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Event Survey (budget for a second event survey, the LTP covers first). Board to specify event $2,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Panmure Fun Day $15,000</td>
<td>- Panmure Fun Day $15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The local board has confirmed that $2,300 will be used to pay for an event survey of the Matamaki Light Trail 2020.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding for the Matamaki Light Trail ($38,000) is expected to be paid out in Q3 or Q4. The local board has confirmed the Matamaki Light Trail as its secondary event survey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work Programme 2019/2020 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or COO</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Local Events Programme – Onetangi Christmas Lights Event</td>
<td>Delivery of a Christmas event at Jellicoe Park featuring a programme of entertainment and stalls, to coincide with the lighting of the tree.</td>
<td>CS, ACE: Events</td>
<td>LTD Opex</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The event date has been confirmed for Friday 29 November 2019 at Jellicoe Park, Onetangi. A permit application has been submitted. Programming will focus on engaging local community participation, with entertainment, activities and food stalls.</td>
<td>The Onetangi Christmas Lights was held on Friday 29 November 2019 at Jellicoe Park, Onetangi. The warm weather brought around 5,000 people to celebrate Christmas and enjoy the performances. The event was well received, with the traditional lighting of the tree at 9pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Citizenship Ceremonies - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Deliver an annual programme of citizenship ceremonies in conjunction with the Department of Internal Affairs. Note: the 2019/2020 budget figure shown for this activity includes the $9,000 originally approved plus $10,000 carried forward from 2018/2019.</td>
<td>CS, ACE: Events</td>
<td>ABS Opex</td>
<td>$24,088</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The Civic Events team delivered two citizenship ceremonies on two separate occasions during Q1 with 257 people from the local board area becoming new citizens.</td>
<td>The Civic Events team delivered two citizenship ceremonies on two separate occasions during Q2 with 194 people from the local board area becoming new citizens. No activity occurred during Q2 as no civic events were scheduled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Local Civic Events - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Deliver and/or support civic events within the local board area.</td>
<td>CS, ACE: Events</td>
<td>LTD Opex</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The following two civic events were confirmed to be held in 2019/2020 - Onetangi Bay reserve (50th turning) - Tamaki Path activation. Both events scheduled for Q3, planning will start in Q2.</td>
<td>Planning for Movies in Parks is on track with pre-entertainment booked and event permits issued for the Harlin Park screening on Saturday 22 February 2020 and Ferguson Domain screening on Thursday 21 March 2020. Public screening licences for &quot;Dream&quot; and &quot;Toy Story 4&quot; have been approved. Event specific marketing starts three weeks prior to each event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Local Events Programme - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki (Movies in Parks)</td>
<td>Programme and deliver two Regional Movies in Parks series events.</td>
<td>CS, ACE: Events</td>
<td>LTD Opex</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Programming and delivery planning for two Regional Movies in Parks series events are underway. Movie listings and screening locations will be confirmed in Q2. Pre-entertainment will be sourced locally during Q2 for engagement and activation by those from within the community.</td>
<td>Planning for Movies in Parks is on track with pre-entertainment booked and event permits issued for the Harlin Park screening on Saturday 22 February 2020 and Ferguson Domain screening on Thursday 21 March 2020. Public screening licences for &quot;Dream&quot; and &quot;Toy Story 4&quot; have been approved. Event specific marketing starts three weeks prior to each event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Arvacs Services - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Support and/or deliver Arvacs services and pathways within the local board area.</td>
<td>CS, ACE: Events</td>
<td>LTD Opex</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Scheduled for Q4; planning will commence in Q2.</td>
<td>Scheduled for Q4; planning commenced in Q2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Local community grants</td>
<td>Contingent grant funding to support local community groups. This will be administered through three rounds.</td>
<td>CS, ACE: Community</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The local board has allocated $59,752.44 in local grants round one, leaving a total of $89,247.56 to be allocated to one local grants round and one quick response round.</td>
<td>There have been no grant decisions in Q2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td>Operational Expenditure - Te Oro (Council Faculty)</td>
<td>Operate Te Oro as a music and arts centre for youth.</td>
<td>CS, ACE: Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>ABS Opex</td>
<td>$395,668</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>During Q1, Te Oro delivered 15 programmes with 3,448 attendees and participants, 14 of which had Māori outcomes.</td>
<td>During Q2, Te Oro delivered 56 programmes to 1,192 participants with 3 programmes that had specific Māori outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>Te Oro Business Plan and governance review</td>
<td>Undertake a review of the business plan, including the governance, for Te Oro.</td>
<td>CS, ACE: Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>ABS Opex</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The final meeting with the Te Oro Governance Committee was held in Q1. The draft business plan and governance options for Te Oro will be presented to the local board in Q3.</td>
<td>Staff held a workshop in November 2019 to finalise the amendments to the business plan and charter. The draft business plan and governance options are being prepared for Te Oro and are expected to be presented to the local board in Q3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747</td>
<td>Te Oro Programme Delivery</td>
<td>Provide a programme of activities including classes, workshops, events and community engagement at Te Oro (approximately $177,300) that align to the Te Oro Charter and Business Plan.</td>
<td>CS, ACE: Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>ABS Opex</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>During Q1, programme highlights included the Pop-Up Tongariro Art Market as part of the Okariko Festival and Tongariro language week, the delivery of the Gisborne Special School Film Festival that was attended by over 600 people over two days, and the Te Aro Rama Mataure Light Trail that was extended to a total of nine nights and included a food market, arts and craft market.</td>
<td>Programme highlights for Q2 included a stand up comedy show called Young Single and Serious to an audience of 300, the first of an annual music night with Lewis Early Music Students, a sell out showing of Days of Oceans with Plantations conversations and the Poi Poi Poi Showcase where 15 young emerging Maori musicians performed, filmed by Moki Television.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Activity Name: Community Places - MT</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Lead Dept / Unit or CO</td>
<td>Budget Source</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Activity Phase</td>
<td>RAG</td>
<td>Q1 Commentary</td>
<td>Q2 Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1067</td>
<td>Access to Community Places - MT</td>
<td>Provide fair, easy and affordable access to safe and welcoming venues in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area. Council delivery: Ferguson Hall Glen Innes Community Hall Otehua Community Centre Parnell Street Hall Oranga Community Centre Parnure Community Hall Riversdale Community Centre.</td>
<td>CS AEC: Community Places</td>
<td>ABS, Opex</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>During Q1, participant numbers across local board areas council and community managed venues have increased by 6% per cent compared to the same period last year. Bookings hours across council and community managed venues have also increased by 14 per cent compared to the same period last year. Satisfaction results for council managed venues show that 97 per cent of customers would recommend the venues they have visited. This top two activity types are arts/cultural events and religious.</td>
<td>During Q2, participant numbers across local board areas council and community managed venues have increased by 13 per cent compared to the same period last year. Bookings hours across council and community managed venues have also increased by nine per cent compared to the same period last year. Satisfaction results for council managed venues show that 89 per cent of customers would recommend the venues they have visited. The top two activity types are arts/cultural events and religious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1068</td>
<td>Activation of Community Places - MT</td>
<td>Enable and co-create a wide range of activities that cater to the diversity of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki local community. Council delivery: Riversdale Community Centre/Oranga Community Centre/Otehua Community Centre. (Community delivery supported by council through a contract for service funding agreement/Dunirk Road Activity Centre, three year term expires 20 June 2021 $49,791). Operational funding management fee amount to be adjusted annually in accordance with Auckland Council’s agreed inflationary mechanism once confirmed.</td>
<td>CS AEC: Community Places</td>
<td>ABS, Opex</td>
<td>$49,791</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Staff across Oranga and Otehua Community Centre have been working closely with a number of social service providers in the wider community to provide access to a range of wellbeing activities including diabetes clinics, B4 school checks, free food packages and cooking on a budget classes. Staff have also focused on other forms of wellbeing with support for an art group, music program and an enjoyable and accessible social community lunch.</td>
<td>Dunirk Road Activity Centre continues to support skill building and network opportunities for local residents and community workers. In Q2, the centre invited neighbours Day Activitas to facilitate an interactive workshop and discussion on community engagement with 19 participants from the local community all new. Participants commented that they had all learned a new strategy to assist in engagement with the local community and would be putting these into practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1069</td>
<td>Programming in Community Places - MT</td>
<td>Develop and deliver programmes that respond to a need or gap in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki local community. Council delivery: Oranga Community Centre (36,967) Otehua Community Centre (80,204)</td>
<td>CS AEC: Community Places</td>
<td>ABS, Opex</td>
<td>$117,261</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Oranga and Otehua have had an increase of programme initiatives that engage and empower youth and families to be self-determined and improve wellbeing. These initiatives have provided great value by partnering with key stakeholders and organisations that create a collective and community impact. An example is staff at the Oranga Community Centre working closely with Synergy Trust to develop and deliver a wide-ranging youth programme including a music lab, junior training programme and the Auckland Rugby Academy. Young people in the community have further been supported by access to an after-school drop-in and school holiday programme. The focus in Q2 will be promoting Maungakiekie Youth Awards and the Otehua Expo.</td>
<td>Otehua Community Centre has had a huge success in Q2 with over 450 members of the local community attending the Otehua Community Day 2019. The success of this activity was due to partnerships with key community groups and organisations, businesses and stakeholders all of whom have great local networks and relationships. The focus for Q3 will be on the continuation of last year’s successful Proud Centre programme, to celebrate and support Pride activities in February 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1070</td>
<td>Service Improvement: Parnure Community Hall Programme Delivery</td>
<td>Increased level of service and activation - Plan, develop, deliver and evaluate a programme of activities that: - align to the outcome area “Maungakiekie- Tāmaki is an active and engaged community” with a strong focus on delivering for young people, promoting the wellbeing and safety in our communities and celebrating diversity; - ensures community participation; - enables more residents to feel connected to their community spaces allows participants to learn, grow and come together to have fun.</td>
<td>CS AEC: Community Places</td>
<td>LED, Opex</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A highlight for the activation of the Parnure Community Hall over Q1 was the Social Impact Summit that was held in August with over 200 attendees.</td>
<td>Q2 highlights for the Parnure Hall activation include staff supporting a celebration of Hīkoi week. The hall also hosted a Tongue parenting class run by Vaka Tautua which was attended by 26 adults and 26 children over eight week period, the course saw a completion rate of 80 per cent. In Q3, the focus will be on supporting people in Tamaki who are in leadership roles in their communities. The aim to create a collection of community group youth leaders and provide a space for them to network, plan and create community events and awareness campaign for young people. After school and weekly evening community activation are also being looked at for the next quarter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Work Programme 2019/2020 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CC</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Youth Connections - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Youth Connections will: • retain and build on the impactful work of Youth Connections to date particularly the community-led solutions demonstrated to create impact; • boost and scale up trial and tested 'The Southern Initiative' activities relating to young people and employment or entrepreneurship; • trial and experiment new approaches to support young marginalized youth (such as those in care, in the youth justice system or discriminated against).</td>
<td>TSI - The Southern Initiative</td>
<td>LDI - Opex</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Capacity and capability development of local community groups with HLC. Currently staff are on the process of signing the agreements for HLC to work with local community groups to capacity and capability development. HLC has identified the community groups that they are looking to capacity build to provide employment broker coach work to fill some construction roles that are coming up in the area. Upgrade of Cadet programme at Toll Group – New Zealand – The staff that has been working on it from Toll Group has gone on parental leave and no one has been allocated this work and hence staff don’t have a contact person to continue the work. Staff will work with this with the local board in Q2.</td>
<td>Once Kainga Ora confirms the local community groups to funded, we will be able to allocate the funding for 2019/20. Expected to have this confirmed by May 2020. The capacity and capability development of local community groups being delivered by Kainga Ora (formerly HLC) has taken longer than expected to get going but is now in progress. Kainga Ora will advise the community groups that the local board can further fund this financial year to provide strong employment skills to local young people and also provide post placement support to the young people. Kainga Ora is looking to provide staff the names of the community groups by end of April/May 2020 so the Youth Connections funding for FY 2019/20 can be used to fund these local groups. The Youth Connections funding that was to be for the upgrade of Cadet programme at Toll Group - New Zealand was reallocated by the local board to another activity as Toll Group was no longer able to deliver this activity (resolution MT.2019/72). Rakau Tauwhiro has completed the workshops from the Rent Smart programme and are now working on capacity building with the Panamanisers. Staff at the centre have continued to support increased collaborations with Kainga Ora and the new residents, Riverside flap, who’s members have been invited to perform and speak at various community events and the Youth Activation Programme led by Flipping East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1071</td>
<td>Service Improvement - Riverside Community Centre Programme Delivery</td>
<td>Increased level of service and activation - To strengthen existing community relationships and initiate programme activities from the Riverside Co-design Project to increase community engagement and participation. Scope potential partners to deliver programming.</td>
<td>CS - AEC - Community Places</td>
<td>LDI - Opex</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Staff at the Riverside Community Centre have been working with the Panamanisers and Rakau Tauwhiro on delivery of the Rent Smart programme. A welcome to Panoma Day for new residents has also been delivered in collaboration with Housing New Zealand, Riverside School and local residents. Staff continue to support the Panamanisers to develop and deliver activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>Support community organisations to access resources from organisations other than the local board by connecting them with each other and with funders, and building the organisations’ capabilities to become sustainable, plan and evaluate activities and programmes, and uphold as required. This will be achieved through - programmes funded via a combination of contestable and targeted funding supporting community organisations to attract funding and maintain funding and utilise the engagement of a Partnerships approach whose roles will be to identify gaps and opportunities, including potential partnerships which increase participation and belonging, and amplify the value of local board investment, influence key local activity to maximise impact towards local board outcomes, particularly Outcome One - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is an active and engaged community. This activity will deliver on the local board’s objective people are cared for and enabled to participate, celebrate and contribute to their community. Note: the 2019/2020 budget figure shown for this activity includes the $275,000 originally approved plus $75,000 carried forward from 2019/2019. This budget allocation includes $7,500 for the partnerships broker, and the remainder for contestable and non-contestable grants.</td>
<td>CS - AEC - Community Empowerment</td>
<td>LDI - Opex</td>
<td>$397,500</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Staff presented a proposal to the local board on how the strategic partnerships work programme line item will be implemented throughout 2019/2020. The local board were also introduced to the Strategic Partnerships Broker who will have a primary role to support local organisations to become more sustainable through one-to-one support, funding workshops and drop-in clinics. Staff identified two key local organisations who received local board funding in the past and would benefit from capability building support to become more sustainable over time. These organisations are TOTUS from Eilen House and The 317 Hub from Onehunga. Staff will provide an update on the progress made to the local board at a workshop during Q2. Four organisations from Maungakiekie-Tāmaki participated in the development of the community impact evaluation toolkit. The toolkit will be launched in Q2.</td>
<td>In Q2, staff supported the delivery of two funding capability workshops in Te Oro with 50 attendees in October 2019, a drop in funding clinic in November 2019 with 30 community groups at the Community Centre with funding advisors and the community grants team. Attendees rated the sessions 4.5 out of 5 and requested follow up sessions. Staff will contract a provider to offer more accountability services in Q3. Staff have built relationships with other funders and are scopeing opportunities for collaboration. The community impact toolkit was finalised and shared with organizations that participated in its development. This will be shared with other groups in 2020. Staff facilitated review workshops and engagement with external funders for The Good the Bad in Q3. Governance support is planned with selection criteria presented to the local board. This will help to strengthen the structures of local community organisations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2019/2020 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or COO</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Engaged Communities</td>
<td>Develop and deliver a programme of activity that delivers on the following priorities:</td>
<td>CS: ACE Community Empowerment</td>
<td>LOI: Opex</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Staff completed funding agreements for:</td>
<td>In Q2, staff supported:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Neighbourhood development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- the Packman, Onohunga and Glen Innes business</td>
<td>- the Packman Business Association to deliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Active participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- the Packman, Onohunga and Glen Innes business</td>
<td>- the Packman Business Association to deliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Economic growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Palanga, Onohunga and Glen Innes community</td>
<td>- the Packman Business Association to deliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improving outcomes for Māori</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Palanga, Onohunga and Glen Innes community</td>
<td>- the Packman Business Association to deliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Palanga, Onohunga and Glen Innes community</td>
<td>- the Packman Business Association to deliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The programme of activity will be funded via a combination of contestable and targeted funding. The targeted funding will include initiatives such as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Palanga, Onohunga and Glen Innes community</td>
<td>- the Packman Business Association to deliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- events or overlooked costs by the Onohunga, Packman and Glen Innes business associations ($345,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Palanga, Onohunga and Glen Innes community</td>
<td>- the Packman Business Association to deliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rent Smart programme to increase community members' financial literacy and their understanding of tenancy rights/responsibilities, support potential tenants to access accommodation in the area etc. ($540,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Palanga, Onohunga and Glen Innes community</td>
<td>- the Packman Business Association to deliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- actions from the Riverview Community Centre Capacity and Capability Plan to support the development of the Panamasans and to identify key areas of responsibility for management of the Riverview Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Palanga, Onohunga and Glen Innes community</td>
<td>- the Packman Business Association to deliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- activities that increase neighbourhood connectedness and resilience, including intergenerational activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Palanga, Onohunga and Glen Innes community</td>
<td>- the Packman Business Association to deliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- partnerships with local community safety organisations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Palanga, Onohunga and Glen Innes community</td>
<td>- the Packman Business Association to deliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This activity will deliver on the local board's objectives 'Our community is a safer place' and 'People are cared for and enabled to participate, celebrate and contribute to the community.'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Palanga, Onohunga and Glen Innes community</td>
<td>- the Packman Business Association to deliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1128</td>
<td>Youth Empowerment</td>
<td>Partner with youth organisations to provide opportunities for local young people to lead or participate in projects that strengthen young people's engagement in the community, enhance their wellbeing, provide pathways into education or employment, and strengthen their connections to their cultural backgrounds Participatory organisations will include: - Flippin East Lab, Te Aroonga. The 312 Hub, Synergy Projects</td>
<td>CS: ACE Community Empowerment</td>
<td>LOI: Opex</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>- 312 Hub will deliver a weekly programme of</td>
<td>- Synergy group, with support from staff, have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This activity will deliver on the local board's objective 'Our young people are engaged in the community and have access to a wide range of opportunities.'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>workshops alongside supporting individual</td>
<td>delivered an entrepreneurship programme supporting young people to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>business and leadership development, and delivery</td>
<td>build life and work skills. They have supported local students with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of local community activations. - Flippin East</td>
<td>job placements, and mentored leaders from local high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>facilitated a series of workshops engaging 32 young</td>
<td>schools to build skills in events and workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>young people in leading the Tamaki Wellbeing Index</td>
<td>- Flippin East supported community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Index was further tested amongst participants</td>
<td>networks, the Tamaki Youth Council and the development of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at the Tamaki Youth Summit co-hosted with Raki Pau</td>
<td>student council toolkit in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tauru. - Synergy will deliver their FUSE Youth</td>
<td>collaboration with teachers from local schools. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring programme in youth hubs and schools, and</td>
<td>312 Hub are working on the sustainability of the HoB, assessing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Oranga Community Centre youth drop in and</td>
<td>the merits of a youth leadership model, preparing for launching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>holiday programme at the Oranga Community Centre.</td>
<td>a new line of merchandise in January 2020 and were recognised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Tamaki Youth Council established regular meetings and have had started to form their action plan for</td>
<td>by the Onohunga Business Association by being awarded the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31/10/2020. They contributed to the co-design of the Tamaki Youth</td>
<td>Young Enterprise and Innovation Award of the Maungakiekie Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Tamaki Youth Council established regular meetings and have had started to form their action plan for</td>
<td>Youth Awards Meetings were held with the team at Ruapotake Māori to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31/10/2020. They contributed to the co-design of the Tamaki Youth</td>
<td>discuss the 2019/2020 Te Amorangi work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2019/2020 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept/Unit or CCD</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>869</td>
<td>Onehunga Sustainability Development Programme</td>
<td>The proposed project is a business sustainability development programme targeting businesses in Onehunga town centre area. This is the first year of a two-year project, with the first stage focussing on retail and services businesses. The programme will actively engage with businesses by ‘door knocking’ and providing a free on-the-spot waste assessment. The proposed approach will help businesses that do not typically engage in waste minimisation to identify potential diversion opportunities. It’s envisaged that businesses will improve their waste minimisation practices after participating in the programme. The programme will actively engage with businesses in the following way: • Site-specific waste minimisation advice – through waste audits and reports providing practical solutions • Facilitating collaborative waste solutions – through workshops, linking businesses and exploring solutions with service providers • Waste communications – detailing success stories and highlighting recycling services through Onehunga Business Association communication channels.</td>
<td>ATEED Local Economic Growth</td>
<td>LD1 Opex</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The programme has commenced. A consultant has been working with the local businesses to undertake initial assessments of their current waste levels. In response to a funding request from Onehunga Business Association (OBA), ATEED offered $3000 to OBA as sponsorship funding to enhance the project and outcomes. The funding would be in addition to the $20,000 local board funding. ATEED is waiting for OBA to advise if they would like to proceed with this sponsorship from ATEED and outline the additional project elements that would be delivered as a result of the additional funding along with the associated outcomes.</td>
<td>Thirty-two business have had discussions with the consultant about the advisory service. Fifteen businesses have proceeded with detailed waste assessments and received reports outlining potential opportunities for waste diversion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239</td>
<td>Pop-Up Business School (MT)</td>
<td>The Pop-Up Business School provides a free 10-day business school to provides education, support for local people interested in starting their own business. Examples elsewhere have had positive results in terms of the numbers of businesses established. Provides local community access to a free course to help them develop business skills and confidence to start their own business. Community Facilities: Business Education and Support.</td>
<td>ATEED Local Economic Growth</td>
<td>LD1 Opex</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Venue and dates for the Pop-Up confirmed for March 23rd to 3rd April 2020 and event listed on ATEED website and Eventbrite for registrations. Promotion will commence in the new year.</td>
<td>Promotional event commenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Waitakarua Park - improve sports park &amp; all-weather sports fields</td>
<td>The components of this improvement project are as follows: Upgrade fields 8, 9 and 10 to two artificial turf fields and one sand carpet field including floodlighting to sports fields, toilet block and changing facilities. An additional 100 car park spaces. One children’s playground, and footpath and cycleway connections to the adjacent coastal cycle and walkway, the neighbouring cemetery and Waitakarua Park. FY19/20 investigation and design FY19/20 commencement physical works FY20/21. Complete physical works FY20/21. Growth Contribution $210,000 FY 1/22. Growth Contribution $250,000 Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP) project</td>
<td>CF: Operations ABS: Capital Development:ABS: Capital: Growth</td>
<td>$1,550,418</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status: Scope of works has been prepared for geotechnical and contamination investigations and for sport field lighting design. Working with Closed Landfill on options to be considered in concept design. Working Healthy Waters on selected location of contaminated stockpiles associated storm water pipe repair. Next steps: Continue working with Service Strategy and Integration Team on Waitakarua Park Master Plan.</td>
<td>The land currently has a notice of requirement from New Zealand Transport Agency for the East West Link multilane project. Proposed work on the Waitakarua Precinct Master Plan will inform scope of works within sports park. Develop a new concept design subject to New Zealand Transport Agency approval. Physical works budget deferred to financial year 2020. Current status: Geotechnical and contamination investigation and sport field lighting design underway. Working with the closed landfill team on options to be considered in concept design. Working with Healthy Waters on redistribution of contaminated stockpiles associated storm water pipe repair. Next steps: Design team meeting with internal stakeholders to ensure collaboration with Service Strategy and Integration Team on Waitakarua Park Master Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6/27
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CC/ SD</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Jubilee Bridge - renew and upgrade bridge</td>
<td>Overview - renew and upgrade Jubilee Bridge which includes the design, construction,</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS, Capex - Development/ External funding</td>
<td>$151,191</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status: Value engineering completed. Recommendations to reduce costs are compiled and a workshop to review these options with the Board is planned. Current status: In August 2019 a new recommendation to restructure the bridge at a lower construction cost was made. Next steps: Proceed with a steel design.</td>
<td>Change in project scope will influence delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Tamaki Greenways - develop a shared path</td>
<td>Creation of a shared path from Parnell Wharf to Wai-o-tahi Nature Reserve. This project is completed and was delivered in advance of the planned timeframe. The budget was lower than the original allocated budget as it was committed. - Adjusted Programme (RAP) project</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS, Capex - Growth</td>
<td>$403,376</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Construction work including planting works are complete and the pathway is now open for use. Next steps: Signage for the pathway is placed on hold until a new name is selected.</td>
<td>Construction of a shared path comprising a cycle path and a pedestrian walkway from Parnell Wharf to Kiao Place until a new name is selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Waitemata Park Cemetery - renew paving and furniture</td>
<td>Renew pavement and furniture assets in Waitemata Park Cemetery. FY18-19: Topographical survey and pavement design has been completed for the access roads. Procurement for physical works currently underway. FY19-20: Plan and deliver physical works.</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS, Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$100,621</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: A detailed pavement renewal design has been completed for the cemetery access roads. Physical works have been carried forward to the FY20 budget to complete the renewal of the entire access road under one project thereby realising savings through economy of scope and reduced establishment costs. Next steps: Procure Contractor to carry out cemetery access road pavement renewal works as designed in November 2020.</td>
<td>Current status: Waitemata Cemetery access road pavement renewal design, schedule and contractor procurement documentation has been completed. Next steps: Procure physical works contractor in early February 2020 for pavement renewal works to be completed by April 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2043</td>
<td>Parnell Basin - implement masterplan priorities</td>
<td>Improvements to open space infrastructure across the Parnell Basin area to support population growth in the area and in accordance with the approved Parnell Master Plan. This project is completed and was delivered in advance of the planned timeframe. The budget remains in the original allocated year as it was committed.</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS, Capex - Growth</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed March 2019. Project scope of works included widening of foreshore between Petone Reserve car park and the Van Damme’s lagoon. Next steps: Realignment and line marking of the Petone Reserve car park.</td>
<td>Project completed March 2019: Project scope of works included widening of foreshore between Petone Reserve car park and the Van Damme’s lagoon car park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work Programme 2019/2020 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CCO</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2089</td>
<td>Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve - new pool</td>
<td>Renewal of the coastal structures at Dunkirk Reserve and Riverside Reserve. FY18/19 investigate and design. FY19/20 deliver physical works.</td>
<td>GF, Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS, Capex, Renewals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed March 2019. Scope of works included: 1. Renewal of the damaged section of seawall at Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve. 2. Renewal of the risk profile of the seawall at Dunkirk Reserve and behind the most wet club rooms and new planting along the top of the seawall to prevent further erosion of the coastal edge. 3. Renewal of the damaged areas of seawall and new planting at Riverside Reserve.</td>
<td>Project completed March 2019. Scope of works included: 1. Renewal of the damaged section of seawall at Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve. 2. Renewal of the risk profile of the seawall at Dunkirk Reserve and behind the most wet club rooms and new planting along the top of the seawall to prevent further erosion of the coastal edge. 3. Renewal of the damaged areas of seawall and new planting at Riverside Reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2131</td>
<td>Onehunga War Memorial Pool - comprehensive renewal</td>
<td>Comprehensive renewal to include the following: 3-yearly paint and refurbishment; auto cleaning system, pool pumps replacement, fill outdoor changing rooms, refurbish swim club building and changing rooms; upgrade of the air con system and upgrade pool consumable area. FY19/20 - Stage 1 renewal works (sauna, steam room, plantroom, starting blocks and bench seats) are complete. FY20/21 - Stage 2 works to renew the changing rooms and pool are planned for late 2019.</td>
<td>GS, Investigation and Design</td>
<td>ABS, Capex, Renewals</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Design of proposed work to renew the indoor pool changing rooms and pool / office (Stage 2) is being finalised. Investigations of future works (Stage 3) is in progress.</td>
<td>Current status: Proposed work to the indoor pool changing rooms and pool / office (Stage 2) is being finalised and contract will be awarded in late December / early January 2020. Building consent application is processing and expected to be obtained in late December / early January 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2161</td>
<td>Dunkirk Activity Centre - renew roof and refurbish interior</td>
<td>Renew the roof including new flashing, flashings, guttering and downpipes. Interior works to include GB ceilings, insulation, floor coverings, painting and minor carpentry. Consider options for toilet removal. FY18/19 - investigation design and scope FY19/20 - detailed design to be approved, plan and deliver physical works.</td>
<td>GF, Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS, Capex, Renewals</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status: Final concept plan and estimated costs for roof renewal and change rooms were to be presented to the local board in April 2019, but this has been postponed until Community Facilities has completed a seismic report on this building. Findings of the seismic report will determine whether further detailed investigation is needed before concept design can be finalised for the next stage of the project. Next steps: Complete the seismic assessments and provide findings by end July 2019 and present an update to the local board in February 2020.</td>
<td>Project timelines have moved into financial year 2020/2021 due to contamination and seismic issues that have been found with the building. The project required further investigation and planning to ensure all issues have been addressed in the design stage of this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2164</td>
<td>Glen Innes Pool - comprehensive renewal</td>
<td>Overview - renew the pool facilities including replacement of the filter and the PA system in the facility, renewal of the roof and spa heater pump, interior and exterior repairs and replacement of the office carpet. Scope of work to include carpenters and painting works. FY18/19 - FY19/20 investigate, design and scope required works FY19/20 - plan and deliver physical works. This is a multi-year funded project and is a continuation of the FY18/19 work programme.</td>
<td>GS, Investigation and Design</td>
<td>ABS, Capex, Renewals, ARBS, Opex</td>
<td>$197,045</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Design to add Security to Reception Area scoped and discussed with Consultant. Plans new concrete path for staff to access plant room at the rear. Replace the external gym awning and concrete the external gym area. Next steps: On receipt of Recreation design and finalize. Document and process procurement of access way, gym awning and concrete on receipt of quotes.</td>
<td>Current status: Quote has been received and accepted for the external gym awning and to concrete the external gym area. Next steps: Contractor to proceed with work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2019/2020 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CCD</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
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<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2189</td>
<td>Lagoon Pool - comprehensive renewal</td>
<td>Renew pool facilities including the following works: refurbishment of the outdoor pool and the pool surrounds; renewal of the pool deck changing rooms; replacement of the saucer; renewal of the fms system; refurbishment of the pool, and renewal of the flooring.</td>
<td>CF- Investigation and Design</td>
<td>ABS Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$154,341</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: A priority list has been developed for work that can be completed with remaining budget (as Stage 3). Next steps: Execute Stage 3 works and finalise scope of works for Project initiation Forms to be presented to the local board for consideration as future renewals.</td>
<td>Current status: Works have been completed for closed circuit television camera renewal; physical room floor renewal and shade structure replacement. Stage three works are in progress for indoor pool seating and fitness centre air conditioning installations. Next steps: Complete stage three works - indoor pool seating and fitness centre air conditioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2196</td>
<td>Onehunga Library - renew furniture, fixtures and equipment</td>
<td>Renew furniture, fittings and equipment at Onehunga Library. This project was previously a bundled project in the 19/20 work programme (reference Sharepoint ID 2132), and the libraries have now been allocated individual project funding.</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$10,021</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed June 2019. Renewals works completed include a carpet replacement, 2 new air conditioning units installed on the roof and new furniture for the library. Some remedial works are still required relating to a new cable channel running through the middle of the library (aluminium strip visible on the carpet). Solutions are being investigated to find the most cost effective solution with the least disruption to the public.</td>
<td>Project completed June 2019. Renewal works completed include a carpet replacement, 2 new air conditioning units installed on the roof and new furniture for the library. Some remedial works are still required relating to a new cable channel running through the middle of the library (aluminium strip visible on the carpet). Solutions are being investigated to find the most cost effective solution with the least disruption to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>Mt Wellington War Memorial Park - provide new dual toilet facility</td>
<td>Development of toilet facilities to support the new sports infrastructure that will meet the demand due to a increase in population in the immediate area.</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>ABS Capex - Growth</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Council staff attempted to reach an agreement with the club in June 2019 regarding contribution to the toilets and changing rooms. However, the agreement has not been settled and the project remains on hold.</td>
<td>On-going discussions are occurring with the rugby club about the location and layout of the toilet block. This is likely to be a grant payment to the club as per the previous agreement. Project remains on hold. Council staff have attempted to reach an agreement with the club in June 2019 regarding contribution to the toilets and changing rooms. However, the agreement has not been settled and the project continues to be on hold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2248</td>
<td>Tamahia Reserve - park development</td>
<td>Develop park as part of the Tamahia Regeneration. FY19/20 external funding contribution $1,000,000/Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP) project</td>
<td>CF - Investigation and Design</td>
<td>ABS Capex - Growth/External funding</td>
<td>$1,015,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status: Resource consent decision expected October/November. Detailed design will be completed following consent decision with physical works anticipated to start early 2020.</td>
<td>Current status: Resource consent approved with detailed design being finalised next steps: Compilations/delay with land exchange from Tamahia Regeneration Company into Tamahia Reserve mean physical works are not able to begin until next earthworks season (October 2020).Current status: Resource consent approved with detailed design being finalised next steps: Compilations/delay with land exchange from Tamahia Regeneration Company into Tamahia Reserve mean physical works are not able to begin until next earthworks season in October 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2293</td>
<td>Maungakiekie - Tāmaki - renew car park FY18</td>
<td>Renew condition 5 and 6 car park assets in the local board area. Assets that require renewal will be identified and then prioritised for delivery.</td>
<td>CF - Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$11,060</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Scope for renewal works is currently being assessed. Next steps: Renewals scope to be presented to the local board for prioritisation.</td>
<td>Current status: Consultant engaged to review scope and present indicative programme. Next steps: Renewals scope to be presented to the local board for prioritisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2019/2020 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CO</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2294</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - renew play spaces FY19</td>
<td>Renew play equipment and play spaces at various sites in the local board area. Assets that require renewal will be identified and then prioritised for delivery. Named sites are identified as: Fern Reserve, Heronham Reserve, Jellicoe Park and Oneroa Bay War Memorial Pools, Massey Reserve, One Tree Hill Domain, Oneroa Bay Reserve, Pakuranga Basin, Savage Park, and the playground at Glen Innes Shops. The local board Bio Accessible report will inform the play space renewals.</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$138,915</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Scope for renewal works is currently being assessed. Next steps: Renewals scope to be presented to the local board for prioritisation.</td>
<td>Current status: Asset condition assessments are completed. Next steps: Recommended sites for renewal to be presented to the local board for prioritisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2295</td>
<td>Maybury Reserve - develop general park</td>
<td>Develop neighbourhood park as part of the Tamaki Regeneration priority projects. FY18/19 investigate development FY19/20 detailed design and scoping FY20/21 consenting and planning FY21/22 commence physical works FY22/23 complete physical works Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP) project</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Growth</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: The local board resolved on the area that they are willing to consider a lease within for the Ruapotaha Māte re development (resolution MT20/19/44). Anticipating TRC response on land exchange proposals to allow for reserve development. Next steps: Procurement for professional services to begin following discussions and agreement from TRC on land exchange. Concept design phase anticipated commencing early 20210.</td>
<td>Current status: The local board resolved on the area that they are willing to consider a lease within for the Ruapotaha Māte re development (resolution MT20/19/44). Anticipating TRC response on land exchange proposals to allow for reserve development. Next steps: Procurement for professional services to begin following discussions and agreement from TRC on land exchange and also when Healthy Western business case for their part of the reserve development is finalized. Concept design phase anticipated commencing mid 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2305</td>
<td>Pearce Street Community Hall - refurbish interior</td>
<td>Internal refurbishment requires renewal of flooring, walls, doors, bathrooms and kitchens FY18/19: investigation design and scope is complete FY19/20 - plan and deliver physical works.</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Scope of interior refurbishment complete, works received. Next steps: Award works on completion of works with community tenancies.</td>
<td>Current status: The scope of the interior refurbishment is complete and tenancies have been received. Award tender and proceed with the delivery of physical works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2307</td>
<td>Commissioner Park - renew play space</td>
<td>Renew play space including options to propose to the local board for assets that will benefit from an increased level of services. The investigation and design of the playground is not complete with local board agreement. FY19/20 - plan and deliver agreed physical works. This is a multi-year funded project and is a continuation of the FY18/19 work programme.</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$97,436</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Playground upgrade is complete. Drinking fountain will be installed once Watercare installs a new water meter at the reserve. Application for new water meter was lodged in February 2019 however approval is still pending. Next steps: Install drinking fountain and close off project.</td>
<td>Current status: Playground upgrade is complete. Drinking fountain will be installed once Watercare installs a new water meter at the reserve. Next steps: Install drinking fountain and close off project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
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<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit / CC</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>Ferguson Domain - renew and upgrade courts to multi-purpose courts</td>
<td>Renew and increase the level of service of the hard courts by upgrading to multisport courts. The renewal of these courts will align with the implementation programme for the Ferguson Domain concept plan. FY18/19 - FY19/20 - investigation and design phase to scope proposed works. Further design work to occur following the approval of the refined Ferguson Domain concept plan. FY20/21 - physical works to be undertaken. Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP) project. (LDP Capex contribution $19,000 FY19/20)</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Procurement underway for design and consents for renewal of the courts. Next steps: Commence design works for the courts. Present concepts for the court design to the local board by March 2020. Current status: Procurement for design and consents for renewal of the courts completed. Next steps: Commence design works for the courts. Present concepts for the local board design to the local board by March 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2473</td>
<td>Parimutu Basin - renew play space</td>
<td>Renew the playground including the 1st base savings. FY19/20 - investigation, design and scope required works FY20/21 - plan and deliver physical works Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP) project.</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Concept design approved by local board in March 2019. Detailed design phase completed. Consent application was expected to be lodged by mid July 2019 however lodgement date has been delayed as we are still awaiting land owner consent from Transpower. Next steps: Complete consent lodgement and start tender for physical works. Current status: The concept design was approved by the local board in March 2019. The detailed design phase is complete. Consent application was lodged in early November 2019. Next steps: Once consent is granted the tender for physical works will be initiated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2521</td>
<td>Wa-o-Taki Nature Reserve - develop nature trail</td>
<td>Investigate the options for a nature trail and present to the local board with cost estimates for further decision making.</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>LDP: Capex</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Project timelines have been adjusted to allow for local board to approve consultation plan in February 2020. Initial site investigations are complete and options are being drafted pending consultation with community in February - March 2020. Maria Whenua consultation in also programmed to commence in February 2020. Next steps: Complete feasibility stage and provide consultation plan to the local board by February 2020. Current status: Project timelines have been adjusted to allow staff to seek local board direction for community consultation scheduled for February to March 2020. Maria Whenua consultation is also programmed to commence in February 2020. Initial site investigations are complete and options are being drafted pending feedback from the consultation process. Next steps: Complete the feasibility stage and present the consultation plan to the local board in February 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2577</td>
<td>193 Mt Wellington Highway, Mount Wellington - renew facility</td>
<td>Highway House Plunket: The condition assessment has indicated that targeted renewal works are required for both the interior and the exterior of the building. Works will include the roof, the ceiling, the brick exterior window frames and door. FY19/20 - investigate, design and scope required works. FY19/20 to FY20/21 - plan and deliver agreed targeted works. Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP) project.</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Council progressing with scoping of the works. Next steps: Finalise scope and price the works. Current steps: Investigation and design to confirm the required scope of works as in progress. Next steps: Confirm scope of work and workshop the recommendations with the local board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2768</td>
<td>Maungakiekie - Tāmaki - renew walkway signage</td>
<td>Renew the walkway signage on Campbell Road and Main/Teau Road to ensure they are fit for purpose.</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Approved in principle</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This project forms part of a three year ongoing delivery programme and will be scoped and completed in future years. Current status: This project forms part of a three year ongoing delivery programme and will be scoped and completed in future years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2794</td>
<td>Maungakiekie- Tāmaki - renew park furniture and fixtures FY20</td>
<td>Renew condition 4 and 5 park furniture and fixtures in the local board area. Assets that require renewal will be identified and then prioritised for delivery. FY19/20 - investigate, design and scope the works required. Sites identified for renewal to be agreed with the local board. FY20/21 - plan and initiate a programme to deliver physical works</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Scope for renewal works is currently being assessed. Next steps: Renewals scope to be presented to the local board for prioritisation. Current status: Asset condition assessments are completed. Next steps: Recommended sites for renewal to be presented to the local board for prioritisation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<thead>
<tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3140</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Full Facilities maintenance contracts</td>
<td>The Full Facilities maintenance contracts include all buildings, parks and open space assets, sports fields, coastal management and storm damage</td>
<td>CF: Operations</td>
<td>ABS: Opex</td>
<td>$5,337,733</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The first quarter of the year has seen a wet and cooler temperature and a slowing in grass growth. Our contractors have been working through the wet periods providing the public with signage and opening the parks as maintained as possible without causing damage. We have had no escalating issues as a result of wet unseasoned areas. All of the tree diets from previous storms left on our reserves have now been removed from the community. Some mulching and replanting of sites has been ongoing throughout the local parks areas in particular the Glen Innes town centre. Audits continue to be carried out across the built and open space community facilities, to ensure that the facilities are being maintained to the required standard. The auditing processes continue to highlight a number of renewal projects that could possibly be added into the draft renewal work programme, which has now been considered by the local board. Our team is continuing to meet monthly and address any issues in our community sites and libraries. Our green spaces assessments have been ongoing, maintaining work has been live in April and have been well managed through this time and absorbed as part of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board maintenance programme.</td>
<td>The focus of this quarter has been embedding the new street trees contracts that came across Auckland Transport. Four town centres including Royal Oak, Glen Innes, Panmure and Orakei Design have involved significant cleaning works. After months of consistent effort, the town centres have been brought up to the required specification. A regular schedule is now in place to ensure these areas remain within the required contract specifications. Our auditing system has identified two areas of concern. Litter in public places and edges. We continue to work closely with the contractor to ensure regular litter collection is in place and if alterations in schedules are required. The drier weather has meant that edging has improved toward the end of the quarter. Throughout this quarter, we have been receiving positive feedback from stakeholders regarding the improvement of town centres. With constant communication between the business associations and the contractors, we have been able to meet expectations of these organisations and the areas they service. A significant highlight in the last quarter has been all the works and improvements we have been making to Mayoral Place. This has included painting of the public toilets, replanting of garden beds and cleaning of hard surfaces. In the second quarter, the backlog of request for service was successfully reduced to a more manageable level. Ground conditions improved in November allowing for deferred work due to wet ground conditions to commence. With these dry ground conditions, annual park programmes work commenced in December including aftercare and watering of recently planted trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Arboretum Contracts</td>
<td>The Arboretum contracts include tree management and maintenance.</td>
<td>CF: Operations</td>
<td>ABS: Opex</td>
<td>$1,930,684</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The first quarter was focused on the reduction of the area’s request for services. This was balanced against addressing deferred requests and priority new requests received. Outgoing work is now limited to sites where access has been restricted due to ground conditions. It is anticipated these sites will be accessible shortly into the second quarter, weather dependent. The scheduled works programme was delayed as a consequence of the large amount of requests, but is now on track. Replacement planting of trees removed throughout the year has been completed during the quarter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3142</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Ecological Restoration Contracts</td>
<td>The Ecological Restoration maintenance contracts include pest and animal control and management within ecologically significant parks and reserves.</td>
<td>CF: Operations</td>
<td>ABS: Opex</td>
<td>$9,243</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>During the first quarter, the annual update of the Site Assessment Report, a large portion of the pest and animal monitoring, and the majority of the first phase of the rat control programme have been completed. The request for service work orders received, continues to be seasonally normal, with an increasing trend in activity occurring apparent during the later stages of the quarter.</td>
<td>The majority of the first stage of pest plant visits are now complete and pest animal control visits have been increased throughout the high value reserves. Aftercare maintenance visits of newly planted areas within reserves were carried out during November.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3251</td>
<td>Boundary Reserve East - development</td>
<td>Development of open space infrastructure to meet the demands of the new subdivisions in the area and population growth across the local network. FY21/22 investigate and design FY22/23 physical works</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Growth</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Investigation and design work underway. Next steps: consultation and local board review of draft concept design anticipated November 2019.</td>
<td>Current status: Investigation and design work underway. Next steps: Consultation and local board review of draft concept design anticipated early 2020 followed by consenting and physical works proposed October 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Lead Dept / Unit of CC</td>
<td>Budget Source</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Activity Status</td>
<td>RAG</td>
<td>Q1 Commentary</td>
<td>Q2 Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3266</td>
<td>Glen Innes Community Hall - Citizens Advice Bureau - refurbish interior</td>
<td>Recapitulate and refurbish the interior of the Glen Innes Community Hall to ensure it is fit for purpose for the relocation of the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB). Concept design and procurement for professional services is complete. FY19/20 undertakes detailed design in consultation with the local board and stakeholder engagement. Deliver physical works. Demolition works for the CAB's current facilities will be scheduled following the CAB relocation to the refurbished community hall.</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renews</td>
<td>$410,788</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Construction is underway and on program to be completed by mid October 2019. Next steps: Citizen's Advice Bureau (CAB) to relocate on 2nd October 2019. CAB building will then be demolished.</td>
<td>Current status: Construction is complete. Citizen's Advice Bureau (CAB) have relocated into their new premises and the existing CAB building has been demolished. Next steps: Project complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3267</td>
<td>Glen Innes Community Hall - renew community places facility</td>
<td>Renew the community hall to encourage better use of the facility by the local community. Proposed interior works to include renewal of the flooring and fixtures in the main hall, drainage works in the toilet facilities, and interior painting. Proposed exterior works include signage and landscaping. FY19/20 investigate, scope and design works. FY20/21 plan and deliver physical works. Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP) project.</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renews</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current Status: AIM Services have been appointed to do this work in parallel with the existing CAB relocation project. Next steps: Project has now commenced and will be completed on Wednesday 13 November 2019.</td>
<td>Current Status: AIM Services have been appointed to do this work in parallel with the existing CAB relocation project. Next steps: Project completed November 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3268</td>
<td>Glen Innes Library - renew furniture, fixtures and equipment</td>
<td>Renew furniture, fittings and equipment at Glen Innes Library. The renewal of this library was previously included in a bundled project in the FY19/20 work programme. Libraries included as part of the bundle have now been allocated funding on an individual basis. FY19/20 investigate scope and design required works. FY20/21 plan and deliver physical works. Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP) project.</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renews</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Concept design being prepared. Expected to be completed by October 2019. Next steps: Prepare a detail design for tender issue.</td>
<td>Current status: Concept design being prepared. Expected to be completed by January 2020. Next steps: Prepare a detail design for tender issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3269</td>
<td>Ferguson Domain - implement concept plan park improvements</td>
<td>Pakatoa has funded a refresh of the Ferguson Domain concept plan and once approved by the local board, recommendations for renewal works and service level improvements will be prioritised and scheduled for delivery as part of an implementation programme for the domain. FY19/20 investigate design and scope works to align with the refreshed concept plan. Once the scope is agreed a prioritised programme of works will be scheduled. FY20/21 indicate the delivery of physical works as projects are prioritised. Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP) project.</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renews</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Concept plan has been reviewed by local board and changes made to design. Next steps: Report to local board on concept plan in February 2020.</td>
<td>Current status: Concept plan has been reviewed by local board and changes made to design. Next steps: Workshop the revised plan with the local board in February 2020 and report to local board to approve concept and implementation plan in March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
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<td>Budget Source</td>
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<tr>
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<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
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<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3270</td>
<td>Glen Innes Pool and Leisure Centre - renew carpark</td>
<td>Renew the carpark for the pool and leisure centre.</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: New car park design scoped by Consultant. Next steps: On receipt of design, it will be presented to Local Board for final deliberation and procured for physical delivery. Current status: New car park design has been completed. Next steps: The design and budget will be discussed with the local board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3271</td>
<td>Ian Shaw Reserve - renew carpark</td>
<td>Renew and potentially upscale the carpark at Ian Shaw Reserve. Current capacity will be considered in the investigation and design phase. FY19/20 - Investigate, scope and design required works. Options for service level improvements to be presented to the local board for review and input. FY20/21 - Finalise detailed design, plan and deliver agreed physical works. Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP) project.</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Status: Scoping underway. Next steps: Tender professional services for design. Current status: Consultant engaged and detailed design being prepared. Next steps: Undertake planning assessment and prepare options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3273</td>
<td>Harmin Park - develop concept plan</td>
<td>Develop a concept plan for Harmin Park to identify and prioritise a programme of works that will improve and upgrade facilities to ensure levels of service are aligned with the use of the park. FY19/20 - develop a concept plan to be submitted to the local board for approval. FY20/21 - plan and deliver a prioritised programme of physical works.</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>LDI: Capex</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Procurement underway for concept designers. Next steps: Complete engaging professional services and draft consultation plan for local board approval. Current status: Procurement underway for concept designers. Next steps: Complete engaging professional services and draft consultation plan for local board approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3294</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - Auckland Urban Forest (Flaxhaven) Strategy - Growing Phase</td>
<td>FY20: Deliver year two 'Growing Phase'. Community Facilities will deliver the planting plan, as informed by the year one (FY19) 'Knowing phase', for the local board's specific implementation of the Urban Planning Strategy (JUS). This part of the program is likely to be ongoing where tree cover is identified as being low. NOTE: Year 2 is being delivered in two components. This activity line is to physically deliver the planting plan and complements the Parks Services programme management of the 'Growing phase' referenced in low item 400.</td>
<td>CF: Operations</td>
<td>LDI: Capex</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Work is currently in the planning phase for this program to ascertain the areas where more tree planting is needed. Work underway to develop an outline of a longer term planting program. Next steps: It is intended to present an outline of the work program for consultation with the local board early in 2020. Current status: A contractor has been chosen to deliver the project and is preparing a work plan that will build on the progress made last year. Next steps: This will be brought to the local board for discussion early in 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3297</td>
<td>Pinheiro Library - renew furniture, fixtures and equipment</td>
<td>Renew furniture, fittings and equipment at Glen Innes Library. The renewal of this library was previously included in a bundled project in the FY18/19 work programme. Libraries included as part of the bundle have now been allocated funding on an individual basis. FY19/20 - Investigate scope and design required works. FY20/21 - Plan and deliver physical works.</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Strategic assessment underway to confirm furniture, fixtures and equipment requiring renewal at the library. The assessment is expected to be completed by February 2020. Next steps: Finalise scope and prepare a concept design for the renewal works.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3296</td>
<td>Riverside Community Centre - comprehensive renewal</td>
<td>Renew the facility, which may include interior and exterior refurbishment, to ensure the facility is fit for purpose.</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Investigation, and preparation of scope. Next steps: Confirm scope with stakeholders. Current status: Investigation and design to confirm the required scope of works is in progress. Next steps: Confirm scope of work and workshop options with the local board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work Programme 2019/2020 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CCD</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3332</td>
<td>Stone Cottage - renew heritage facility</td>
<td>Renew the facility which may include both interior and exterior refurbishment to preserve and restore the heritage asset. FY2020-21 investigate design and scope works to renew the facility. Lines with heritage for input into the scope of works.</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Approved in principle</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project will be scoped and completed in future years.</td>
<td>Project will be scoped and completed in future years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3333</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - renew bollards FY19/20</td>
<td>Renew condition 4 and 5 bollards at parks and reserves in the local board area. Two priority sites have been identified for bollards renewal include Avens Creek and Iremore Reserve. Additional bollards will be assessed for potential renewal and prioritised for delivery in consultation with the local board. FY19/20 - investigate design and scope works to renew bollards at Avens Creek and Iremore Reserve. Plan and initiate physical works. Assess bollards throughout the local board area to identify further required renewals. FY20/21 - continue to deliver bollards renewal physical works</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Scope for renewal works is currently being assessed. Next steps: Renewals scope to be presented to the local board for prioritisation.</td>
<td>Current steps: Investigation and design to confirm the required scope of works is in progress. Next steps: Confirm scope of work and workshop options with the local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3335</td>
<td>Onehunga Bay Reserve - develop dog agility area</td>
<td>Develop a concept plan for a proposed dog agility area at Onehunga Bay Reserve. Concept plan to be workshoped with the local board for input, review and approval prior to commencing physical works.</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Feasibility and design options are being investigated. Next steps: Finalise design options for local board approval by March 2020.</td>
<td>Current status: Feasibility and design options are being investigated. Next steps: Finalise design options for local board approval by March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3568</td>
<td>Jordan Recreational Centre - refurbish sledding and changing room</td>
<td>Refurbish the stadium to ensure the facility remains fit for purpose. Change room refurbishment to male and female change rooms in stadium. This project was carried forward from FY17/18, previous SharePoint ID 42348.</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$61,426</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: The project has gone to tender and a price has been obtained from Ventia which was above the project budget. Ventia are reviewing their price and will resubmit for review and value engineering. Next steps: Auckland Council will assess the price and options to achieve the most cost effective outcome.</td>
<td>Current status: Council staff to meet with the Full Facilities contractor onsite in January 2020 to discuss the reduced scope in order to achieve the most cost effective outcome. Next steps: Outcome and findings to be discussed with the local board in early 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3583</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - LDI minor capex fund 2019/19</td>
<td>Funding to deliver minor capex projects throughout the financial year as approved in the monthly local board workshops.</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>LDI: Capex</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Projects to be funded from the LDI minor capex funding are yet to be identified. Potential projects will be presented to the local board for consideration and approval. Next steps: Work with the local board to confirm the minor new assets to be allocated Locally Driven Initiative minor Capex funding and submit a report for funding approval.</td>
<td>Current status: The recent completion open space site assessments in the local board area will help to inform where new minor assets should be considered for approval by the local board. Stats is completing a lot of recommendations now to present to the local board. Next steps: Workshop new minor asset recommendations with the local board during FY21 work programme discussions in February-March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3680</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki - renew signage</td>
<td>MT: Signage Renewal. This project was carried forward from FY20/21, previous SharePoint ID 3207.</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$49,142</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Current status: Reserves in need of sign renewals have been assessed and identified. Next steps: Renewals scope to be workshoped with the local board for prioritisation.</td>
<td>Current steps: Investigation and design to confirm the required scope of works in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki region is in progress. Next steps: Confirm scope of work and workshop the recommended with the local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3681</td>
<td>Onehunga War Memorial Pool - remove free &amp; renew boundary wall</td>
<td>Remove free, renew boundary wall. This project is carried forward from the 2019/18 programme (previous ID 3132).</td>
<td>CF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Development</td>
<td>$5,908</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project completed in August 2019 with free removal and reinstatement of the wall.</td>
<td>Project completed in August 2019 with free removal and reinstatement of the wall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2019/2020 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or COO</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3716</td>
<td>Store Cottage - renew roof and joinery</td>
<td>Renew roof and joinery to ensure weather tightness. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (project ID 2330)</td>
<td>GF: Project Delivery</td>
<td>ARS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$53,581</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Current status: Project has been identified as not ready for delivery as it requires further strategic assessment.</td>
<td>Project is currently on hold due to seismic implications. The seismic team will undertake an investigation and recommend a way forward for this project. Current status: Maintenance repair of the roof has been delivered. A seismic assessment has been undertaken. The scope for future works is in the investigation and design phase. Next steps: Community Facilities to present findings and workshop potential future works with the local board in planning the TYCI work programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3707 | Otuwhanga Bay Reserve - build skatepark | Construct a new street style skate facility that will complement the existing vert ramp and increase the range of play/skate provision. The provision of a new street style skate facility will appeal to a broader range of users and age groups which will increase participation and usage. Stage one - investigate, design and scope physical works (including options to propose to the local board for assets that may benefit from an increased level of service). Stage two - physical works commence. This project is a multi-year funded project and is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme. $400,000 of the board's discretionary funding was allocated to this project in 2017/2018. | GF: Investigation and Design | LDI: Capex | $191,668 | In progress | Amber | Current status: Procurement for design and consenting for the skatepark and basketball court completed. Design work is underway and second round of consultation planned for October 2019. Next steps: Complete concept design for local board approval by end of 2019. Physical works are planned for March to May 2020. | Physical works intended to begin by March 2020 but work is now intended to commence in May 2020. Current Status: Concept design completed. Consultations and design is currently underway for the full skate park and vert ramp design with the understanding that the vert ramp will only be progressed once funding has been allocated. Resource consent planning in progress. Next steps: Finalise collation of consultation feedback, progress developed design and resource consent. Physical works are expected to commence in early May 2023. |

### Community Services, Service delivery and planning

| 3771 | Pakuraine Library - refurbish building and replace pavilion roof | Comprehensive building refurbishment, including carpet and vinyl in both public and staff areas. This project is a continuation of the 2017/2018 programme (previous project ID 2330) | GF: Project Delivery | ARS: Capex - Renewals | $701,832 | In progress | Green | Current status: Watertightness repairs to the roof completed December 2018. Further internal remedial works proposed by operations. Next steps: Await the buildings future outcome from Pakuraine. | Current status: Watertightness repairs to the roof completed December 2018. Further internal remedial works proposed by operations. Next steps: Await the buildings future outcome from Pakuraine. |

| 1216 | Investigate community facility requirements in Otahuhu and Pakuraine to support TRC and Pakuraine programmes. | Investigate provision of community facilities in this area giving consideration to facility condition and suitability. Year 2 of 2 | CS: Service Strategy and Integration | Regional | $6 | In progress | Green | Community developing options for the future delivery of services currently provided from Pakuraine Library and Pakuraine Community Hall that: a) consider the asset condition of the Pakuraine Library and Pakuraine Community Hall and the cost of addressing any issues b) explore options as a primary funding source for capital investment. Planned for Q2 - Continue options development in relation to Pakuraine Library and Community Hall. | Progress on options development and planning for stakeholder engagement. Options development includes working with Pakuraine to explore the feasibility of applying the service optimisation policy to develop a new multi-purpose community facility as part of the Unlock Pakuraine programme. Planned for Q3: Local board workshop to update on progress and seek feedback on draft options and proposed stakeholder engagement. |

| 1234 | Transform Pakuraine, potential optimisation | Undertaking community needs assessment and investigating options for provision of recreation services in Pakuraine. | CS: Service Strategy and Integration | Regional | $6 | In progress | Green | Introductory workshop held in August to present project scope, timesframes and engagement approach Planned for Q2: Community engagement planned for October/November 2019. | Community engagement complete and workshop held in December to present findings from community engagement phase. Planned for Q3: Workshop to discuss potential responses/recommendations to meet community needs. |

<p>| 1260 | Waitakarua Park Reserve Management Plan | Develop a reserve management plan (year 2 of 3) for Waitakarua Park including sports fields, speedway and cemetery. | CS: Service Strategy and Integration | LDI: Opex | $6 | In progress | Green | Completed first round of consultation to inform development of the plan. Decisions for classification of park land were made in August 2019 (MT2018/15). Planned for Q2: Public notification of classification proposals will be completed. Workshops will be held on consultation findings. Further engagement with stakeholders will be completed. | Completed public notification of classification proposals. Two workshops were held in November and December to discuss outcomes of stakeholder meetings and plan principles and values. Planned for Q3: Workshop to discuss draft plan and second round of public notification. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>LeadDept/UnitorCCG</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>ActivityStatus</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1285</td>
<td>Maungakiekie- Tāmaki Local Board Parks Management Plan</td>
<td>Develops a multi-park management plan (year 1 of 2) that assists the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board in managing, use, development and protection of all parks, reserves and other open space they have allocated decision-making for.</td>
<td>US: Service Strategy and Integration</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Work programme has been approved by the local board. Activity has not started.</td>
<td>Planned for Q2: Workshop to discuss the scope and initiating the project including first round of consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>673</td>
<td>Industrial Pollution Prevention – Porirua and Mt Wellington</td>
<td>This programme is primarily educational and aims to inform urban industries and businesses about the impacts their activities may have on local waterways. The programme includes a site inspection and discussion with the business owners about potential issues around pollution as well as waste minimisation techniques and spill training. This may include subsidies for litter traps. If changes are recommended, a report is sent to the business. The programme involves a GIS mapping exercise to ensure that commercial businesses understand the stormwater network connections in relation to local waterways.</td>
<td>ILES: Healthy Waters</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Procurement has been finalised and the project is due to commence in quarter two.</td>
<td>Due to a scheduling conflict, this project has been delayed until quarter three. However, the project is still expected to be completed within the financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>686</td>
<td>Pest education and management for schools</td>
<td>This project educates and empowers school students to undertake investigations and management in their schools and households to improve biodiversity and manage pest spaces. Specific activities undertaken in this project include: additional education sessions to connect students with the biodiversity of the local environment; professional development to teachers for them to support their students learning and inquiry facilitation of student-led inquiry and citizen science to understand local issues; facilitation of student-led action projects to protect or enhance the local environment.</td>
<td>ILES: Environmental Services</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Auckland Zoo has been directly awarded this contract (alongside the contract for the board’s pest education and action for water in schools project) due to their high standard of delivery in the previous year’s project and the strategic relationship the programme has created, with Auckland Zoo increasing further time and resources into schools in the local board area. The Sustainable Schools team have a priority list of schools to engage in this year’s programme based on location, previous involvement in programmes and engagement level. The contractor will start engaging with those schools in quarter two.</td>
<td>Three schools have been signed up for the programme to date: Bailey Road School, Rangotake and Tamaki Primary. The contractor has met with teachers from all schools involved and has dates planned for quarter three for the experiential trips to an example of a healthy ecosystem. Whole school education sessions have also taken place to educate around pests. This contractor will focus on further engagement with one class in quarter three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690</td>
<td>Experiential learning and action for water in schools</td>
<td>This project will focus on educating and empowering school students, through experiential learning and citizen science, to undertake investigations and actions in their schools and local communities with a focus on freshwater and marine environments. Specific activities to be undertaken in this project will include:</td>
<td>ILES: Environmental Services</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Auckland Zoo has been directly awarded this contract (alongside the contract for the board’s pest education and management for schools project) due to their high standard of delivery in the previous year’s project and the strategic relationship the programme has created, with Auckland Zoo increasing further time and resources into schools in the local board area. The Sustainable Schools team have a priority list of schools to engage in this year’s programme based on location, previous involvement in programmes and engagement level. The contractor will start engaging with these schools in quarter two.</td>
<td>Four schools have been signed up for the programme – Point England Primary, St Mary’s College, St Peter’s Camden and Royal Oak Intermediate. The contractor has met with teachers from all four schools and has dates planned for quarter three for the experiential trips to a good example of a “pristine” ecosystem. The contractor has also run a whole school education session and will focus on engaging further with one class in quarter three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Lead Dept / Line of C/O</td>
<td>Budget Source</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>Q1 Commentary</td>
<td>Q2 Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693</td>
<td>Love Your Neighbourhood (Eckharts Environment Trust)</td>
<td>This project will: 1. Provide rapid response assistance to a value of $900 to support volunteer-driven practical environmental initiatives such as environmental clean-ups and restoration, community planting and food growing. 2. Provide practical assistance to low-income preschools to enable environmental education initiatives; in particular edible gardens and water-saving/conservation devices. 3. Promote the availability of the assistance through appropriate networks across the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area.</td>
<td>UES Environmental Services</td>
<td>LTD</td>
<td>Opex</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A funding agreement was established with Eckharts Environment Trust to enable delivery of the Love Your Neighbourhood initiative. One application of $500 was approved in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki in quarter one, leaving $8,000 remaining for future applications. The funding provided support to Starnrops Ako School by enabling the group to plant fruit trees and educate students on the benefit of local food and healthy eating. The Love Your Neighbourhood initiative was promoted to the community prior to quarter one and further promotion is scheduled for quarter two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td>Low Carbon Lifestyles - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>The project supports and empowers householders to live low carbon lifestyles - helping them to live well, save money and care for the planet. The project has two objectives: 1) To reduce residential energy use and associated carbon emissions. 2) To improve resident health by keeping houses warmer and drier. Home insulation, ventilation and efficient heating are critical to making homes warmer, lowering energy use and improving health outcomes in Auckland, and amongst lower income and ethnically diverse residents in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki local board area. Lower income areas are targeted as part of this project, as determined by census data. Targeted advice will be provided to residents on home energy efficiency with the potential to extend this to water conservation, zero waste, smarter mobility and food security. This project involves a doorstep conversation with residents and may also include the provision of energy saving devices. A follow up survey evaluates the effectiveness of the action taken, converting to carbon and money saved.</td>
<td>UES Environmental Services</td>
<td>LTD</td>
<td>Opex</td>
<td>$8,250</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Door knocking commenced in September 2019 in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki with follow up phone calls to take place in October 2019. Engagement and behaviour change reporting will be provided to the local board in quarter three. Door knocking was completed in quarter one, with 223 households engaging in the programme, exceeding the target of 200. Follow up calls took place in quarter two capturing resulting behaviour change around energy efficiency in the home. Of all households who participated in the evaluation, 89 reported taking one or more actions. The most popular included discussing energy saving with social networks and other residents, having shorter showers, turning off lights when not in use, and switching to energy-efficient light bulbs. Total carbon reductions and financial savings will be provided to the local board in the summary report due for completion in quarter four.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum (Maungakiekie-Tāmaki)</td>
<td>The Tāmaki Estuary Environment Forum operates as a collaboration between live local boards and several community organisations to advocate for the Tāmaki catchment. The forum’s vision is “To see Te Wai a Tahi (the Tāmaki Estuary) as a thriving, dynamic and healthy ecosystem that is loved and used by the community and which positively enhances and connects with the Waitematā Harbour, the Waiheke Island and the Huia Pump.” This is the third year where Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board budget will enable the funding of a coordinator for 12 hours per week to support the forum and associated organisations in progressing the vision for the Tāmaki Estuary. Remaining funds not used for the coordinator contract will be used to implement projects, such as beach clean ups, which progress the vision of the forum.</td>
<td>UES</td>
<td>Healthy Waters</td>
<td>LDX</td>
<td>Opex</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2019/2020 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or COG</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>877</td>
<td>Manukau Harbour Forum - Maungakiekie- Tāmaki</td>
<td>To continue to support the implementation of the Manukau Harbour Forum work programme. This year’s work programme includes a youth leadership sustainability workshop (educational programme held over three days), a communications plan, support for young environmentalists in southern Auckland, and supporting volunteer action during Seaweek. Additional proposed projects informed by the governance and management support review report will be considered by the forum early in 2020. Note the 2019/2020 budget figure shown for this activity includes the $8,000 originally approved plus $3,000 carried forward from 2018/2019.</td>
<td>WES: Healthy Waters</td>
<td>LD: Opex</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>In June 2019 the member local boards allocated funding totalling $70,000 to the Manukau Harbour Forum work programme, with detailed projects to be presented to the forum for consideration early in the 2019/2020 financial year. At the 30 August 2019 business meeting the Manukau Harbour Forum approved a budget of $46,000 for the following projects: • continued support for the delivery of a youth leadership sustainability workshop - $15,000 • continued support for the delivery of a communications plan - $10,000 • support for the Southern Auckland Youth Environments - $5,000 • support for enabling SeaWeek volunteer action across the Manukau Harbour - $10,000. Updates on the delivery of these initiatives will be provided in quarter two. Project proposals for delivering on priority recommendations identified in the governance and management support review report will be developed in quarter two. The forum will consider project proposals for allocating the remaining $25,000 of work programme budget in December 2019.</td>
<td>In quarter two each of the nine member local boards agreed to reinstate the Manukau Harbour Forum and nominated a board member and an alternate to represent the board on the forum. The first forum workshop and business meeting was held on 13 December 2019 and the forum approved the allocation of the remaining $22,000 work programme budget towards the delivery of a part-time Manukau Harbour Forum Coordinator. The coordinator will support the forum to deliver their vision, including the development of a forward work programme and a plan for engaging with mana whenua. Staff will progress procurement for a part-time coordinator in quarter three. Also in quarter two, staff worked with the Southern Auckland Youth Environmentalists to develop initiatives for programs that fit their vision for an environmental movement in southern Auckland. Initiators include delivering up to three workshop events to underline, inspire and educate support. Paakitika and tangatawhenua environmental groups. Planning for these events will progress in quarter three.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 944 | Access to Library Service - Maungakiekie- Tāmaki | Deliver a library service - Help customers find what they need, when they need it, and help them navigate our services and digital offerings. Providing information, library collection lending services and e-resources as well as support for customers using library digital resources, PCs, and WIFI. Hours of service - Glen Innes Library for 52 hours over 6 days per week ($544,177), Okeehunga Library for 52 hours over 7 days per week, ($607,714), Parakai Library for 56 hours over 7 days per week, ($489,569)(budget based on FY18/19, will be updated when available). | CS: Libraries & Information | ABS: Opex | $1,341,520 | In progress | Green | Our digital and eCollections continue to grow with an increase in issues of 18% across all libraries when compared to the same quarter last year. Glen Innes Library saw a 5% increase in physical issues compared to the same quarter last year. The number of new patrons increased by 35% at Glen Innes Library and 4% at Parakai Library compared to the same quarter last year. Visit numbers have been affected by the measles outbreak and are down 10% compared to the same quarter last year. | New registrations across all three libraries were up by 0% in this quarter. Attendances to Programmes and Events across all libraries were up by 2% due to numerous Diwali, and Christmas programmes offered across the local board libraries. Glen Innes also celebrated Tongariro and Māori Language Week with good attendances at their events. All libraries have been promoting our new video streaming service BeamStaff. BeamStaff is Australia’s leading streaming channel for documentaries and independent features with a collection of over 700 award winning movies, documentaries and festival favourites. Access is free with an Auckland Libraries’ membership (registration and full membership – anywhere, anytime). |

| 945 | Preschool programming - Maungakiekie- Tāmaki | Provide programming for preschoolers that encourages early literacy, active movement, and supports parents and caregivers to participate confidently in their children’s early development and learning. Programmes include: Wiggle and Rhyme, Rhymetime, Storytime. | CS: Libraries & Information | ABS: Opex | $0 | In progress | Green | Attendance at preschool programmes and outreach to early childhood centres and playgroups have been affected by the measles outbreak. A total of 3,350 children and parents attended a total of 113 rhyme time, story time and wiggle and rhyme sessions at the three libraries this quarter. As per previous quarter, outreach to preschools and early childhood centres and playgroups are still being affected by the measles outbreak. A total of 3,350 children and parents attended a total of 113 rhyme time, story time and wiggle and rhyme sessions at all three local board libraries. These preschool activities provide an opportunity for new parents, and those new to the neighbourhood, to get to know and interact with each other in a safe environment. |
### Work Programme 2019/2020 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Hosting COG</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>946</td>
<td>Children and Youth engagement - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Provide children and youth services and programming which encourage learning, literary and social interaction. Engage with children, youth and whānau along with local schools to support literacy and grow awareness of library resources.</td>
<td>CS, Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>ABS, Opex</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A successful July school holiday programme was delivered across all three libraries. Onehunga Library collaborated with Onehunga Community Centre, with the highlight being Pepe Hunt, where children learnt about animals that live in the South Pole through a fantastic scavenger hunt in the library. The most popular activity at Paraparaumu library was the Science Station, which reached 60 children and parents. As part of Onehunga Library's annual Winter Evening Programme for children and families, July saw a circus-themed Storytime with 32 in attendance. A monthly teen 'Biscuit Club' started in May 2019 at Onehunga Library in collaboration with Mericell College. Glen Innes Library has been involved in a Tongan Reading Together programme at St Paul's School. Paraparaumu Library continues our involvement with Paraparaumu Bridge School with the Reading Together programme, school visits, and outreach to the schools annual Book Week programme.</td>
<td>October school holiday programme themed 'Top Secret!' attracted 582 children and parents/guardians across all three local board libraries. Highlights included a 'grrrs' food challenge and detective skills at Paraparaumu and a mystery at the library and QR code scavenger hunt at Onehunga Library. Paraparaumu Library held library tours for local primary schools as part of a membership drive. Our Kids Make Their Mark to Explore Summer Reading programme is well underway with registrations now underway. Our librarians have visited local schools to promote the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>947</td>
<td>Support customer and community connection and celebrate cultural diversity and local places, people and heritage - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Provide services and programmes that facilitate customer connection with the library and empowers communities through collaborative design and partnerships with Council and other agencies. Celebrate local communities, cultural diversity and heritage. Gather, protect and share the stories, old and new, that celebrate our people, communities and Tāmaki Makaurau.</td>
<td>CS, Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>ABS, Opex</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Cook Island and Tongan Language weeks were celebrated across all three libraries. Glen Innes and Paraparaumu Libraries collaborated with Te Oro and community groups to run very successful language programmes that were attended by local dignitaries. An increasing number of community groups are using library spaces for meetings at all three libraries. Celebrations at Onehunga and Glen Innes Libraries for the Chinese Moon Festival attracted large numbers of people. Onehunga Library hosted a bilingual border inspection talk by New Zealand Customs. Onehunga Library supported Auckland City Mission’s Winter Appeal by collecting cash and non-perishable food items. It was an overwhelming success! In response to popular demand, the yoga class at Paraparaumu Library is now being offered fortnightly thanks to our community volunteers.</td>
<td>Niuean Language Week was celebrated at Paraparaumu and Glen Innes Libraries with highlights including UII weaving at Paraparaumu Library in collaboration with Paraparaumu Community Hall. Glen Innes Library celebrated with programmes and events offered in collaboration with Te Oro and Tamaki Regeneration Company (TRC). Diesel was celebrated at all three libraries. Highlights included a cultural celebration day at Onehunga Library in collaboration with the Onehunga Business Association, performances and demonstrations. A community year end and volunteer appreciation event was hosted by Paraparaumu Library and the Community Hall. Paraparaumu Library participated in the Paraparaumu Christmas Street Party and promoted library memberships and services. Onehunga Library held exhibitions, displays and talks to celebrate Heritage Festival. Highlights included a special talk from Jim Jack on the historic significance of Onehunga wharf, including connecting communities by ferries and connecting Auckland to Lower North Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>948</td>
<td>Celebrating Te Ao Moturau and strengthening responsiveness to Māori - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Engage and build partnerships with Rua Pūkenga Māori, local iwi and Māori organisations to support local Māori communities. Celebrating te ao Māori with events and programmes, including regionally coordinated and promoted programmes. Te Tiriti o Whaitangi, Matariki and Māori Language Week. Whakapāpuna te reo Māori - champion and embed te reo Māori in our libraries and communities.</td>
<td>CS, Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>ABS, Opex</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Matariki was celebrated at all three libraries with displays. Matariki-themed regular programmes, school holiday activities and craft activities for adults and children. Glen Innes Libraries collateralised with Te Oro and community groups for Matariki events in Glen Innes. Glen Innes Library worked with local kotahunga reo and kura kaupapa for Māori Language Week with students coming to the library for a special story telling session. After school activities were also run. Onehunga and Paraparaumu Libraries celebrated with displays, themed Storytime and storytime &amp; rhyme sessions. Paraparaumu Library held a bilingual cooking club, where children and parents shared their culinary creations and learned to talk about food and cooking in te reo.</td>
<td>Paraparaumu Library is investigating community interest in starting a Te Reo Koru group based at the library. Glen Innes Libraries started a Te Reo class in December which will continue to be offered in 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work Programme 2019/2020 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or COO</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>949</td>
<td>Learning and Literacy programming and digital literacy support - Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Provide learning programmes and events throughout the year. Support our customers to embrace new ways of doing things. Lift literacy in the communities that need it most. Help customers and whānau learn and grow, and provide opportunities for knowledge creation and innovation.</td>
<td>CS Libraries &amp; Information</td>
<td>ABS: Opex</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>32 adult learning activities were held across the three libraries, reaching a total of 572 adults. 24 classes and workshops were held, reaching 879 adults and 532 children and young people. E6 Book a Librarian sessions were held, reaching 77 adults and 86 children and young people. In particular, Glen Innes Library promoted Book a Librarian sessions with special assistance on researching your family history throughout Family History Month. All three libraries encouraged reading and literacy during Comic Book Month with displays and a region-wide Take 5 book promotion. Glen Innes and Papakura Libraries collaborated with UpSkills to deliver adult literacy classes at local factories. Onehunga Library continues to hold monthly Book Chats, with 5 sessions consistently well attended.</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Glen Innes Pool &amp; Leisure Centre Operations</td>
<td>Operate Glen Innes Pool &amp; Leisure Centre in a safe and sustainable manner, through a management agreement with the YMCA. Deliver a variety of accessible programmes and services that get the local community active. These services include: fitness, group fitness, learn to swim, aquatic and recreation services. Along with core programmes that reflect the needs of the local community.</td>
<td>CS PSRE Active Recreation</td>
<td>ABS: Opex</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The Glen Innes Pool and Leisure Centre has experienced a 15% decrease in centre visits year to date when measured against the same period last year (July to November). This is largely casual swimmers and may be a direct result of the road works outside the facility. Glen Innes hosted the annual Y-Games, which saw members from different YMCA centres compete in fitness activities. The Get Summer Ready program in September Members were rewarded with prizes when they completed 50 workouts in 50 days. Customer satisfaction is measured by regular Net Promotion Score (NPS) surveys. This survey asks how likely the users are to recommend the centre to friends and family. The current score for the centre is 31.4. This is the third highest score among the contracted aquatic sites. They have also seen an increase of 3.4 compared to Q1 of 2019/2020.</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
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<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Lead Dept / Unit or CCO</td>
<td>Budget Source</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Activity Status</td>
<td>RAG</td>
<td>Q1 Commentary</td>
<td>Q2 Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
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<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Lagoon Pool &amp; Leisure Centre Spas</td>
<td>Operates Lagoon Pool &amp; Leisure Centre, in a safe and sustainable manner, through a management agreement with the YMCA. Delivers a variety of accessible programmes and services that get the local community active. These services include fitness; group fitness; learn to swim; aquatic and recreation services. Along with core programmes that reflect the needs of the local community.</td>
<td>CS - PSR Rec</td>
<td>ABS - Opex</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The fitness centre has seen new pieces of equipment introduced this quarter. The fitness timetable has been reviewed and due to the spin classes continuing to be popular, these classes retain high occupancy. Other changes allowed for Yoga and Pilates to return to the programme. Year 1, 6, 7, 8, &amp; 9 students from Parnell Bridge School and Somerville Special School attended Greater Auckland Aquatic Action Plan (GAAAP) lessons this quarter. The AMETI roadworks have impacted on the access to the centre. YMCA management is working closely with Fulton Hogan to assist with the road management through weekly Monday meetings and updates. A traffic management program is being created to inform users of the centre of road works and possible timelines. Customer satisfaction is measured by regular Net Promoter Score (NPS) surveys. This survey asks how likely the user is to recommend the centre to friends and family. The current NPS score is 55.4. This rating is a slight decrease of 3.5 compared to Q4 2018/2019. However, this is a good score when compared to the rest of the network.</td>
<td>Lagoon Pool and Leisure Centre has experienced a slight increase in centre visits year to date, when measured against the same period last year (July to November). This is largely due to an increase in fitness participation. Pool use has decreased, particularly by casual swimmers, and this may be caused by the AMETI road works. The outdoor pool opened as planned for the summer season, on the first weekend of December. During Q3 the centre is extremely busy with Greater Auckland Aquatic Action Plan (GAAAP) school lessons, Plunket classes and school events in the outdoor pool. The centre has been involved in pre-season maintenance to ensure that the summer runs smoothly, including cleaning of pool and gutter wash, repair of cafe, removal of the old outdoor shade structure and installation of umbrellas, and replacing two circulation pumps with variable speed drive pumps for the main outside pool. YMCA management continues to work with Fulton Hogan (the contractor) on AMETI project access issues, through weekly meetings and updates. A traffic management program is being created to inform pool users about road works, access and parking. Customer satisfaction is measured by regular Net Promoter Score (NPS) surveys. This survey asks how likely the users are to recommend the centre to friends and family. The current NPS score is 55.4. This is the second highest score among the contracted aquatic sites, with the score not changing between this quarter and the previous quarter of 2018/2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Lagoon Stadium</td>
<td>Operates Lagoon Stadium in a safe and sustainable manner, through a management agreement with the YMCA. Delivers a variety of accessible programmes and services that get the local community active. This includes fitness; group fitness; and recreation services, along with core programmes that reflect the needs of the local community.</td>
<td>CS - PSR Rec</td>
<td>ABS - Opex</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The stadium is currently being utilised for basketball, badminton, table tennis. There are also various rentals such as the boxing gym, church groups and corporate basketball leagues. Two new additions of sport programs that will be introduced at this time are paddelboat and 3-on-3 basketball. These ideal locations would be during the off peak times to ensure full utilisation of the centre. Auckland Transport is currently working on the new access to the stadium via Domain Road, this is estimated to be completed at the end of October 2019. This will result in two access points to the stadium to be used until such time as the current access on Lopcoe Drive is closed. YMCA management are working closely with Fulton Hogan (the contractor) to assist with road management through weekly meetings and updates. A traffic management program is being created to inform users of the stadium about road works and possible timelines.</td>
<td>Lagoon Stadium has experienced a 10% decrease in centre visits year to date when measured against the same period last year (July to November). This change is likely related to the impact of the AMETI road works. The centre is continuing to focus on improving the presentation of the centre, with support from Community Facilities. This is creating more opportunities for school groups, local businesses and drop-in visitors to make use of the stadium and recreation space. YMCA management continue to work with Fulton Hogan (the contractor) to manage road access through weekly meetings and updates. A traffic management program is being created to inform stadium users about the road works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or CCO</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Onehunga War Memorial Pool and Leisure Centre Operations</td>
<td>Operate the centre in a safe and sustainable manner; through a management agreement with the YMCA. Deliver a variety of accessible programmes and services that get the local community active. This includes, Fitness, Group fitness, and Recreation services, along with core programmes that reflect the needs of the local community.</td>
<td>CS: PSR Active Recreation</td>
<td>ABS: Opex</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Participation in activities at the centre has increased. The after-school programmes continue to be popular. After-school activities include swimming, sports, playground, arts and crafts and K-Club (extra fitness in the gym). The fitness centre continues to grow with members utilising the use of personal training, group fitness classes and smaller group training. Customer satisfaction is measured by regular lat Promotions Score (IPS) surveys. This survey asks how likely the users are to recommend the centre to friends and family. The current score for this centre is 5.7. This rating is a slight decrease of 0.7 compared to Q4 2018/19. The decrease represents the dissatisfaction with the changing room (upgrades planned for Q3). The centre has experienced a 4% increase in centre visits year-to-date when measured against the same period last year (July to November). This increase is spread across the whole centre, with an increase of 1,902 fitness users and 3,167 aquatic users with the largest increase in 16 and-under swimming. Data for the final phase of this change is not yet available, but the expectation is that the improvement and reception renewal works have been set for 3 February 2020. This 5-month project will likely have an impact on attendance during that period. Customer satisfaction is measured by regular lat Promotions Score (IPS) surveys. This survey asks how likely the users are to recommend the centre to friends and family. The current IPS score has a slight decrease of 0.7 compared to Q1 of 2019/20. Customer feedback noted the poor condition of the changing rooms. This will be addressed by the refurbishment works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>MT Urban Forest (Highline) Strategy FY20</td>
<td>This is the second year of the local board specific implementation of Auckland’s Highline Strategy. The local board area ‘Knows’ report, from year one (2019/2020), will be used to help guide the board on options in a planning workshop. This includes, a desktop exercise identifying potential sites in parks and streets across the local board area, recommending species, and investigating opportunities to further develop partnerships (including community groups, schools, volunteers). This will be delivered in partnership with Community Facilities. Operations activity line 4 which is the ABS:CAPEX for planting the trees in Autumn/Winter 2020. Phase three (2020/2021) will develop the Protecting Phase, in addition to the ongoing growing programme.</td>
<td>CS: PSR Park Services</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Presented the ‘Knows’ results to the August business meeting, this was approved by the local board MT/2019/114. Work is in progress to develop an outline of a long-term planting programme and discuss options with the local board in Q3. The local board adopted the draft Highline Strategy in September. Staff have begun preparing long-term and annual planting plans for the board area which will identify local sites for tree planting. These plans will be discussed with the board at a workshop in Q3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>Port England Wildlife Access Assessment</td>
<td>Prepare a service assessment for Port England Reserve. Note: this activity is dependent on the outcome of the Treaty settlement negotiations.</td>
<td>CS: PSR Park Services</td>
<td>ABS: Opex</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Staff have developed some high level outcomes. A full service assessment can only be developed once the outcome of the Port England Treaty Settlement has been confirmed. A full service assessment can only be developed once the outcome of the Treaty settlement negotiations has been confirmed. The assessment in progress. Staff will report findings to the local board in Q3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>MT Parks, Animal service assessment</td>
<td>Scope will include an assessment of current provision, identification of gaps and recommendations for improved provision</td>
<td>CS: PSR Park Services</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The board of a Q1 workshop requested additional analysis of additional amenities including bike racks, dog bins and dog feeding stations. The assessment will be undertaken in Q2 and findings presented to the board in Q3. The assessment in progress. Staff will report findings to the local board in Q3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>MT Ecological volunteers and environmental programming programme 2019-2020</td>
<td>This is an ongoing programme to support community and volunteer ecological and environmental initiatives. This includes, annual pest plant and animal control, local park clean-ups, and community environmental education and events. Additional activities have been planned throughout the year Q1 - Wetland spring community plantings Q2 - Prepare for autumn planting Q3 - Autumn community plantings</td>
<td>CS: PSR Park Services</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Volunteer activities in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki local parks continued to focus on ongoing restoration work, animal pest control and rubbish clean-ups. Tree planting also took place at Port England Reserve. Volunteer activities in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki local parks continued to focus on ongoing restoration work, animal pest control and rubbish clean-ups. A new volunteer group began regular weed control, plant releasing and clean-ups at Aprana Reserve, Glen Innes. There were two volunteer training days this quarter - risk assessment and Level 1 First Aid course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1205</td>
<td>MT ‘Te Kate Rukuruku’ (Māori naming of parks and places) FY20</td>
<td>Māori naming (and associated story telling) of parks and places in partnership with mana whenua to value and promote Auckland’s Māori identity and use of it to Māori.</td>
<td>CS: PSR Te Waka Tai-enga-atahaia</td>
<td>LDI: Opex</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki local board confirmed their tranch one park list, at a business meeting on 27 August 2019 (resolution number MT/2019/140). Staff are currently working through the process of identifying the overlapping areas versus interests so that we can progress this list into the mana whenua naming stage. The overlapping interest groups in the process will require longer than initially planned. This will push this process out across Q3 and Q4 and the giving of names process into Q1 2020/2021. Mana whenua received the new tranch list in December 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Work Programme 2019/2020 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept / Unit or COG</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>Local History of Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>The purpose of this project is to improve public understanding of the local history of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area in order to support its inclusion in community development. This project will take place over two years. The first year is the 'Knowing and Growing' stage. This stage is about developing a better understanding of the local history of the MTLB area. It will be done in collaboration with the Heritage Libraries Team.</td>
<td>GPO: Plans and Places</td>
<td>Local Open</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The project is in the growing stage, building relationships within the community. The team have started historical research, oral history recordings and commissioning photography. Planning work is underway for more oral histories, a community archive event and creating an online story map.</td>
<td>The project team continues to build relationships in the community. Photography work has been commissioned. Oral history has been completed and more are being commissioned. The project team are focusing on Orange, Panmure and Glen Innes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265</td>
<td>Mt Wellington planning investigation</td>
<td>The purpose of this project was to help determine whether any local spatial planning such as area planning, is required to be undertaken in the Mt Wellington area in the future.</td>
<td>GPO: Plans and Places</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The final outcomes of the Mt Wellington planning investigation were presented to the Local Board at a workshop held on 16 July 2019. Due to the Plans and Places Department’s fall work programme for this financial year as well as the 2020-21 year, an area plan for Mt Wellington will only be able to be commenced at the earliest, in July 2021, in the 2021/2022 financial year.</td>
<td>The final outcomes of the Mt Wellington planning investigation were presented to the Local Board at a workshop held on 16 July 2019. Due to the Plans and Places Department’s fall work programme for this financial year as well as the 2020-21 financial year, an area plan for Mt Wellington will only be able to be commenced at the earliest, in July 2021 (FY2021/2022). In late 2019 the Local Board requested that an area plan for Mt Wellington be commenced during 2020-21 rather than 2021-2022. A meeting is scheduled to take place in Q3 to discuss possible timing options for an area plan for Mt Wellington.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2019/2020 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Dept/Unit or CC</th>
<th>CL: Lease Commencement Date</th>
<th>CL: Right of Renewal</th>
<th>CL: Final Lease Expiry Date</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1447</td>
<td>10 Palsson Rd (name: Auckland Society of Model Engineers Incorporated)</td>
<td>Renewal of building lease</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>01-11-14</td>
<td>2 x 5 Years</td>
<td>31-10-24</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>An application form is being received. The site visit will be conducted once this is received.</td>
<td>Site visit completed. Renewal application received and being reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1448</td>
<td>102 Kingsway Rd, Parnurre St (name: George’s Rowing Club Incorporated)</td>
<td>Renewal of ground lease</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>01-03-15</td>
<td>2 x 5 Years</td>
<td>28-02-25</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A lease renewal has been received. The site visit will be conducted once completed.</td>
<td>Follow up contract has been made with the group about the application for renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1449</td>
<td>7-13 Princes Road, Parnurre Auckland Tamaki Redevelopment Company Limited</td>
<td>Renewal of ground lease</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>01-10-17</td>
<td>2 x 1 Year</td>
<td>30-09-21</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A lease renewal application has been sent to the group. The site visit will be conducted once completed and information has been received.</td>
<td>The application form has been received. A visit will be conducted in December 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450</td>
<td>175-243 Nelson St, Onehunga Auckland Stock and Sale Car Club Incorporated</td>
<td>New ground lease</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>24-08-04</td>
<td>2 x 5 Years</td>
<td>23-09-19</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>A lease renewal application was received from the group. It will be completed.</td>
<td>This lease project is one of a few that is on hold until the completion of the Watukaria Park Reserve Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1451</td>
<td>143 Tawhi Rd, Glen Innes Youthtown (Youthtown Incorporated)</td>
<td>New building lease</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>01-08-04</td>
<td>2 x 5 Years</td>
<td>31-07-19</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This lease item is not due to commence until quarter three.</td>
<td>This project will be worked on by the Auckland Council staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1452</td>
<td>Parnurre Community Hall, 7-13 Princes Road, Parnurre, Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust</td>
<td>New ground lease</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>01-06-05</td>
<td>2 x 5 Years</td>
<td>31-05-20</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This matter is not due to commence until quarter two.</td>
<td>Leasing is working with Community Places and the group to find a suitable space in the community hall. Leasing with the practice manager in November to conduct a site inspection of the options for lease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1453</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Community Leases FY2019/2020 Work Programme</td>
<td>Leases to be progressed in the 2020-2021 Work Programme year</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Leases to be progressed in the 2020-2021 Work Programme year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Lead Department or COO</td>
<td>CL: Lease Commencement Date</td>
<td>CL: Right of Renewal</td>
<td>CL: Lease Expiry Date</td>
<td>Activity Status</td>
<td>RAG</td>
<td>Q1 Commentary</td>
<td>Q2 Commentary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1454</td>
<td>Leases to be progressed in the 2019-2020 Work Programme year:</td>
<td>Community Leases</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leases to be progressed in the 2019-2021 Work Programme year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3443</td>
<td>New reserve lease to Auckland Rowing Club Incorporation</td>
<td>Community Leases</td>
<td>21-11-03</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>21-11-18</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A business report seeking endorsement for this lease will be made available at a future local board business meeting.</td>
<td>A business report will be presented at the local board’s first business meeting in February/March 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3444</td>
<td>New community ground and building lease to Mount Wellington Tennis Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Community Leases</td>
<td>01-01-09</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>31-12-23</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td>ComPLETED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3445</td>
<td>New community and building lease to Auckland Canine Agility Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Community Leases</td>
<td>01-04-04</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>31-03-19</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>The group has surrendered the use of the building, and returned the keys to the college which they have not been using since July 2019. They are using the surrounding ground area only to train dogs. They seek a lease to occupy this space, which is on hold pending completion of the Reserve Management Plan for Waitakarua Park.</td>
<td>This matter cannot be progressed until the Waitakarua Park Reserve Management Plan is completed at the end of 2020. This lease to occupy is on hold pending the completion of the Reserve Management Plan for Waitakarua Park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3447</td>
<td>New community ground lease to Onohunga Combined Sports Trust</td>
<td>Community Leases</td>
<td>15-08-03</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>14-08-18</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Operational Management and Maintenance and Leasing are working with the group on the full agreement costs for maintaining the club-owned amenities open to the public. This matter cannot be progressed until the Waitakarua Park Reserve Management Plan is completed.</td>
<td>The lease matter cannot be progressed until the Waitakarua Park Reserve Management Plan is completed at the end of 2020. Management staff have met with the group to discuss a way forward regarding usage, costs and maintenance of the club-owned amenities by the public. These discussions are on-going in addressing possible options for the new lease which cannot be progressed until the Waitakarua Reserve Management Plan is completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3448</td>
<td>New community lease for operation and management of Parnure Stone Cottage to Parnure Historical Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Community Leases</td>
<td>01-01-09</td>
<td>1 x 5 years</td>
<td>31-12-18</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Leasing engagement with Mana Whanua was completed in August 2019. The new management agreement proposal will be worked with the new local board after the election.</td>
<td>This project requires workshops with the local board in 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3449</td>
<td>New community ground lease to Scout Association of NZ - Maunganui Scout Group</td>
<td>Community Leases</td>
<td>01-04-14</td>
<td>1 x 5 years</td>
<td>31-03-19</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This lease matter requires a workshop with the local board in quarter two.</td>
<td>Awaiting confirmation from the zone leader that the Maunganui Scout Group is no longer in operation and the premises is being used by another scout group. This will require a workshop with the board to consider options regarding a new lease.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3450</td>
<td>New ground and building lease to Te Ao Hou Community Charitable Trust Inc</td>
<td>Community Leases</td>
<td>01-12-03</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>30-11-18</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>A business report seeking approval of the new lease to the group will be presented at the first business meeting of the new local board.</td>
<td>A business report will be presented at the local board’s first business meeting in February/March 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3451</td>
<td>New community lease to Ellerslie Tennis Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Community Leases</td>
<td>01-01-03</td>
<td>2 x 5 years</td>
<td>31-12-17</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Programme 2019/2020 Q2 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Lead Depth/Unit or CCO</th>
<th>CL: Lease Commencement Date</th>
<th>CL: Right of Renewal</th>
<th>CL: Final Lease Expiry Date</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Q1 Commentary</th>
<th>Q2 Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3452</td>
<td>Ehitane North Reserve, 36A Ehitane Avenue Glen Innes</td>
<td>Renew lease to Tamaki Model Aero Club Incorporated. Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>01-04-06</td>
<td>2x 5 years</td>
<td>31-03-21</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The group has sought a variation to their lease agreement for a reduction in rent. This will not be able to go through the streamlined renewal process and requires a business resolution. A business report will be available at the first business meeting after inauguration of the new board.</td>
<td>The business report for this project and the item 3490 is combined as it relates to the same group. The report will be available at the local board's first business meeting in February/March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3457</td>
<td>92-106 Line Road Glen Innes Lease to Citizens Advice Bureau - Glen Innes</td>
<td>New community lease to Citizens Advice Bureau - Glen Innes (Ruapotaka Reserve).</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This renewal is dependent on execution of the head lease which is with Legal Services for renewal. Progress with the renewal will commence as soon as the review is complete and the head lease deed is executed.</td>
<td>Head lease has been sent to CAB for execution. The head lease has been incorporated into the first term of the head lease. Provided CAB execute the head lease this item could be deleted from workplan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3458</td>
<td>Onelunga Community Centre, 191 Church Street Onelunga</td>
<td>New community lease to Citizens Advice Bureau - Onelunga.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This renewal is dependent on execution of the head lease which is with Legal Services for review. Progress with the renewal will commence as soon as the review is complete and the head lease deed is executed.</td>
<td>Head lease has been sent to CAB for execution. The head lease has been incorporated into the first term of the head lease. Provided CAB execute the head lease this item could be deleted from workplan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3459</td>
<td>Parnure Community Centre, 7-13 Parnure Road Parnure</td>
<td>New community lease to Citizens Advice Bureau - Parnure. Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This renewal is dependent on execution of the head lease which is with Legal Services for review. Progress with the renewal will commence as soon as the review is complete and the head lease deed is executed.</td>
<td>Head lease has been sent to Citizens Advice Bureau for execution. The head lease has been incorporated into the first term of the head lease. Provided Citizens Advice Bureau executes the head lease this item could be deleted from workplan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3460</td>
<td>Pt England Reserve, 122 Ehitane Avenue Glen Innes</td>
<td>Renewal airspace lease to Tamaki Model Aero Club Incorporated. Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>01-03-07</td>
<td>2x 5 years</td>
<td>28-03-22</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This has been sent to the local board for their consideration.</td>
<td>The business report for this project and the item 3452 is combined as it relates to the same group. The report will be available at the local board's first business meeting in February/March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3461</td>
<td>Allenby Reserve, 53-54 Allenby Road Parnure Lease to The Scout Association of NZ - Parnure Scout Group</td>
<td>New community lease to The Scout Association of NZ - Parnure Scout Group. Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>01-07-97</td>
<td>1x 5 years</td>
<td>30-06-17</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Staff had difficulty making contact with the new group (a different branch of NZ Scouts) and the regional office. Matter was worked up with the local board who provided a direction regarding varying the EOI process as this group was already onsite and affiliated with the original group. Site visit was completed in July after contact was made with the group, and worked up with the local board. In August. Matter has been scheduled for hearing in November 2019. A business report will be presented in the next business meeting of the new board.</td>
<td>The engagement was completed in November 2019. A business report will be completed and brought to the local board in 2023.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3511</td>
<td>Waite Reserve, 12 Spring Street, Onelunga</td>
<td>New lease to Dolphin Theatre Incorporated - Onelunga</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>01-11-09</td>
<td>2x 5 years</td>
<td>31-10-24</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This group is due for a lease renewal (1/11/2019) and was not on the work programme 2018/2019. The group has been contacted by email and sent a lease renewal application to be completed.</td>
<td>A site visit was completed in December 2019. The lease application had been received and is being reviewed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Delegation of local board feedback on the Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity

File No.: CP2020/01211

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To delegate responsibility to a member of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board to provide input into Auckland Council’s submission on the proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
3. The NPSIB provides detailed direction on maintaining indigenous biodiversity, including identification and protection of significant indigenous biodiversity, under the Resource Management Act 1991.
4. The primary objective of the proposed NPSIB is to maintain indigenous biodiversity through directions relating to:
   - applying the concept of Hutia te Rito when implementing the NPSIB and managing indigenous biodiversity
   - providing opportunities for tangata whenua involvement in the management of indigenous biodiversity
   - processes and criteria to identify, assess and protect areas as significant natural areas (areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna)
   - managing adverse effects of activities within significant natural areas and managing effects on indigenous biodiversity that occur outside of significant natural areas
   - identifying and protecting taonga species and ecosystems
   - identifying and managing locations for highly mobile fauna
   - promoting and providing for restoration and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity
   - requiring development of regional biodiversity strategies and monitoring plans.
5. The closing date for submissions is 13 March 2020. The draft Auckland Council submission will be sent to local boards on 18 February and final approval will be signed-off by delegated councillors on 9 March 2020.
6. To meet these timeframes, local board feedback is due on 3 March 2020 and will be attached verbatim to the Auckland Council submission.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) delegate authority to a Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board member to input into Auckland Council’s submission on the proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
25 February 2020

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity discussion document</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Mal Ahmu - Local Board Advisor - Mngke-Tmk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Puketapapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key themes for the Auckland Council submission on He Kura Koiora i hokia - a discussion document on a proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity

This document outlines the draft key themes that will be used to draft the full council submission on the proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB). Staff are still considering some aspects of the NPSIB and its implications on both the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) and council’s implementation of the NPSIB. This includes the criteria for identifying significant natural areas and the management of adverse effects in SNAs. Initial comments on such matters are provided but the implications will be expanded on in the draft submission.

The submission will be organised in response to the key parts, and related questions, of the discussion document for the proposed NPSIB.

Overall comments

- Auckland Council supports the need for a National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB) to strengthen requirements for protecting and maintaining indigenous biodiversity under the Resource Management Act (RMA). This includes providing direction and guidance to implement the RMA.

- The council supports the overall intent of the proposed NPSIB, however considers there are opportunities to improve clarity in the proposed provisions and certainty in aspects of its implementation.

- The council has concerns with the interaction and alignment of the NPSIB with other national directions, specifically the National Policy Statements on Urban Development and Freshwater Management and the lack of recognition of the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy. Alignment of national direction is necessary to achieve the outcomes sought in the NPSIB.

- The council considers that technical and financial support will be essential for successful implementation of the NPSIB. The council has identified several areas where guidance could be provided to support implementation, clarify expectations required by the NPSIB and ensure consistency. The council supports the provision of technical and financial support to councils who may not be as well-resourced as Auckland to implement the NPSIB. Iwi/Māori also need to be adequately resourced for implementation.

- The Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) identifies significant natural areas as Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) covering all domains. The council has extensive programmes delivering protection, restoration and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity across the region along with supporting landowners and community groups with advice and funding. As a unitary authority Auckland Council has greater opportunity to achieve integrated management of indigenous biodiversity and in this regard is likely to have different implementation challenges compared with other councils.
Specific topics

Objectives and Policies of the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB Part 2)

- The council agrees that the NPSIB is necessary to strengthen protection of indigenous biodiversity under the Resource Management Act (RMA). It will provide the necessary guidance and direction on achieving the outcomes sought under the RMA, and to achieve a more consistent approach across New Zealand. To date such national guidance has been absent. Throughout the submission the council has identified various opportunities to improve clarity in the NPSIB provisions to ensure it can be implemented effectively.

- The council recognises that the NPSIB applies to terrestrial indigenous biodiversity while the NPS for Freshwater Management and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement will manage indigenous biodiversity in their respective domains. While management can be undertaken through different documents the council emphasises the importance of ensuring alignment between documents to enable clear and effective implementation by councils, and certainty for landowners.

- The council generally agrees with the objectives and policies proposed in the NPSIB. However, the council questions whether they have been over simplified removing important detail from the objectives and prioritise restoration and enhancement over protection of significant indigenous biodiversity. As currently proposed, some objectives and policies do not add any further direction than the RMA.

- The council supports the inclusion of restoration and enhancement within the objectives and the implementation of the NPSIB. The council considers there is a need to do more than just maintain indigenous biodiversity, recognising the reference to ‘at least no reduction’ currently proposed in the NPSIB (clause 1.7). There needs to be a positive gain for nature to build resilience to impacts of climate change and enable nature-based solutions.

Section A: Recognising te ao Māori and the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi

a. Providing for the concept of Hutia te Rito (Objective 3, Policy 1, clause 3.2 & 3.3)

- The council supports the use of the underlying concept of Hutia te Rito within the NPSIB, recognising the important connections between the health of nature and of people.

b. Providing for the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and engaging with tangata whenua (Objective 2 & 6, Policy 1 & 12, clause 3.3)

- The discussion document (p25) indicates that the NPSIB proposes a broader participation to allow councils to involve iwi/Māori, as opposed to only iwi authorities. For Auckland (and elsewhere), with a significant mataawaka presence, engagement with all Māori is important.
The council supports the direction to involve tangata whenua at all stages of implementation of the NPSIB, and the incorporation of mātauranga Māori and tikanga Māori in decision-making and biodiversity management. The council is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi/ the Treaty of Waitangi and supports the additional direction that the NPSIB provides. The council is concerned around resourcing iwi/Māori for the implementation of the NPSIB.

Section B: Identifying important biodiversity and taonga

a. Identification and mapping of Significant Natural Areas (Policy 6, clause 3.8)

- The council supports having a national approach to identifying areas of significant indigenous biodiversity as Significant Natural Areas (SNAs). The Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) already identifies its SNAs as Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs), with over 3000 identified across terrestrial, freshwater and marine domains.
- The council supports the inclusion of principles and approaches in the NPSIB that must be used when undertaking assessment and classification of SNAs, which reflects the council’s approach.
- It is noted that the NPSIB criteria do not cover wetlands and streams (which are covered by the AUP SEA overlay), and this may have implications for the AUP.
- An initial assessment of the criteria used to identify SNAs/SEAs in the AUP suggests that there are generally high levels of congruence with the NPSIB significance criteria (which NPSIB clause 3.8(4) provides for). However, the council considers that the language used in the NPSIB Appendix 1 significance criteria is often general and vague such that they may not be useful to identify SNAs or allow for meaningful comparison throughout New Zealand and may lead to increased contention and litigation about their application. All regional councils have committed to the use of the terrestrial ecosystems identified in Singers & Rogers (2014)1. In Auckland, this ecosystem classification is used to identify and assess representativeness and other matters covered by the significance criteria in the AUP and provides an objective basis to assess important ecological characteristics. The NPSIB may be out of date in its approach to ecosystem identification, and a more consistent and robust basis is required than currently proposed in the NPSIB. Use of a standardised classification system provides the opportunity for consistent assessment of the current and future state of biodiversity across the country, and in a way that can be aggregated to the national scale.
- The council would like to see greater consideration of climate resilience in the proposed NPSIB significance criteria, or the ability to apply them to manage climate change impacts. Climate resilience and representativeness are linked and will become more important in future.
- The NPSIB proposes to manage adverse effects on SNAs differently depending on whether an SNA is classified as High or Medium (using criteria in Appendix 2 of the

---

NPSIB). The council has concerns with the implications of having to classify SNAs as High or Medium, which may become contentious and be subject to litigation. The NPSIB does not provide any detail around how landowners need to be advised or involved in this process.

- The council is also concerned with using the High Medium classification to manage effects on SNAs. Potentially it may result in greater loss of Medium SNAs and it is still a subjective assessment process.

- The council generally supports regional councils being responsible for identifying, mapping and scheduling SNAs and notes that the approach adopted in other parts of the country where regional councils identify SNAs that are then included in the district plans of the region allows for some efficiency of scale, and more consistent approaches. The success of any approach relies on adequate resourcing, and a standardised approach may not be always provide for the best outcome. As a unitary authority this will have less impact on Auckland Council than other councils.

- The council would like to highlight the impact that RMA section 76(4A)\(^2\) has on where the mapping and schedule of SNAs sits for urban areas. In Auckland, where there are significant areas of SNA/SEA on land that meets the definition in RMA s76(4C), and for which satisfying the requirements in 76(4A)–(4D) would be impossible, regional rules are required to enable SNA/SEA protection. If the NPSIB is to specify the inclusion of SNAs and associated provisions in district plans, consideration needs to be given to the interaction with RMA section 76(4A) –(4D) and the potential to repeal these provisions to enable effective protection of urban SNAs.

b. **Recognising and protecting taonga species and ecosystems (Policy 12, clause 3.14)**

- The council supports the identification and management of taonga species and ecosystems, and the recognition that tangata whenua have the right to choose not to identify taonga and the level of detail at which these may be described.

c. **Surveying for and managing ‘highly mobile fauna’ (Policy 13, clause 3.15)**

- The council supports recognition of highly mobile fauna within the NPSIB but suggests that these will be difficult to identify. The council considers that further guidance is required on the appropriate responses to managing the habitats of threatened species, including which regulatory responses might be appropriate.

- The council questions whether the relationship between the requirements for councils to identify and manage highly mobile fauna in the NPSIB and the Department of Conservation’s functions have been adequately clarified.

\(^2\) RMA section 76(4A-4D) refers to district rules for tree protection
Section C: Managing adverse effects on biodiversity from activities

a. *Managing adverse effects and providing for specific new activities within SNAs (Policy 8 & 9, clause 3.9-3.12)*

- The council generally supports the use of the effects management hierarchy to manage effects on indigenous biodiversity proposed in the NPSIB. This generally aligns with the approach in the AUP, including the emphasis on avoidance of adverse effects as the first and sometimes only option.
- However, there are concerns that the application of the effects management hierarchy in the proposed NPSIB, including in relation to the ‘Medium’ and ‘High’ classifications required, could undermine protection of ‘Medium’ value sites. Conversely, the ‘High’ classification may imply the need to apply prohibited activity status which may be overly restrictive in some SNAs. (Staff are still considering the implications of this)
- The relationship between subdivision and subsequent land use could be more clearly addressed in the proposed NPSIB.
- The council supports the proposed NPSIB including more emphasis on pest management – including integration with other tools such as Regional Pest Management Plans where appropriate.
- The council questions whether the NPSIB contains enough emphasis on positive outcomes for indigenous biodiversity versus managing effects on SNAs.

b. *Providing for existing activities (Policy 10, clause 3.12)*

- The proposed NPSIB approach to managing existing activities within SNAs (clause 3.12) generally aligns with the AUP approach. However, the approach to existing farming activities and ‘improved pasture’ proposed may be more enabling than the approach in the AUP and may lead to relitigating of some rural SEAs. The NPSIB may potentially go further than the existing use rights set out in RMA s10 and s20A (notwithstanding the NPSIB recognising these RMA sections ‘apply according to their terms’).

c. *Managing adverse effects outside significant natural areas (Policy 7, clause 3.13 & 3.15)*

- The council supports the inclusion of managing adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs in the proposed NPSIB. However, the council would like to see greater recognition of the impacts of pests and pathogens on indigenous biodiversity and consideration given to the potential of sites to improve, through active management, such that they meet SNA status.
- The council requests greater direction be provided as to the appropriate response to the management of the habitat of highly mobile fauna, including outside of SNAs.

d. *Use and development of Māori land (clause 3.7, 3.9, 3.13 & 3.16)*
The council supports the proposed NPSIB recognition of the constraints on use and development of Māori land, and the relationship with indigenous biodiversity areas. The proposed approach in the NPSIB is generally consistent with approach to Māori land in the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP).

e. **Consideration of climate change (Policy 3, clause 3.5)**

- The council supports the requirement to promote the resilience of indigenous biodiversity to climate change through the regional policy statement, plans and regional biodiversity strategy. The council suggests that it will be necessary to undertake more than just promote resilience to climate change. The council would support central government providing additional guidance on what is expected of councils when implementing the clause 3.5 climate resilience requirements.

- In relation to climate change, the council suggests that consideration be given as to the need for significance criteria related to 'refugia' for climate resilience. As habitats and distributions change some areas will become important refuges for flora and fauna providing relief from the stress of climate change and enable adaptation. The council recognises that regional biodiversity strategies will play an important role in this regard through the inclusion of such a criteria or lens in development of a long-term vision for restoration and enhancement.

- Overall, the council considers the climate change responses in the NPSIB could be developed and elaborated further.

f. **Applying a precautionary principle to managing indigenous biodiversity (Policy 2, clause 3.6)**

- The council supports the inclusion of the precautionary approach in the proposed NPSIB, noting that such an approach is also part of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.

g. **Biodiversity offsetting and compensation (clause 1.8, Appendix 3 & 4)**

- The effects management framework in the proposed NPSIB includes biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation. The council supports the framework of criteria as set out in the NPSIB (Appendix 3) for the use of biodiversity offsets which is based around widely accepted principles to qualify as a biodiversity offset. The council also supports the provision in the NPSIB for environmental compensation when biodiversity offsets are not possible or effective. However, the council considers biodiversity offsets should still be preferred for any significant effect on indigenous biodiversity where they are achievable.
Section D: Restoration and enhancement of biodiversity

a. Restoration and enhancement of degraded SNAs, connections, buffers and wetlands (Policy 11, clause 3.16)
   - The council supports the inclusion of clear direction for restoration and enhancement policies and requirements in the NPSIB.
   - With respect to requirements around restoration of wetlands and former wetlands in proposed NPSIB clause 3.16, the council reinforces the need for alignment with the proposed NPS for Freshwater Management so there is no overlap or gap between the two NPS directions that will prevent the restoration of wetlands as desired in the NPSIB.

b. Restoring indigenous vegetation cover in depleted areas (Policy 11, clause 3.17)
   - The council supports directions and requirements to increase indigenous vegetation cover in urban and rural areas with depleted cover. However, there is some uncertainty in terms of how the 10% target/assessment is to be applied. The council suggests that there should be criteria around unequal distribution of indigenous vegetation cover such as is included in Auckland’s Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy.
   - The discussion document indicates the benefits of increasing vegetative cover in urban and peri-urban areas (p72). The council reinforces the importance of aligning the NPS on Urban Development with the NPSIB. Bringing nature into cities is an important part of environmental quality in urban development and for responding to the impacts of climate change.

c. Regional biodiversity strategies (Policy 14, clause 3.18, Appendix 5)
   - The council supports the direction to require regional biodiversity strategies in the proposed NPSIB. With a focus on a collaborative approach to development of a regional vision for restoration and enhancement across all domains, regional biodiversity strategies will be important tools providing strategic vision and direction to implement the NPSIB.
   - Their inclusion in the NPSIB, rather than in the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy, enables better linkages with RMA plans. The council considers there needs to be strong linkages to the NZBS to ensure regional approaches are consistent with the national approach.
   - The council considers that there may need to be stronger direction in clause 3.18(2) whereby regional policy statements and plans ‘must have regard to’ the regional biodiversity strategy, particularly given the expectation of a collaborative strategy process and engagement with community.
   - The council considers that Appendix 5, which details how regional biodiversity strategies will be developed, contains detailed requirements that go beyond what a strategy includes such as the requirement for a comprehensive record of all actions being undertaken. Such a record is generally anticipated in an action plan or
implementation plan. For a large region such as Auckland creating such a record would be an immense task that may detract from development and engagement on a vision. Consideration should be given to greater flexibility around such detailed records being required in a strategy.

- As a regional vision for restoration and enhancement, the council supports regional biodiversity strategies promoting other outcomes such as predator control and prevention of spread of pests and pathogens. The strategy provides the opportunity to provide an integrated approach connecting all aspects of managing, protecting and restoring indigenous biodiversity.

Section E: Monitoring and Implementation

- The council supports greater guidance and direction on monitoring of indigenous biodiversity as proposed in clause 3.20 of the NPSIB, including the direction around using mātauranga Māori and tikanga Māori monitoring methods equally with scientific monitoring, where tangata whenua agree.

- The council supports SNAs being identified on public conservation land, although acknowledges the costs. The AUP currently identifies SNAs on public conservation land and public land. The council considers that protecting and maintaining indigenous biodiversity needs to be tenure neutral and that local and central government play an important leadership role.

- The council generally supports the proposed timeframes to implement the NPSIB and considers it is likely that these timeframes can be met. The council recognises that it may be in a different position to other councils in that it currently identifies and manages SNAs within the AUP, has programmes to support communities and landowners managing and restoring indigenous biodiversity, and is well resourced.
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To delegate responsibility to a member of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board to provide feedback on the proposal to develop an Inter-regional Marine Pest Pathway Management Plan.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Pathway management plans allow councils to manage the way pests are transported from one place to another, with an overall goal to avoid or minimise potential wide-ranging negative impacts.
3. A potential pathway management plan will be complementary to existing and proposed marine biosecurity measures under Auckland’s Regional Pest Management Plan and Auckland’s Unitary Plan.
4. Between 18 March 2019 and 24 May 2019 informal public consultation on potential approaches for inter-regional marine pest pathway management was undertaken in four regions: Northland, Auckland, Waikato and Bay of Plenty.
5. Results of informal consultation and next steps were provided in a memo to members of the Environment and Community Committee on 30 July 2019 (Attachment A).
6. Auckland Council staff are currently progressing with an options analysis to identify a preferred option for marine pest pathway management and are collating further supporting evidence through the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity working group.
7. Once this analysis is complete, staff intend to present a report to the Environment and Climate Change Committee at its 12 March 2020 meeting. This report will seek approval to start the statutory process for development of an inter-regional marine pathway management plan under the Biosecurity Act.
8. Local boards can provide input into the proposal to develop an Inter-regional Marine Pest Pathway Management Plan. To meet timeframes, local board feedback is due on 2 March 2020.
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Memorandum

To: All Local Boards

Subject: Update on options for inter-regional marine pest pathway management and next steps

From: Phil Brown – Head of Natural Environment Delivery

Contact information: Samantha Happy - Senior Marine Biosecurity Advisor

samantha.happy@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Sietsa Bouma – Team Leader Natural Environment Strategy

sietsa.bouma@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

1. To share results of informal public consultation on potential approaches for inter-regional marine pest pathway management, and to inform local boards on the next steps, including opportunities for further input into this initiative.

Summary

2. Informal public consultation on potential approaches for inter-regional marine pest pathway management was undertaken between 18 March and 24 May 2019 in four regions: Northland, Auckland, Waikato and Bay of Plenty.

3. Pathway management plans allow councils to manage the way pests are transported from one place to another, with an overall goal to avoid or minimise potential wide-ranging negative impacts. A potential pathway management plan will be complementary to existing and proposed marine biosecurity measures under Auckland’s Regional Pest Management Plan and Auckland’s Unitary Plan.

4. In the marine environment ‘pathway’ often means boats, as movement of hull-fouled boats is the single biggest risk for marine pest transfer. The identified approaches included in the consultation focused on potential rules for hull fouling, which means that boat users will be most affected by any changes proposed through a marine pest pathway management plan.

5. Results of the informal consultation and next steps were provided in a memo to members of the Environment and Community Committee on 30 July 2019 (see Attachment A).

6. In summary, the consultation results showed a preference among submitters for consistent rules for boat hull-fouling across the four regions, and a preference for boat owners to maintain a clean hull at all times.

7. Auckland Council staff are currently progressing with an options analysis to identify a preferred option for marine pest pathway management and are collating further supporting evidence through the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity working group.

8. Staff intend to present a report to the Environment and Climate Change Committee at its 12 March 2020 meeting. This will seek approval to start the statutory process for development of an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan under the Biosecurity Act, including the preferred option.

9. Staff are available to attend local board workshops in February 2020 to provide an opportunity for further local board input into this initiative. Local boards can also provide formal feedback on the proposal to develop an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan through resolutions at a business meeting or an urgent decision-making process.
Context

10. Movement of marine pests by humans into and within the Auckland region poses a significant risk to the marine environment. The management of marine pests on vessel hulls within the Auckland region is addressed in the Auckland Unitary Plan through passive discharge and hull cleaning rules.

11. To address this, Auckland Council participated in the development of a discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan through the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity Partnership (a group composed of councils from the upper North Island, Department of Conservation and the Ministry for Primary Industries). This initiative was endorsed by the Upper North Island Strategic Alliance (UNISA) in late 2017.

12. An update on this initiative was provided to all local boards on 28 November 2018 in the form of an information memorandum. In summary, this memo:

- identified statutory responsibilities of central government, regional and unitary councils under the Biosecurity Act 1993 and Resource Management Act 1991 to address the threat of marine pests
- informed local boards of Auckland Council’s participation in the development of a draft discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan for informal public consultation through a Top of the North working group
- expressed the intent of staff to present the high-level discussion document to the Environment and Community Committee for their approval in February or March 2019
- identified opportunities for local boards to provide feedback on the discussion document (e.g. workshops on request, engagement activities as part of the consultation process).

13. This memorandum provides a project update since the 28 November 2018 memo.

Discussion

14. Workshops with Auckland Council staff in the pre-consultation period (memo 28 November 2018) were held with the Great Barrier Local Board (December 2018) and Rodney Local Board (March 2019). In addition, emails of support for the initiative were received from the Henderson-Massey Local Board (28 November 2018) and the Waitamata Local Board (29 November 2018).

15. The discussion document was developed by the Top of the North working group between December 2018 and February 2019. The document was approved for informal public consultation by elected members in the four northern council/provincial regions (Northland, Auckland, Waikato and Bay of Plenty). Auckland Council’s Environment and Community Committee approved the document at its 19 February 2019 meeting (resolution number ENV/2019/9).

16. Informal public consultation on potential approaches for inter-regional marine pest pathway management identified in the discussion document was undertaken between 18 March and 24 May 2019.

17. Information on the consultation process and channels for engagement were shared via email with all local boards (15 March 2019). The Puketāpapa Local Board acknowledged the consultation by email (27 March 2019) and provided formal feedback on the discussion document on 18 July 2019.

18. Results of the informal public consultation and next steps were presented to members of the Environment and Community Committee on 30 July 2019 in an information memo, which is attached to this memo.

Summary of consultation results

19. In summary, the consultation results showed:
- a preference to develop consistent rules for managing boat hull-fouling across the four regions
- a requirement to have a clean hull at all times
- regional differences with the preferences of Northland submitters being notably different to other regions. Northland submitters wanted alternative management options for managing marine pests
- Nine key feedback themes were identified, with the top three being practicality and compliance issues; allocation and distribution of costs, and the need for a national pathways plan.

**Relationship to the Regional Pest Management Plan**

20. As noted in a memo that is also being sent out to members of the Environment and Climate Change Committee, marine pests may also be added to the Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan as a result of Environment Court appeal processes.

21. The diagram below explains the relationship between the two plans and the expected timeline for confirming the inclusion of marine pests in the Regional Pest Management Plan versus developing the Inter-regional Marine Pest Pathway Management Plan.
Next steps and opportunities for local board input

22. As outlined in the 30 July 2019 memo, staff are currently progressing with an options analysis to identify a preferred option for marine pest pathway management. To support this analysis staff are also collating further evidence through the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity working group.

23. Staff will be using feedback received from local boards since the start of this initiative to inform the options analysis.

24. Once this analysis is complete, staff intend to present a report to the Environment and Climate Change Committee at its 12 March 2020 meeting. This report will seek approval to start the statutory process for development of an inter-regional marine pathway management plan under the Biosecurity Act.

Opportunities for local board input

25. Local boards can request a workshop in February 2020 to provide the opportunity for further local board input into this initiative. These workshops will need to be held before 20 February 2020 for staff to be able to integrate local board’s informal feedback into their draft report.

26. Local boards can also provide formal feedback on the proposal to develop an inter-regional marine pathway management plan through resolutions at a business meeting or an urgent decision-making process. To be included in the committee report, this formal feedback will need to be emailed to cosette.saville@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz by 2 March 2020.

27. Any formal feedback received after this date up until 10 March 2020 will be tabled at the Environment and Climate Change Committee meeting.

Contact details

28. For any questions relating to development of the inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan and the consultation feedback elected members should contact Samantha Happy – samantha.happy@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz or Sietse Bouma – sietse.bouma@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

29. To request a workshop or discuss other options for providing feedback, local boards should contact cosette.saville@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Attachments

Attachment A:

Inter-regional marine pest pathway management – results of informal public consultation and next steps (Memo presented to Environment and Community Committee, 30 July 2019)
Memorandum

30 July 2019

To: Members of the Environment and Community Committee

Subject: Inter-regional marine pest pathway management - results of informal public consultation and next steps

From: Sietske Borma (Natural Environment Strategy Unit)
Samantha Happy (Environmental Services Department)

Contact information: samantha.happy@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

1. To present the results of informal public consultation on potential approaches for inter-regional marine pest pathway management and inform elected members on the next steps.

Summary

2. The Environment and Community Committee approved a discussion document on approaches for inter-regional marine pest pathway management for informal consultation at its 19 February 2019 meeting (resolution number ENV/2019/9).

3. Informal public consultation on the topic potential of approaches for inter-regional marine pest pathway management in the four northern council / provincial regions (Northland, Auckland, Waikato and Bay of Plenty) was undertaken between 18 March and 24 May 2019.

4. The consultation attracted a total of 370 submissions from a wide range of interests and some submitters represented a considerable number of marine users.

5. In summary the consultation results show:
   - a preference to develop consistent rules for managing boat hull-fouling across the four regions along with rules for other pathways;
   - a preference to require a clean boat hull at all times;
   - regional differences with preferences of Northland submitters being notably different to the other regions – with 37% of Northland submitters wanting alternative management options for managing marine pests.
   - nine key feedback themes were identified with the top three being practicality and compliance issues, allocation and distribution of costs and the need for a national pathways plan.

6. Additional key feedback received from mana whenua in the Auckland region included:
   - recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi in any regulatory framework;
   - empowerment of mana whenua where possible (e.g. use of kaitiaki for surveillance);
   - the advantage of having a national direction and/or pathway plan;
   - utilisation of a holistic approach that is cognisant of the relationship between different ecosystems (e.g. land use and its impact on the coastal marine area);
   - consideration of the impact of climate change;
   - consideration of a growing population and globalisation.

7. Moving forward Auckland Council staff will:
• publicly release the report ‘Consultation results – Better ways to stop marine pests?’ through the agencies represented on the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity Partnership, subject to minor edits.

• progress with an options analysis to identify a preferred option (and supporting evidence) for inter-regional marine pest pathway management in collaboration with the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity Partnership.

• continue to work in partnership with mana whenua and with input from our key stakeholders to identify preferred future options for marine pest pathway management in the Auckland region.

8. Staff anticipate presenting a preferred option and supporting evidence to Auckland Council’s Governing Body (or relevant committee) for consideration in early 2020.

Context

9. The Environment and Community Committee approved a discussion document on approaches for inter-regional marine pest pathway management for informal consultation at its 19 February 2019 meeting (resolution number ENV/2019/9).

10. The discussion document was developed through the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity Partnership as a collaborative project between Northland Regional Council, Auckland Council, Bay of Plenty Toi Moana Regional Council, Waikato Regional Council, Ministry for Primary Industries and the Department of Conservation.

11. The discussion document presented four options for the overall direction on managing marine pests:

• Option 1: Status quo – continue our combined efforts and work towards a collaborative national pathway approach. In the meantime, each region keeps its own rules or policies for managing marine pests.

• Option 2: Lead the way with consistent rules for clean hulls – develop consistent rules on managing hull-fouling across the four biggest boating regions – Northland, Auckland, Waikato, and Bay of Plenty.

• Option 3: Go even further – make rules for other pathways too - along with rules for hull-fouling, develop rules for other pathways like ballast water, aquaculture, bilge water and marine equipment.

• Option 4: None of the above.

12. The discussion document also sought feedback on the following options for clean hull rules:

• Option 1: Clean hull required at all times – all vessel hulls required to have no more than a slime layer and/or barnacles at all times.

• Option 2: Clean hull required only when moving – no more than a slime layer and/or barnacles permitted when moving from one harbour/place to another.

• Option 3: Clean hull required only when moving to specially identified places – no more than a slime layer and/or barnacles permitted when moving to specially identified high value places.

• Option 4: None of the above.

13. Consultation in the four northern regions (Northland, Auckland, Waikato and Bay of Plenty) and through Ministry for Primary Industries and Department of Conservation channels was undertaken between 18 March and 24 May 2019.
Discussion

Consultation process

14. Feedback in all four regions was collected via an online survey hosted on Bionet.nz as well as in hard copies distributed to:

- Regional council offices
- Iwi workshops
- Marinas
- Harbour master offices
- Haul-out facilities
- Boat clubs
- Boat ramps
- Community Groups
- Mooring holders
- Hutchwilco New Zealand Boat Show

Email submissions were also accepted.

15. In addition, specific engagement activities were undertaken in each of the regions in the form of emails to key stakeholders, media releases, distribution of printed material (e.g. marinas, boat ramps, haul out facilities, boating clubs, council offices), social media (e.g. Facebook pages), public events and workshops with mana whenua.

16. Specific engagement activities in the Auckland region included:

- 2 workshops with mana whenua (2 March 2019 and 25 June 2019).
- 4 stakeholder and public drop-in sessions:
  - Bucklands and Eastern Beaches Memorial Hall (10 April 2019);
  - Orewa Community Centre (17 April 2019);
  - Westhaven marina (18 April 2019);
  - Henderson Council Building (2 May 2019).
- Email distribution:
  - Auckland Council stakeholder email list (15 March 2019 and 4 May 2019)
  - Mahurangi Harbour marine farmer email list (18 April 2019)
  - Auckland Council iwi representative list (19 March 2019)
- Media release on Auckland Council website (19 March 2019).
- Distribution of printed material (discussion documents and pamphlets) at all Auckland high-use boat ramps and marinas.
- Social media: Auckland Council Biodiversity and Westhaven marina Facebook pages.

Feedback across the four regions

17. Consultation results across the four different regions are presented in the report ‘Consultation results – Better ways to stop marine pests?’ attached to this memorandum (attachment A). This report provides detailed information on the public consultation and engagement processes, methodology and results (overall and per region). It also summarises comments explaining preferred options, identifies some key messages and presents a list of all submitters.

Number of responses

18. The consultation attracted a total of 370 submissions from a wide range of interests across New Zealand (Table 1) with some submitters representing a considerable number of marine users. Examples include Aquaculture New Zealand, the New Zealand Defence Force, New Zealand Marine Operators Association, New Zealand Marine Industry Association and conservation groups/societies (e.g. New Zealand Marine Sciences Society and the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.).
Table 1. Submitters to top of the north inter-regional marine pest pathway management by area and boat ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey completed</th>
<th>Number of submitters</th>
<th>Boat ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>89 (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>70 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay of Plenty</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in NZ</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No region given</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incomplete submissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No region given</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>370</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preferred option for the overall direction on managing pathways for marine pests

19. Over the total number of responses the preferred option for the overall direction on managing pathways for marine pests across the four regions was option 3 (go even further – make rules for other pathways too: 37%), followed by option 2 (lead the way with consistent rules for clean hulls: 30%), option 4 (none of the above: 20%) and option 1 (status quo: 13%).

20. Most submitters across the four regions were boat owners (60%). Overall, their most commonly selected preference was option 2 (31%) whereas most submitters who do not own a boat that resides in the water selected option 3 (60%).

Regional differences

21. There were regional differences with preferences of Northland submitters being notably different to the other regions (Figure 1). Whereas Auckland, Waikato and Bay of Plenty submitters preferred option 2 (consistency in hull cleaning rules) Northland preferred other management options. This likely reflects both a higher level of boat ownership, the recent introduction of the Northland Marine Pest Pathway Plan and charging regime to cover marine pest activities in Northland.

![Figure 1. Preferred options for managing marine pests by all submitters by region.](image-url)
Preferred option for hull fouling rules

22. The preferred option for hull fouling rules across the four regions is option 1 (clean hull required at all times; 42%), followed by option 2 (clean hull required only when moving; 24%), option 4 (none of the above; 19%), and option 3 (clean hull required only when moving to specially identified places; 15%).

23. Boat owners across the four regions did prefer option 4 (none of the above; 29%), followed by option 1 (27%), option 2 (24%) and option 3 (20%). Most submitters across the four regions who do not own a boat that resides in the water selected option 1 (65%).

Regional differences

24. There were regional differences with preferences of Northland submitters being notably different to the other regions (Figure 2). Whereas Auckland, Waikato and Bay of Plenty submitters clearly preferred option 1 (clean boat hulls at all times) Northland preferred option 4 (none of the above closely followed by option 1 (clean boat hulls at all times).

Figure 2. Preferred options for hull fouling rules by all submitters by region.

Key feedback themes

25. Nine key themes were identified during the analysis of submitter comments related to the overall direction for managing pathways for marine pests (258 comments in total):

1. Practicality and compliance issues (32%);
2. The allocation and distribution of costs (e.g. international/commercial vessels and ballast water issues) (21%);
3. The need for a national pathways plan (12%);
4. The importance of protecting marine environments (9%);
5. Managing other pathways is also important (not just vessel hull biofouling) (8%);
6. The practicality of current tools (e.g., the effectiveness of anti-fouling, a lack of haul-out facilities, and in-water cleaning rules) (8%);
7. Pests having already established (6%);
8. Regional differences require local management (4%);
9. Exemptions are needed for stationary vessels (several comments provided in response to hull fouling rules)
Auckland specific feedback

Key feedback from mana whenua partners

26. Key themes of importance to mana whenua that were identified from the two workshops with mana whenua in the Auckland region were:
   - Recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi in any regulatory framework;
   - Empowerment of mana whenua where possible (e.g. use of kaitiaki for surveillance);
   - A national direction and/or pathway plan would be advantageous.

27. In addition, mana whenua suggested that the following factors should also be considered:
   - A holistic approach be utilised that is cognisant of the relationship between different ecosystems (e.g. land use and its impact on the coastal marine area);
   - The impact of climate change;
   - Growing population and globalisation.

28. Not all mana whenua that were present at the workshops may have put in a submission on the discussion document. The facilitator of the mana whenua hui in the Auckland region summarised his observations from the workshops in his submission to the discussion document as follows:

   ‘Having run a workshop for Auckland Council with mana whenua from the area, there was a strong sense that something needed to be done. Option 2 was the bottom line for the majority of the people present, but some wanted option 3. I feel that some of the mana whenua will not have time to make a submission.’

Feedback from local boards

29. All local boards were provided with information on the development of the consultation document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan (information memorandum 28 November 2018).

30. Workshops with Auckland Council staff pre-consultation and covering marine biosecurity issues in general were offered and taken up by the Great Barrier Local Board (December 2018) and Rodney Local Board (March 2019). In addition, emails of support for the initiative were received from the Waitakaruru Local Board (29 November 2018) and Henderson-Massey Local Board (28 November 2018).

31. Feedback received from these local boards showed that local boards are supportive of investigating the development of an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan.

32. Following public release of the consultation document in March 2019 information on the consultation process and channels for engagement were shared via email with all local boards (15 March 2019).

33. The Pukeatapata Local Board acknowledged the consultation by email (27 March 2019), and formal feedback from the Papakura Local Board on the consultation document was received on 18 July 2019.

34. The Papakura local board supported option 2 leading towards option 3 and commented that ‘There should be regulations to manage the transfer of ballast water from one region to another’.

Preferred option for the overall direction on managing pathways for marine pests

35. Submitters from the Auckland region preferred option 2 (develop consistent rules on managing hull fouling across Northland, Auckland, Waikato, and Bay of Plenty; 39%) and option 3 (go further and develop rules for other pathways too; 38%).

36. 57% of submitters from the Auckland region were boat owners (Table 1). Boat owners preferred option 2 over option 3 (respectively 41% and 27%), whereas non-boat owners preferred option 3 over option 2 (respectively 53% and 37%).
Preferred option for hull fouling rules

37. Submitters from the Auckland region preferred option 1 (clean hull required at all time; 48%) followed by option 2 (clean hull required only when moving; 23%), option 3 (clean hull required only when moving to specially identified places; 18%) and option 4 (none of the above; 11%).

38. Boat owners in the Auckland region indicated a preference for option 1 (34%) compared to option 2 (27%), option 3 (21%) and option 4 (17%). Non-boat owners indicated a strong preference for option 1 (65%) followed by option 2 (19%), option 3 (12%) and option 4 (4%).

Key feedback themes from key stakeholders

39. Submitters from the Auckland region (82 comments) most commonly commented on practicality and compliance issues (38%), the importance of marine protection (13%), the need for a national plan (9%) and the distribution of costs (9%).

40. Key themes identified from the stakeholder and public drop-in sessions in the Auckland region were:
   - Prioritisation of education at schools so that kids champion marine biodiversity and keep their parents in check in terms of vessel cleaning;
   - Concerns about the lack of cleaning facilities for recreational and commercial vessels;
   - Agreement that the spread of pests need to be managed, but desire to ensure that the rules will be practical (and that all stakeholders are considered when writing the rules).

Next steps

41. Auckland Council staff will publicly release the report ‘Consultation results – Better ways to stop marine pests?’ through the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity Partnership, subject minor edits.

42. Auckland Council staff will progress with an options analysis to identify a preferred option (and supporting evidence) for inter-regional marine pest pathway management in collaboration with the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity Partnership.

43. Auckland Council staff will continue to work in partnership with mana whenua and with input from our key stakeholders to identify preferred future options for marine pest pathway management in the Auckland region.

44. Auckland Council staff anticipate that a preferred option and supporting evidence will be presented to Auckland Council’s Governing Body (or relevant committee) for consideration in early 2020.

Attachments

Attachment 1. Consultation results – Better ways to stop marine pests?
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1 Executive summary

Background

This report summarises the views of 370 submitters on the discussion document ‘Better ways to stop marine pests?’. The report has been prepared by the Top of the North (TON) Marine Biosecurity Partnership and is intended to provide an overview of the preferences of submitters in relation to questions posed.

The report summarises the overall preferences of submitters and examines the differences between regions (Northland, Auckland, Waikato, Bay of Plenty, and elsewhere in New Zealand or overseas) and according to boat ownership. It also outlines key themes identified in submitter comments and highlights points made by majority groups and notable submitters. It is not intended to be a comprehensive presentation of all points made by submitters.

Feedback was collected via an online survey hosted on Bionet.nz as well as in hardcopies made available from a range of places including regional council offices, iwi workshops, marinas, and boat clubs (See Appendix Table 4 for a full summary of the publicity and engagement activities each region, Biosecurity New Zealand, and DOC conducted to publicise and attract submissions). Email submissions were also accepted.

Summary of feedback

1. Which is your preferred option for managing marine pests, and why?

The preferred option was Option 3 (go even further and make rules for other pathways too; 37%), followed by Option 2 (lead the way with consistent rules for clean hulls; 30%), ‘none of the above’ (20%), and finally Option 1 (the status quo; 13%).

The majority of submitters (60%) were boat owners and, overall, their most commonly selected preference was Option 2 (31%) whereas the vast majority of submitters who do not own a boat that lives in the water selected Option 3 (60%).

2. If hull-fouling rules were developed, which option do you think is best, and why?

The preferred option for hull-fouling rules was Option 1 (clean hull at all times; 42%), followed by Option 2 (clean hull required only when moving; 24%), ‘none of the above’ (19%), and finally Option 3 (clean hull required only when moving to specially identified places; 15%).

Overall, boat owners were not polarised on this issue, with relatively equal numbers of submitters choosing each of the four options. Specifically, boat owners preferred ‘none of the above’ (29%), Option 1 (27%), Option 2 (24%), and Option 3 (20%), whereas the vast majority of submitters (65%) who do not own a boat selected Option 1.

Themes

There were nine key themes that were identified during the analysis of submitters comments, based on the questions posed in the discussion document. These were: 1) The importance of protecting marine environments; 2) Practicality and compliance issues; 3) Regional differences require local management; 4) Managing other pathways is also important (not just vessel hull biofouling); 5) The
practicality of current tools (e.g., the effectiveness of anti-fouling, a lack of haul-out facilities, and in-water cleaning rules); 6) The allocation and distribution of costs (e.g., international/commercial vessels and ballast water issues); 7) The need for a national pathways plan; 8) Peats having already established; and 9) Exemptions are needed for stationary vessels.

Key messages

Overall, there was a clear call for greater action to address marine pests across the TON regions from both the individuals and the agencies that responded, some of which represent considerable numbers of marine users. In addition, there is likely to be benefit in implementing a consistent approach across the regions because issues around practicality and the ease or difficulty of compliance were of high importance to many submitters.

Results also indicate there is a significant percentage of submitters who support some form of control on hull-fouling, although this is notably more muted in Northland than the other regions with 33% either opposed to hull-fouling rules or seeking further detail about their implementation.

The differences in submitter responses and comments seen in Northland compared with the other TON regions likely reflect both a higher level of boat ownership and the recent introduction of the Northland Marine Pest Pathway Plan with an associated charging regime. While it seems clear that further engagement with boat owners is required, it is encouraging that many already support the introduction of new hull-fouling rules and desire consistency in these rules across the regions.
2 Introduction

2.1 The Top of the North Marine Biosecurity Partnership

For several years, Auckland Council, Gisborne District Council, Northland, Bay of Plenty Toi Moana, Waikato, and Hawkes Bay Regional Councils alongside Biosecurity New Zealand (part of the Ministry for Primary Industries) have worked together to prevent the spread of marine pests in New Zealand’s northernmost regions. Together these organisations have formed the Top of the North (TON) Marine Biosecurity Partnership.

The four northernmost regions are home to the largest boating populations in the country and there is extensive vessel movement (recreational and commercial) throughout. However, the rules and management approaches for marine pests currently vary between the TON councils:

- Northland Regional Council has had marine pest-led rules in place since 2010 and recently introduced pathway rules requiring a clean hull when entering the region or moving from place to place. The pest-led rules are implemented through a surveillance programme which inspects more than 2000 hulls each year. The pathways plan rules are yet to be fully implemented, however the pathways approach is a proactive way to manage the impacts of marine pests rather than a reactive measure of managing pests once they are already established.
- Auckland Council has risk-based rules in the Unitary Plan to manage the spread of harmful and invasive organisms, which include marine pests, via fouled hulls.
- Waikato Regional Council currently has no marine pests or pathway plan rules in place but is active in managing the impacts and risks of marine pest species.
- Bay of Plenty Regional Council has pathway-style rules in the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan, and currently has small-scale management programmes for Sabella and Styela.

2.2 Public Consultation and Engagement process

A key area of focus for the TON Partnership is the management of risk pathways that have the potential to introduce or spread marine pest populations in the TON regions, and throughout New Zealand. Feedback on the discussion document ‘Better ways to stop marine pests?’ was gathered to help the TON Partnership understand people’s views on how to prevent the spread of marine pests. To explore whether inter-regional hull-fouling rules could be a better way forward, a public consultation was run to assess answers to the following questions:

1) Which is your preferred option for managing marine pests, and why?

- **Option 1 – Status quo**
  Continue our combined efforts and work towards a collaborative national pathway approach. In the meantime, each region keeps its own rules or policies for managing marine pests.

- **Option 2 – Lead the way with consistent rules for clean hulls**
  Develop consistent rules on managing hull-fouling across the four biggest boating regions – Northland, Auckland, Waikato and Bay of Plenty.

- **Option 3 – Make rules for other pathways too**
  Along with rules for hull-fouling, develop rules for other pathways like ballast water, aquaculture, bilge water, and marine equipment.
• None of the above

2) If hull-fouling rules were developed, which option do you think is best, and why?

• **Option 1 – Clean hull required at all times**
  All vessel hulls required to have no more than a slime layer and/or barnacles at all times.

• **Option 2 – Clean hull required only when moving**
  No more than a slime layer and/or barnacles permitted when moving from one harbour/place to another. This rule is already in place for Northland.

• **Option 3 – Clean hull required only when moving to specially identified places**
  No more than a slime layer and/or barnacles permitted when moving to specially identified high value places.

• None of the above

See Appendix (Table 4) for a summary of the publicity and engagement activities each region, MPI, and DOC conducted to publicise and attract submissions.

The feedback received on the ‘Better ways to stop marine pests?’ has been collated and is presented in this report. This information will be used to help the relevant agencies decide whether to formally proceed with developing shared rules within the Northland, Auckland, Waikato, and Bay of Plenty regions. If new rules were proposed, these would need to follow the public consultation and decision-making processes set out in the Biosecurity Act 1993. This would include consideration of implementation, including roles and responsibilities, where costs should lie, and how these should be funded.

3 Methodology

3.1 Survey collection

Feedback was collected via an online survey hosted on Bionet.nz as well as in hardcopies distributed to:

• Regional council offices
• Iwi workshops
• Marinas
• Harbour master offices
• Haul-out facilities
• Boat clubs
• Boat ramps
• Community groups
• Mooring holders
• Hutchwilco New Zealand Boat Show

Email submissions were also accepted. All email submissions which did not answer the questions posed in the survey, and all paper surveys that were incomplete, were recorded and
3.2 **Analysis**

Quantitative data are presented as counts and percentages, in total and per region, as well as according to boat ownership. Qualitative data from submitters’ comments were categorised and quantified according to common themes identified and a general discussion of key points from submitter’s comments is included.

4 **Results**

4.1 **Number of responses**

Overall, 370 responses were received; 341 submitters completed the survey and responded to the main questions, and an additional 29 submitters responded but did not provide an answer to one or both of the main survey questions. These additional submitters responded via email or by sending incomplete paper surveys and their comments are included in the report (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey completed</th>
<th>Number of submitters</th>
<th>Boat ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>89 (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>70 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay of Plenty</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in NZ</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No region given</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Incomplete submissions**

| No region given | 29 |  |

**Total responses considered**

370

4.2 **Submitter types**

Submitters mainly included individuals from across New Zealand but also a range of notable organisations including maritime/boating interest groups (Aquaculture New Zealand, the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF), Far North Holdings Limited, Coromandel Marine Farmers Association (CoroMFA), New Zealand Marina Operators Association, New Zealand Federation of Commercial Fisherman, Sanford Limited, New Zealand Marine Industry Association, Russell Mooring Owners and Ratepayers, Bay of Islands Maritime Park Incorporated Society), Iwi (Te Kawerau Iwi Tribal Authority, Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātau), Regional and District Councils (Greater Wellington Regional Council, Thames-Coromandel District Council, Waikato Regional Council Coromandel Catchment Committee), conservation groups/societies (New Zealand Marine Sciences Society, Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.).
4.3 Key themes identified in submitter comments

There were nine key themes identified during the analysis of submitter comments, based on the questions posed in the discussion document:

1. The importance of protecting marine environments
2. Practicality and compliance issues
3. Regional differences require local management
4. Managing other pathways is also important (not just vessel hull biofouling)
5. The practicality of current tools, including:
   - The effectiveness of anti-fouling
   - A lack of haul-out facilities
   - In-water cleaning rules
6. The allocation and distribution of costs, including:
   - International/commercial vessels
   - Ballast water
7. The need for a national pathway plan
8. Pests having already established
9. Exemptions for stationary vessels (relevant to Question 2 only)
5 Question 1: Which is your preferred option for managing marine pests, and why?

- OPTION 1: Status quo.
- OPTION 2: Lead the way with consistent rules for clean hulls.
- OPTION 3: Go even further – make rules for other pathways too.
- Or → None of the above

5.1 Overall feedback

Of the 341 submitters who completed the survey and responded to this question: 44 (13%) agreed with Option 1; 102 (30%) agreed with Option 2; 126 (37%) agreed with Option 3; and 69 (20%) agreed with ‘none of the above’ (Figure 1). Eight of the additional 29 submitters who did not provide direct answers to the survey questions preferred Option 2, three preferred Options 1 and 3, respectively, and one preferred ‘none of the above’. Preferences of the remaining additional submitters were not clear from their comments.

![Graph showing the percentage of submitters choosing each option.]

**Figure 1.** Submitter responses to the question: What is your preferred option for managing marine pests, and why? The total number of submitters was 341.
5.2 Feedback according to region

There were regional differences, with the preferences of Northland submitters being notably different to the other TON regions. In particular, only 16% of Northland submitters chose Option 2 compared with 39%, 46%, and 47% of submitters from Auckland, Waikato, and Bay of Plenty, respectively. In contrast, 37% of Northland submitters chose ‘none of the above’ compared with only 8–9% of those from the other TON regions (Figure 2). In addition, 64% of submitters from elsewhere in New Zealand selected Option 3 (22 submitters). The total number of submitters who responded to this question was 314 (a number of submitters either did not complete the question or were from elsewhere in NZ, overseas, or did not identify a region).

![Figure 2. Preferred options for managing marine pests by region.](image)

5.3 Feedback according to boat ownership

In total, 331 of the 341 submitters responded to the question of whether or not they owned/co-owned a boat that lives in the water. The majority (205, 60%) were boat owners, and most kept their boats in Northland (82 submitters) and Auckland (57 submitters). Overall, the most commonly selected preference by boat owners was Option 2 (64, 31%), followed by ‘none of the above’ (61, 30%) and Option 3 (46, 22%), whereas the vast majority of submitters who do not own a boat that lives in the water preferred Option 3 (76, 60%) (Figure 3). There were also regional differences in the preferences of boat owners, as shown in Figure 4. Most notably, boat owners in Northland were more likely to prefer ‘none of the above’ whereas the majority of those from the other TON regions preferred Option 2. All submitters who do not own a boat showed similar preferences across the regions.
Which is your preferred option for managing marine pests?

![Bar chart showing preferred options for managing marine pests by boat ownership.]

**Figure 3.** Preferred option for managing marine pests, according to boat ownership.
Which is your preferred option for managing marine pests?

- Option 1: Status quo - regions set their own rules or policies
- Option 2: Develop consistent risk rating across regions
- Option 3: Gather and develop rules for other pathways
- No (e.g., bottled water)
- None of the above

Figure 4. Regional feedback according to boat ownership in response to the question: What is your preferred option for managing marine pests, and why?
5.4 Summary of comments explaining preferred Option

Overall, 258 submitters (76%) provided a comment with their answer to Q1 (96 from Northland, 82 from Auckland, 41 from Waikato, 41 from Bay of Plenty, 21 from elsewhere in New Zealand and 1 from overseas (Table 2). In addition, there were relevant comments from the majority of the 29 submitters who did not complete the survey. Similar themes were addressed in comments across all options; however, the same theme could be presented either in general support of, or in general opposition to, the new rules initiative depending on the option selected. For example, several submitters who selected Option 3 and 'none of the above' cited concern regarding international vessels and ballast water. The former submitters were more likely to suggest the need for as robust rules as possible across all pathways, while the latter were more likely to suggest no rules were worthwhile at all, least of all regional hull-fouling rules, because they felt marine biosecurity was impossible to control.

Table 2. Total number of submitter comments in relation to the question: Which is your preferred option for managing marine pests, and why? from each of the four northernmost Top of the North (TON) regions according to the key themes identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Northland</th>
<th>Auckland</th>
<th>Waikato</th>
<th>Bay of Plenty</th>
<th>Elsewhere in NZ</th>
<th>Overseas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicality and compliance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine protection important</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional differences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All pathways are important</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of costs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International/commercial vessels</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballast water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No practical tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-fouling ineffective</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haul-out facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-water cleaning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pests already established</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National plan required</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of submitters</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of comments</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 1: Status quo – regions set their own rules or policies

Of the 44 submitters who preferred Option 1, 28 made a comment. The Thames-Coromandel District Council (TCDC) cited the need for a National Pathways Plan, and the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) commented that decisions about pathway rules should be made at a national level:

"NZDF supports Option 1, which proposes to continue combined efforts and work towards a collaborative national pathway approach, yet in the meantime allow each region to keep its own rules or policies for managing marine pests. Although NZDF agrees that consistent..."
pathway rules across the country would create certainty for vessel operators, such decisions should be made at a national level following detailed consideration of the practicalities of their implementation for larger vessels with unique operating profiles. The approach would also need to consider the possible effects on the RNZN fleet, so that the operational capability of the NZDF is not restricted.”

“TCDC submits that marine biosecurity is of such critical significance to New Zealand that as a matter of urgency, central government, working collaboratively with regional councils and other key stakeholders, should lead the development of a national pathway approach for coastal waters.”

The majority of the comments relating to Option 1 highlighted regional differences in pest species (9 comments), the importance of international and/or commercial vessels as a vector of invasive species (5 comments), and that pests are already established, particularly on marinas and permanent structures (5 comments). For example, a private submitter from the Bay of Plenty suggested “the one rule fits all denies local situations”, and two other submitters thought that “the spread of pests across all regions is inevitable” and “the resident boating public are the injured parties through lack of border controls.”

**Option 2: Develop consistent hull-fouling rules across Northland, Auckland, Waikato and Bay of Plenty**

Of the 102 submitters who chose Option 2, 68 made a comment. The majority who commented (52) suggested this was the best option because it would be the most practical and would achieve the greatest level of compliance. For example, an individual submitter from Northland suggested:

“Consistent rules make compliance and enforcement easier for all parties. The issues are the same throughout the regions.”

Key stakeholders that supported Option 2 included Aquaculture New Zealand, the New Zealand Marine Industry Association and the Coromandel Marine Farmers Association. Aquaculture New Zealand commented:

“Acknowledging the risks of spreading organisms between operational regions, the aquaculture industry is developing biosecurity standards for the salmon, mussel, and oyster industries that will set rules for the pathways that are within its control, particularly between Operational Regions (e.g. Top of the North; Top of the South, Banks Peninsula, Southland etc.). Given that aquaculture is setting its own biosecurity standards, it seems appropriate that other pathways in the marine environment have consistent rules and standards applied.”

Similarly, the Coromandel Marine Farmers Association commented:

“Given that marine Biosecurity is desirable and important, our CoroMFA supports: Firstly, that there be consistent hull-fouling rules as per Option 2, and which appears to be the key risk pathway. Secondly, that there be further consideration and consultation re the Option 3 matters of “rules for other pathways” in the marine environment.”

Peter Busfield, Executive Director of the NZ Marine Industry Association, was also supportive of Option 2 and commented:
"We like the concept of the 4 noted regions working together to have one set of rules for vessels in each of and moving to and from each region. We do wish to make sure that any rules are fair, practical, easily understood and easy to comply with by boat owners."

In addition, Thomas Malcolm, of Auckland, cited the need for a National Pathways Plan, commenting:

"Having run a workshop for Auckland Council with Mana whenua from the area, there was a strong sense that something needed to be done. Option 2 was the bottom line for the majority of the people present, but some wanted option 3. I feel that some of the mana whenua will not have time to make a submission. That being said, I would like to see ToN develop the IRMPPP based on option 2 whilst holding MPI accountable for their lack of national direction."

**Option 3: Go further and develop rules for other pathways too (e.g., ballast water)**

The largest proportion of submitters (126, 37%) selected Option 3 and 94 also made a comment. Overall, the most common themes identified in these comments were practicality and compliance (28 comments), followed by the importance of marine protection (21 comments), all pathways are important (20 comments), ballast water (9 comments) and international/commercial vessels (8 comments) as vectors of pest species, and that a national pathway approach is required (7 comments).

There was a high level of support for this option by the notable individuals and organisations who submitted. For example, the New Zealand Marine Sciences Society (NZMSS) supported Option 3, highlighting the importance of all pest pathways:

"We do not believe option 2 will be effective as it does not consider all pathways (e.g. aquaculture). In the management of marine pests it is important to consider all of the ways in which pests can enter and be spread within New Zealand. Pathway management should not just concentrate on vessel hulls. The transport of invasive species in ship ballast water and through movement of aquaculture infrastructure (vessels, buoys, harvesting and processing equipment) has been widely demonstrated. Furthermore, structures within harbours, ports and marinas, such as buoys, pontoons, moorings, platforms, walls and boat traffic, are known to harbour and spread a range of marine pests. These aspects therefore all need to be included in pathway management."

Similarly, an individual submitter from Nelson suggested:

"The most prudent approach is to fill all gaps in pathway management as much as resources allow. This will take longer to implement than other options, and involve stakeholder consultation to optimize strategies and management tools without unnecessary impact on user groups. But significant gaps in vector management can (is likely to) undermine progress made on other pathways. The cost of implementation should diminish over time as a culture of pathway management is ingrained. This approach is the most comprehensive long-term management vision, which can be developed and implemented over time in a step-wise approach as resources allow."

In addition, the Greater Wellington Regional Council “strongly supports development of the comprehensive national marine pathway management plan”, as does the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.:
"We support the inclusion of pathways into an inter-regional pest management approach, either under a National Pest Pathway Plan or through a coordinated approach to developing and implementing Regional Pest Pathway Plans. We want a pathway plan(s) that is proactive, sets requirements for Councils to designate harbours and popular anchorages as discrete ‘places’ (as per the Northland RPMP) in order to control the introduction and spread of marine pests and to protect our significant indigenous marine biodiversity. We agree with the consultation documents that there is a risk that councils will delay action while considering this approach. We have already seen evidence of this in Auckland where their recently adopted regional pest plan refers to a possible inter-regional pathway plan as a reason for not including pathway management at this time in that plan. This means that the Ministry for Primary Industries needs to be very clear in pursuing an inter-regional approach that this should not delay current responsibilities of councils which can be addressed under a regional pest plan in the interim. MPI needs to move faster, too often we have seen delays and inaction which result in the spread of pests and disease. Whatever option is adopted we consider that Councils need to have responsibility for implementing and enforcing rules and that the pathway management plan be completed by the end of 2020."

Tame teRangi, on behalf of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whāua, commented:

"The arrival of invasive marine-pests in any of the waterways is deemed culturally inappropriate. The significance of iconic places across the extent of the Ngāti Whāua tribal rohe also carries the upper-most obligation to ensure the environmental integrity of those areas including the marine environment. [This] submission states that the classification of managing invasive marine pests be assigned the highest of priorities with strict enforceable penalties for any such breaches of unwanted disregard. That such prohibition be applied to any public marine place including those waterways where wild-catch wild-harvest activities occur."

Several individuals from places in New Zealand outside the TON regions also commented on the importance of a national plan. For example, a submitter from Nelson commented:

"Considering that the Marlborough Sounds has such a significant percentage of NZ coast it should be one of the areas on the survey. Being a “lifetime bootie” I am only too willing to help but it needs help from all sides - not just from the “easy victims.”"

With regards to practicality and compliance, five independent submitters all supported Option 3 with a replicated submission, stating their reasons as:

1) Boats move readily between regions, especially from Auckland and Waikato to Northland. It is logical that there be consistent rules for hull fouling between regions; and 2) It is more cost-effective if the same message is promoted in the four regions as many boat-owners will not know about, or refer to, the different regional marine biosecurity plans.

Comments that related to international and/or commercial vessels usually highlighted concern over the distribution of costs. For example, an individual submitter from Nelson suggested:

"We cannot ignore foreign shipping or NZ Based commercial fishing vessels. The recreational boating community always gets the short end of the stick."

17
None of the above

All but one of the 69 submitters who chose ‘none of the above’ also provided a comment as to why they preferred this option. The majority of comments related to the importance of international and/or commercial vessels (22 comments) as vectors of pest species, the need for a national pathways approach (20 comments), ballast water (10 comments), the ineffectiveness of anti-fouling paint (10 comments), and the feeling that pests were already established, particularly on permanent structures and marinas (9 comments).

Just under 20% (13 submitters) were comments according to a template document distributed by the Russell Mooring Owners & Ratepayers group. These submitters felt that:

“Councils impose considerable compliance costs on recreational boaties who by and large care for the marine environment, and yet boaties’ efforts are stymied by the lack of rules on the commercial sector. New Zealand should have consistent domestic rules across the country that apply to both commercial and recreational vessels for methods that mitigate the biosecurity risk aspects of their vessels and gear.”

Submitters who were concerned about ballast water generally felt the risks from this pathway, and others, overruled any posed by domestic boat travel. For example, an individual submitter from Northland commented:

“Without including ballast water in the regulations there is no sense in doing anything. And even including ballast water is simply delaying (at great cost) the inevitable. Perhaps allowing more toxic bottom paint is a more economical and effective way to slow the spread of undesirable organisms. Punishing yachts when the marine pests are moving by other means is not only unfair but pointless. If you are serious about controlling marine pests you must consider all pathways including natural within the ocean.”

Several submitters mentioned the ineffectiveness of current anti-fouling options, and suggested superior alternatives, or highlighted the lack of other practical tools such as cleaning grids. For example, an individual submitter from Northland asked:

“Where have all the cleaning grids gone? Don’t expect clean hulls if you deny boat owners affordable access to cleaning facilities.”

Those who mentioned anti-fouling paints almost unanimously cited their ineffectiveness, for example:

“The rules on hull fouling are frustrating, the effective paint additives have been removed, then boat owners are required to somehow have clean hulls (barnacles excluded).”

However, a number of submitters also suggested implementing alternative solutions, such as:

“Need[s] some lateral thinking. Antifouling paint is poisonous, expensive, short-term only. I was owner of the scow Alma (75ft) in 1980’s, we moved her into “fresh water” in the Waima river, to kill teredo worm and all marine pests, worked well. Fresh water canals/basins, should be a part of all marina developments. (Think Marsden Cove (inland canal development), Hatea River).”

Many of these submitters expressed a desire to protect the environment and comply with council to control marine pests, however they believe any plans should be ratepayer funded. The incursion of the
Sabella was central to many comments, particularly those that felt pests were already established. For example, an individual submitter from Northland suggested:

“What’s the point? They are here to stay, perfect example is Marsden Cove stopped trying to get rid of the fan worm, was too hard and expensive. It will be everywhere in a few years no matter what is done. Stop burdening the boat owners with a solution that won’t stop the outcome.”
6 Question 2: If hull-fouling rules were developed, which option do you think is best, and why?

- **OPTION 1**: Status quo.
- **OPTION 2**: Lead the way with consistent rules for clean hulls.
- **OPTION 3**: Go even further – make rules for other pathways too.

*Or* None of the above

6.1 Overall feedback

Overall, 341 submitters completed the survey and responded to this question: 144 (42%) agreed with Option 1; 80 (24%) agreed with Option 2; 51 (15%) agreed with Option 3; and 66 (19%) agreed with ‘none of the above’ (Figure 5). In addition, two of the 29 additional submitters (who did not answer the survey questions directly) provided clear feedback in accordance with a preference for Option 1, while the remaining comments from this cohort did not provide a clear answer.
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**Figure 5.** Submitter responses to the question: If hull-fouling rules were developed, which option do you think is best and why? The total number of submitters was 341.
6.2 Feedback according to region

As was the case for Question 1 detailed above, the preferences of Northland submitters were notably different to the other regions. Specifically, while only 8–14% of submitters from Auckland, Waikato, and Bay of Plenty chose ‘none of the above’, the greatest proportion of Northland submitters (33%) selected this option. Instead, the vast majority of submitters from these former regions selected Options 1, 2, or 3 (Figure 6). The 22 submitters from elsewhere in NZ, and one from overseas, who answered this survey question selected Option 1 (9 submitters), Option 2 (8 submitters), Option 3 (1 submitter) and ‘none of the above’ (5 submitters).

If hull-fouling rules were developed, which option do you think is best?

Figure 6. Preferred option for hull-fouling rules by region.
6.3 Feedback according to boat ownership

Overall, the most commonly selected preference by boat owners was ‘none of the above’ (60, 29%), followed by Option 1 (56, 27%), Option 2 (49, 24%), and Option 3 (40, 20%), whereas the vast majority of submitters (82, 65%) who do not own a boat selected Option 1 (Figure 7).
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**Figure 7.** Survey feedback according to boat ownership in response to the question: if hull-fouling rules were developed, which option do you think is best and why?

Notable regional differences included Northland boat owners showing a clear preference for ‘none of the above’ while boat owners from Waikato favoured Option 3. In contrast, boat owners from Auckland and the Bay of Plenty had less clear preferences between the options but overall the majority selected Option 1 (Figure 8).
If hull-fouling rules were developed, which option do you think is best?
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**Figure 8.** Regional feedback according to boat ownership in response to the question: If hull-fouling rules were developed, which option do you think is best and why?
6.4 Summary of comments explaining preferred Option

In total, 232 (68%) submitters provided an answer to why they preferred their chosen option, and approximately half of the additional 29 submitters also provided relevant comments.

Option 1: A clean hull required at all times

The majority of submitters preferred Option 1 (144, 42%), with 92 providing comments. Two thirds of these comments related to practicality and compliance (60 comments). Other themes were the importance of marine protection (15 comments), and issues around practical tools, e.g., a lack of haul-out facilities (6 comments) and ineffective anti-fouling paints (5 comments).

Amongst the majority of submitters that cited practicality and compliance in support of the option of enforcing a clean hull at all times were NZMSS and the Greater Wellington Regional Council, the latter also commenting on the need for a national pathways approach:

"Northland require a clean hull, we suggest the other three regions match this – if it is a standard that is working in one area, it should be successful when applied to the whole region. It is also the least confusing rule, with no exceptions, and on that basis is likely to be the easiest option to carry out surveillance activities for, bearing in mind that funding must be available to police it. Again, the marine biosecurity will only truly benefit if a national marine pathway management plan is in place."

In addition to supporting the development of a national plan, NZMSS suggested clarification on the definition of a ‘clean hull’ citing concern over the allowance of ‘barnacles’:

“Option 1 is clearly the best option in terms of clarity, compliance, enforcement and minimising the spread of invasive marine species. The other options will be less effective as they are considerably more difficult from a compliance and enforcement perspective. From a practical perspective Option 1 could be implemented by issuing boats that are fouled with a notice that means they cannot be used or moved until they have been cleaned. This will mean that boats are not being used do not incur a fine, but prevent movement of that boat until it is cleaned. This will be more effective than Option 2 as it means boats can be inspected within ports and marinas. Option 3, which only requires clean hulls in high value areas, is highly problematic and not a practical solution due to the highly dispersive nature of marine species and high connectivity in the marine environment. NZMSS believes it is important to clarify the rules regarding a standard for a 'clean' hull. It appears that these have changed recently and we encourage the development of a standard that is fit for purpose. It should therefore include specific information on all of the types of organisms likely to foul boats. Slime is a very vague term and a more precise definition is needed. Furthermore, we are concerned that “barnacles” are generally incorporated in the allowable clean hull standard as (a) there are numerous species and (b) they provide a complex surface for other biofouling species to be associated with them, providing increased opportunity for marine pests to settle. NZMSS believes a comprehensive ‘clean’ hull standard needs to be developed that is easy to use and allows regulators to assess the level of biofouling on a vessel. The efficacy of implementing an inter-regional pathway management plan is currently unknown so monitoring will be essential to evaluating the uptake of the rules and assessing the effectiveness of the plan in preventing the introduction and spread of marine pests.”
The Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. expressed similar questions/concerns as NZMSS above:

“Clean hull requirements need to be in place at all times to ensure that boating does not contribute to an increase in marine pests where they already exist or the introduction of marine pests into areas where they are currently not established. However it is not clear at what level of slime cover or barnacle infestation cleaning is required. Even at low levels there can be an unacceptable risk of spreading pests to new areas/harbours and to our high value areas.”

Three submitters using a shared template also highlighted concerns over exemptions for boats not moving for long periods and the ineffectiveness of anti-fouling paints:

“There needs to be an easy way to apply for an exemption if a boat is not being moved for two months or longer (e.g. on-line form addressing dates, place of mooring (including mooring number or marina berth), owner details, boat name and type, New Zealand contact details if different, time period for exemption up to a maximum). There needs to be careful consideration as to what constitutes a “clean hull” especially for boats in the Opua-lower Waikare-Veronica Channel area. Pacific oysters and barnacles grow very quickly in this area and there are abundant sources of local oyster spat. Boats moored in this locality and hauled and antifouled in December 2018, had extensive and rapid barnacle regrowth and some oyster regrowth after less than six weeks. From then the hulls have required significant in-water cleaning approximately every four weeks. It seems that irrespective of the hull material and the antifouling paint used, the application of new anti-fouling paint has not made much difference to the hull fouling rates in this location.”

In contrast to the above comments, other submitters suggested that though option 1 was their preferred choice, they thought it may not be the most practical option, e.g., an individual submitter from Auckland commented that option 1 was:

“... obviously the best, however impractical.”

Several submitters who selected Option 1 also mentioned a desire to protect the marine environment. For example, a Northland resident commented:

“The weight of recreational values should not outweigh the importance of water quality and the marine environment.”

**Option 2: A clean hull required only when moving from one harbour/place to another**

Following Option 1, the next highest number of submitters chose Option 2 (80 submitters, 24%), with 53 of these providing comments. Themes were identified in much the same pattern as for Option 1, with the greatest proportion relating to practicality and compliance (25 comments), followed by a lack of practical tools (haul-out facilities [5 comments] and ineffective anti-fouling paint [2 comments]), and international and/or commercial vessels as a vector for pests (4 comments).

Several submitters noted this seemed much more affordable than Option 1 for boat owners, which would result in higher compliance. For example, the following three comments were provided by individual submitters from across different regions:
“This will be much more affordable for boaties which will hopefully result in higher uptake and compliance.”

“This is easier to enforce (but this does need to be enforced to work, particularly at entry point with the right of refusal for entry) and simpler to understand for boaties. Does not penalize so much boaties while they are not going anywhere and deals with inconsistency between requiring boaties to maintain a clean hull whilst moored in places (e.g., marinas) with existing extensive biofouling and NIS.”

“Pro-active vector management (option 2) promotes a clean hull culture; addresses the compounding effects of pest spread among marinas (and high-value sites); focuses on biofouling associated with moving vessels (the core problem); and provides flexibility to address biofouling (any time at home marinas or at the point of pre-departure [for boaters] and at arrival [for managers]). Adopting a pathway management plan that reduces ‘export’, as well as ‘import’, of pests provides the strongest basis for minimizing pest spread.”

*Option 3: A clean hull required only when moving to specifically identified places (high value areas)*

Of the 51 submitters who preferred Option 3, 27 comments were provided. These mostly related to practicality and compliance (7 comments), lack of haul-out facilities (3 comments), and the feeling that pests were already well established in the environment (3 comments).

Notable submitters who agreed with Option 3 and cited practicality issues included the NZDF and Tom Hollings, Executive Officer of the Coromandel Marine Farmers Association.

NZDF commented:

“This option is the most pragmatic and achievable. It ensures that rules are developed having regard to the different marine environments of the specific regions, and gives the RNZN comfort that ships can return to their home port at DNB without having to be cleaned off-shore (which is not a preferred option by MPI).”

The Coromandel Marine Farmers Association felt:

“Having clean hulls when moving between regions is valuable and it is planned to very soon be incorporated into Aquaculture industry biosecurity standards. That concept is likewise seen as valuable for all northern coastal vessels. We suggest the need is to identify and minimize the higher risk movements and that moving around nearby is not per se the issue but rather the issue is as per option 3, moving from where (define) to where (define).”

Those submitters concerned about practical tools for keeping hulls clean most commonly mentioned prohibitive costs and accessibility. For example, two individual submitters from Auckland and Waikato respectively commented:

“It is difficult to get a lift out even in Auckland at short notice as well as expensive to get a hull cleaned may be as often as monthly.”

“I agree with action needing to be taken, I also feel the affected areas and councils must take practical steps to ensure relatively easy access to haulout facilities to allow boat owners the opportunity to keep their boat hulls clean and regularly anti fouled.”
Finally, the feeling that pests are already established in the marine environment concerned several submitters who made points such as:

"Marine pests of the type this discussion is subject to are already established in many Marinas, infrastructure structures and vessel bottoms in Auckland and Northland. The cost of compliance if a blanket regulation was enacted will be excessive. New Zealand is very under supplied with marine service industries and locations that can cope with the implications of the suggested requirements for continual clean bottom. Particularly larger craft in excess of 100 tonne."

None of the above

The majority of respondents who selected ‘none of the above’ also provided a comment (60 comments made by 66 submitters). More than a third of these cited a lack of practical tools (including the ineffectiveness of current anti-fouling paint options [23 comments] and lack of haul-out facilities [13 comments]), and another third (21 comments) questioned the fairness of targeting small boat owners, specifically mentioning international and/or commercial vessels and ballast water as important vectors of pest species. The Incursion of the Sabella was also central to many of these comments, with 11 submitters stating that pests were already well established. Only 6 comments related to practicality and compliance, in contrast to the majority of comments made in support of each of the previous options.

Notable submitters who selected this option were not necessarily opposed to new rules, but tended to request clarification on the possible new rules or provide practical ideas on how they saw the rules being enforced. For example, Chris Galbraith, of the New Zealand Marina Operators Association, commented:

"We would like to discuss options but need to be clear on how structure/facility owners are affected by the rules that would be decided for vessels and how these would be policed and who would pay the costs of enforcement."

Sanford Limited commented:

"Sanford supports the concept of a yearly clean hull pass that is issued to all boats both commercial and recreational prior to summer similar to a warrant of fitness. It is important that the certificate is easy to obtain and keep updated - for example the certificate can be stored on a smart phone and linked to the name of the boat. Not carrying a certificate could be subject to minor infringement notices, that escalate in penalty and consequence for repeated non-compliance. The aim of the programme should be to improve boat owner awareness and encourage responsibility. Sanford also supports the clean hull pass being part of a wider pest management awareness education programme and voluntary compliance."

Aquaculture New Zealand highlighted the importance of all pathways:

"Given that aquaculture is setting its own biosecurity standards, it seems appropriate that other pathways in the marine environment have similar rules and standards applied. As such AQNZ would support the development of a rule that ensured clean hull requirements on movements between operational regions and look forward to further consideration and consultation on the development of such a rule. One option would be to develop a ‘clean vessel pass’ for all watercraft that are anchoring in areas of special significance (or moving
between operational regions). The pass would be kept on the boat and renewed each year (e.g. between August-December). It could be free for recreational boats, and for commercial ones they would need to have it certified by a registered dive company. Not carrying it would result in an infringement notice with more serious penalties on repeated non-compliance.”

Finally, the TCDC commented on the need for a national pathways plan:

“TCDC does not have a view on which of these options is the best approach. Rather, it considers that central government, in collaboration with regional councils and other stakeholders should lead the development of a consistent national rule framework for coastal waters that includes rules, standards, management systems and timeframes for implementation across various pathways. This approach needs to be fully integrated with the frameworks for managing international vessels and aquaculture-related movement of marine pests if effective biosecurity is to be achieved.”

The submitters who highlighted practicality and compliance were all highly concerned that any new rules would be unpractical and unachievable. For example, a resident of Northland commented:

“How could you possibly achieve any of these options without astronomical costs? It seems to me the process is almost self limiting.”

In addition, approximately half of the comments (12) relating to the lack of practical tools and concern over international and/or commercial vessels were based off a template document distributed by the Russell Mooring Owners & Ratepayers group. The individuals from this group stated:

“My preferred option is that boat owners should be required to ensure their vessel is antifouled and maintained according to manufacturer’s specifications and provide evidence to a regional council when requested, such as copies of invoices etc. The cost to boat owners of meeting the unachievable standard, if it meant they had to antifoul their vessels at a shorter interval than recommended by the manufacturer, would be prohibitive. It would also be a waste of boat owners’ money because councils are proposing no rules to cover other pathways.”

7 Conclusion

Overall, 370 responses were received; 341 submitters completed the survey and responded to the main questions, and an additional 29 submitters responded (by email or a hardcopy version of the survey) but did not provide an answer to one or both of the survey questions.

There were nine key themes that were identified during the analysis of submitters comments, based on the questions posed in the discussion document. These were: 1) Marine protection is important; 2) Practicality and compliance; 3) Regional differences; 4) All pathways are important; 5) No practical tools (including sub-themes of the effectiveness of anti-fouling, a lack of haul-out facilities, and in-water cleaning rules); 6) Distribution of costs (including sub-themes of international/commercial vessels and ballast water); 7) National Plan needed; 8) Pests already established; and 9) Stationary vessels.

Of the 341 submitters who completed the survey, the preferred option for managing marine pests was Option 3 (go even further and make rules for other pathways too) for 126 submitters (37%), followed by Option 2 (lead the way with consistent rules for clean hull) for 102 submitters (30%), ‘none of the
above’ for 69 submitters (20%), and finally Option 1 (the status quo) for 44 submitters (13%). There were some regional differences, with the preferences of Northland submitters being notably different to the other regions. Only 16% of Northland submitters preferring Option 2 compared with 39%, 46% and 47% of submitters from Auckland, Waikato, and Bay of Plenty, respectively. In contrast, 37% of Northland submitters chose ‘none of the above’ compared with only 8–9% of those from the other TON regions. The majority of submitters (205, 60%) were boat owners, and overall, their most commonly selected preference was Option 2 (64, 31%), followed by ‘none of the above’ (61, 30%) and Option 3 (46, 22%), whereas the vast majority of submitters who do not own a boat that lives in the water selected Option 3 (76, 60%).

The preferred option for hull-fouling rules, if they are to be developed, was Option 1 (clean hull at all times) for 144 submitters (42%), Option 2 (clean hull required only when moving) for 80 submitters (24%), ‘none of the above’ for 66 submitters (19%), and finally Option 3 (clean hull required only when moving to specially identified places) for 51 submitters. Again, the preferences of Northland submitters were notably different to the other regions. Specifically, while only 8–14% of submitters from Auckland, Waikato, and Bay of Plenty chose ‘none of the above’, the greatest proportion of Northland submitters (33%) selected this option. Overall, boat owners were not polarised on this issue, with relatively equal numbers of submitters choosing each of the four options. Specifically, boat owners preferred ‘none of the above’ (29%), Option 1 (27%), Option 2 (24%), and Option 3 (20%), whereas the vast majority of submitters (65%) who do not own a boat selected Option 1.

**Key messages**

Overall, there was a clear call for greater action to address marine pests across the TON regions from both the individuals and the agencies that responded, some of which represent considerable numbers of marine users. In addition, there is likely to be benefit in implementing a consistent approach across the regions because issues around practicality and the ease of compliance were of high importance to many submitters.

Results also indicate there is a significant percentage of submitters who support some form of control on hull-fouling, although this is notably more muted in Northland than the other regions with 33% either opposed to hull-fouling rules or seeking further detail about their implementation.

The differences in submitter responses and comments seen in Northland compared with the other TON regions likely reflect both a higher level of boat ownership and the recent introduction of the Northland Marine Pest Pathway Plan with an associated charging regime. While it seems clear that further engagement with boat owners is required, it is encouraging that many already support the introduction of new hull-fouling rules and desire consistency in these rules across the regions.
9 Appendix B – Engagement summary

Table 4. Summary of publicity and engagement activities each region, Biosecurity New Zealand, and DOC conducted to publicise and attract submissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI national stakeholder list</td>
<td>18/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine biosecurity partnerships (Fiordland and TOS)</td>
<td>18/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal MPI to all MPI marine experts</td>
<td>18/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/04/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal DOC to all marine and biosecurity staff</td>
<td>2/05/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council stakeholder email list</td>
<td>15/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24/05/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahurangi Harbour marine farmer email list</td>
<td>16/04/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council iwi representative list</td>
<td>19/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland mooring register list + Northland Regional Council iwi and stakeholder list + Northland territorial authorities</td>
<td>20/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/05/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato marine stakeholder and iwi email list</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay of Plenty Regional Council Toi Moana to Tame Malcom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Media release

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media release</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council website</td>
<td>19/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland Regional Council website</td>
<td>19/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay of Plenty Regional Council Toi Moana website</td>
<td>21/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato Regional Council website</td>
<td>18/03/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Printed Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Material</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion documents and pamphlets distributed at all Auckland high-use boat ramps and marinas through an extensive outreach programme</td>
<td>Throughout consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion documents and pamphlets distributed to all Northland marinas, some boating/fishing clubs and haul outs</td>
<td>Throughout consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion documents and pamphlets distributed to all Northland Regional Council offices, posters at key sites</td>
<td>Throughout consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion documents and pamphlets distributed to Waikato mooring holders, community groups and industry</td>
<td>During April</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 20

**Available from all Waikato Harbour Masters and Waikato Regional Council reception**

- Throughout consultation

**Public Event**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orewa Community Centre (Auckland)</td>
<td>17/04/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westhaven Marina (Auckland)</td>
<td>18/04/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckland and Eastern beaches Memorial Hall (Auckland)</td>
<td>10/04/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Council Chamber (Auckland)</td>
<td>2/05/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay of Plenty Regional Council Tol Moana hosted public drop-in workshops</td>
<td>29 April and 1 May – Tauranga, 30 April – Whakatane, 2 May – Rotorua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchwilco boat show stand, Auckland</td>
<td>16–19 May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Media**

| Platform                                                        | Date          |
|                                                               |               |
| Biosecurity New Zealand Facebook page and Ko Tatou “This is Us” | 19/03/2019    |
| Northland Regional Council Facebook page                       | 12 April + reminders; 19, 29 April, 15, 23 May |
| Waikato Regional Council Facebook page                         | 19/03/2019    |
| Bay of Plenty Regional Council Tol Moana Facebook page         | 14/05/2019    |
| Auckland Council Biodiversity Facebook page                    |               |
| Sailworld Facebook page                                         |               |
| Westhaven Marina Facebook Page                                  |               |

**Webpage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sailworld.com</td>
<td>17/04/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bio.net.com with links to further information</td>
<td>Throughout consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>2/04/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council iwi hui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay of Plenty Regional Council Tol Moana Key Stakeholder workshop</td>
<td>14/05/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato iwi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato territorial authorities</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additions to the 2019-2022 Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Meetings Schedule

File No.: CP2020/01740

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval for two meeting dates to be added to the 2019-2022 Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board meeting schedule in order to accommodate the Annual Plan 2020/2021 timeframes.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
3. At that time the specific times and dates for meetings for local board decision making in relation to the local board agreement as part of the Annual Plan 2020/2021 were unknown.
4. The local board is being asked to approve two meeting dates as an addition to the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board meeting schedule so that the Annual Plan 2020/2021 timeframes can be met.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) approve two meeting dates to be added to the 2019-2022 Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board meeting schedule to accommodate the Annual Plan 2020/2021 timeframes as follows:
   i) Tuesday, 5 May 2020
   ii) Tuesday, 16 June 2020

b) note the venue for the meeting will be at the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board office, 7-13 Pilkington Road, Panmure, starting at 10am.

Horopaki
Context
5. The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) and the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA) have requirements regarding local board meeting schedules.
6. In summary, adopting a meeting schedule helps meet the requirements of:
   • clause 19, Schedule 7 of the LGA on general provisions for meetings, which requires the chief executive to give notice in writing to each local board member of the time and place of meetings. Such notification may be provided by the adoption of a schedule of business meetings.
sections 46, 46(A) and 47 in Part 7 of the LGOIMA, which requires that meetings are publicly notified, agendas and reports are available at least two working days before a meeting and that local board meetings are open to the public.

7. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board adopted its business meeting schedule at its 3 December 2019 business meeting.

8. The timeframes for local board decision making in relation to the local board agreement which is part of the Annual Plan 2020/2021 were unavailable when the meeting schedule was originally adopted.

9. The local board is being asked to make decisions in May and June to feed into the Annual Plan 2020/2021 process. These timeframes are outside the board’s normal meeting cycle.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

10. The local board has two choices:

i) Add the meeting as an addition to the meeting schedule.

or

ii) Add the meeting as an extraordinary meeting.

11. For option one, statutory requirements allow enough time for the meeting to be scheduled as an addition to the meeting schedule and other topics may be considered as per any other ordinary meeting. However, there is a risk that if the Annual Plan 2020/2021 timeframes change or the information is not ready for the meeting there would need to be an additional extraordinary meeting scheduled anyway.

12. For option two, only the specific topic Annual Plan 2020/2021 may be considered for which the meeting is being held. There is a risk that no other policies or plans with similar timeframes are running in relation to the Annual Plan 2020/2021 process could be considered at this meeting.

13. Since there is enough time to meet statutory requirements, staff recommend approving the meetings as an addition to the meeting schedule as it allows more flexibility for the local board to consider a range of issues.

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

14. Local boards have a statutory responsibility to develop an annual local board agreement, which forms part of the annual budget and is adopted by the Governing Body. At the May business meeting the local board will agree their feedback and advocacy on the Annual Budget 2020/2021. The Governing Body is approving the Annual Budget 2020/2021 on 23 June 2020, so an additional local board business meeting is required in June to meet the budget-setting process timelines.

15. This report requests the local board’s decision to schedule two additional meetings and consider whether to approve it as an extraordinary meeting or an addition to the meeting schedule.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

16. There is no specific impact for Māori arising from this report. Local boards work with Māori on projects and initiatives of shared interest.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

17. There are no financial implications in relation to this report apart from the standard costs associated with servicing a business meeting.

Ngā raru tūpono

Risks

18. There are no significant risks associated with this report.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

19. The local board democracy advisor will implement the processes associated with preparing for business meetings.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tracey Freeman - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Puketapapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urgent decision - Urban Development Bill

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To inform the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board that an urgent decision was made and approved under delegation by the Chair and Deputy Chair to provide feedback on Auckland Council's draft submission of the Urban Development Bill.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. At the 3 December 2019 Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board meeting the board considered the urgent decisions process and passed resolution MTLB/2019/75:

   That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki 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 requirement of a quorum;
   
b) delegate authority to the chair and deputy chair, or any person acting in these roles, to make urgent decisions on behalf of the local board;
   
c) agree that the relationship manager, chair and deputy chair (or any person/s acting in these roles) will authorise the urgent decision-making process by signing off the authorisation memo;
   
d) note that all urgent decisions will be reported to the next ordinary meeting of the local board. CARRIED

3. Local boards have a role in representing the views of their communities on issues of local importance, such as inputting local impacts of Central Government proposals into Auckland Council submissions.

4. Due to the Christmas/New Year period, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board’s first business meeting for the 2020 calendar year is on 25 February 2020.

5. Local boards received an opportunity to provide feedback into Auckland Council’s submission to Central Government’s Urban Development Bill. The due date for submissions is 14 February 2020. A workshop was held for local board members on the Bill on 31 January 2020. The draft Auckland Council submission was approved by delegates on 11 February 2020 and will be presented to the Planning Committee on 4 March 2020. To meet these timeframes local board feedback was due by 7 February 2020.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) note the decision made under the urgent decision-making process on 4 February 2020, that the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board provide formal local board feedback on the Central Government’s Urban Development Bill.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board, Urgent Decision on the Urban Development Bill</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Mal Ahmu - Local Board Advisor - Mngke-Tmk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Puketapapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum 4 February 2020

To: Chris Makoare, Chairperson – Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board; Debbie Burrows, Deputy Chairperson – Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board; Nina Siers, Relationship Manager – Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Puketāpapa Local Boards

cc: Christie McFadyen, Senior Local Board Advisor – Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board; Anna Jennings, Principle Advisor – Urban Growth and Housing

Subject: Urgent decision request of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

From: Mal Ahmu, Local Board Advisor – Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

Purpose
1. To initially seek the local board relationship manager’s authorisation to commence the urgent decision-making process and if granted, seek formal approval from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles) to use the process to make an urgent decision.

2. The decision required, and the supporting report, are attached to this memo. The urgent decision being sought needs to be authorised by the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles) by signing this memo. Both this memo and the report will be reported as an information item at the next business meeting if the urgent decision-making process proceeds.

Reason for the urgency
3. Local Boards have a role in representing the views of their communities on issues of local importance, such as inputting local impacts of Central Government proposals into Auckland Council submissions.

4. Due to the Christmas/New Year period, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board’s first business meeting for the 2020 calendar year is on 25 February 2020.

5. The due date for submissions to Central Government’s Urban Development Bill is 14 February 2020. A workshop was held for local board members on the Bill on 31 January 2020. The draft Auckland Council submission will be presented to the Planning Committee on 4 March 2020 and final approval by delegates on 11 February 2020. To meet these timeframes local board feedback is due by 7 February 2020.

Decision sought from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles)
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) provide input into Auckland Council’s submission on Central Government’s Urban Development Bill.

Context
6. On 1 October 2019, the Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Bill established Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities as a new Crown entity by:
7. Kāinga Ora has two key functions; being a public housing landlord and leading and coordinating urban development. The entity's objective is to "contribute to sustainable, inclusive and thriving communities that:

- provide people with good quality, affordable housing choices that meet diverse needs; and
- support good access to jobs, amenities and services; and
- otherwise sustain or enhance the overall economic, social, environmental and cultural wellbeing of current and future generations."

8. The Urban Development Bill was introduced to Parliament on 5 December 2019 and had its First Reading on 10 December 2019. It has now been referred to Select Committee. The Bill sets out the functions, powers, rights and duties of the Kāinga Ora to enable it to undertake its urban development functions.

9. Development powers are set out under the following categories:

- Infrastructure – scope potential works, three waters and drainage infrastructure, roading, parking, public transport, transfer of ownership, bylaw powers
- Planning and Consenting – amendments to district plan, regional plan or regional policy statement, issue consents, shortened consent process, requiring authority powers, veto or amend applications of resource consents or plan changes in the project area
- Funding – Set and assess targeted rates, require development contributions, require betterment payments, require infrastructure and administrative charges
- Land Acquisition and Transfer – exchange, revoke, reconfigure some reserves, create, classify and vest reserves, transfer and set apart Crown owned land, acquire private land, transfer of ownership, buy, sell and hold land in own name, transfer of former Maori land.

Approval to use the urgent decision-making process

Signed by Nina Siers
Relationship Manager, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Date: 5 February 2020
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Approval to use the urgent decision-making process

Chris Makore
Chairperson, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board  Date: 7 February 2020

Debbie Burrows
Deputy Chairperson, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board  Date: 7 February 2020

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local board Resolution/s

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) note that the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area has a significant level of urban development planned and currently in progress and that this Bill is likely to significantly impact the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki community

b) oppose Central Government’s proposed Urban Development Bill, as the proposed tools and feedback timeframes that Kāinga Ora will have access to indicates that Kāinga Ora would potentially work from a distance and may disregard current and future communities’ aspirations and needs, putting ratepayers and our local community at high-risk of disempowerment, noting:

i) the local board do not have strong confidence in large-scale crown entities, due to the current experience of working with the New Zealand Transport Agency which operates from a distance, inhibiting effective and efficient collaboration

c) note that the local board previously supported in principle Auckland Council’s submission on the establishment and principles of the Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Bill, when the powers that Kāinga Ora could assume were not yet defined

d) endorse quality urban development as highlighted in the *Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Plan 2017*, which sets out intent to collaborate with housing developers to create new developments that are high-quality and reflect the flavour and character of our local area.

e) recommend Kāinga Ora take a more collaborative approach with local government and recognise Auckland Council’s unique governance model as established under the Local Government Act 2009, noting:

i) local boards have a key role in Tāmaki Makaurau/Auckland to:

- represent the views of our community on issues of local importance
- maintain and upgrade local facilities, town centres and parks
- care for the environment

ii) Local Government New Zealand recently released its discussion paper on localism which depicts how communities feel empowered to participate when they are provided the opportunity and visibility to engage in decision-making processes

iii) the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board currently has an efficient and meaningful collaborative relationship with the Kāinga Ora staff working on housing developments in the local board area. There are concerns that this Bill will diminish the relationship that has been built not only with the local board, but also with local communities

f) recommend that Kāinga Ora must consider local planning documents, particularly local board’s planning documents and strategies in the context of Tāmaki Makaurau/Auckland, as these plans have had a significant level of local input that will ensure that urban development meets the needs of both the current and future communities

g) oppose Kāinga Ora’s proposed ability to utilise the Public Works Act to compulsorily acquire land, namely existing homes, for the purpose of housing developments due to the impact of dislocation, which has already been significantly experienced by the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki community

h) recommend that any investment by Kāinga Ora in community amenities and infrastructure factors in the “whole of life cost” of any new asset that has any intention to be handed to local government to manage in the future, noting the impact this could potentially have on local government financially

i) oppose the use of reserve land for urban development without guarantee that the current provision of public open space will be upheld or amplified to create healthy and quality urban environments for our communities

j) recommend that the Urban Development Bill take greater consideration of climate change and put in safeguards to protect and improve the physical environment within the local areas being developed, noting that Point England and Onehunga have been identified as locations in the local board area at higher risk of environmental degradation

Chris Makoare
Chairperson, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Date: 7 February 2020

Debbie Burrows
Deputy Chairperson, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Date: 7 February 2020
Memorandum

16 January 2020

To: All Local Board members

Subject: Urban Development Bill

From: Anna Jennings – Principal Advisor, Urban Growth and Housing

Contact information: anna.jennings@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

1. To provide an overview of the Urban Development Bill and process for local boards to provide feedback.

Summary

2. The Urban Development Bill sets out the functions, powers, rights and duties of the Crown entity, Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities (Kāinga Ora) to enable it to undertake its urban development functions.

3. Local board members will receive an invitation to attend a workshop on the Bill on Friday 31 January at 10am. Feedback from this meeting will feed into the draft submission.

4. Submissions on the Bill are currently open until Friday 14 February. We request that local boards submit their formal feedback by Friday 7 February. These will be appended to the Auckland Council submission.

Context

5. The Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Bill established Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities as a new Crown entity on 1 October 2019 by:
   - disestablishing Housing New Zealand Corporation (HNZC) and Homes Land Community (HLC)
   - putting HNZC and HLC’s assets into Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities
   - repealing the Housing Corporation Act 1974
   - putting some of the functions and assets related to KiwiBuild that currently sit in the Ministry for Housing and Urban Development into Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities.

6. Kāinga Ora has two key functions; being a public housing landlord and leading and coordinating urban development. The entity’s objective is to “contribute to sustainable, inclusive and thriving communities that:
   - provide people with good quality, affordable housing choices that meet diverse needs; and
   - support good access to jobs, amenities and services; and
   - otherwise sustain or enhance the overall economic, social, environmental and cultural wellbeing of current and future generations.”

7. The Urban Development Bill was introduced to Parliament on 5 December 2019 and had its First Reading on 10 December 2019. It has now been referred to Select Committee. The Bill sets out the functions, powers, rights and duties of the Kāinga Ora to enable it to undertake its urban development functions.
**Discussion**

9. The Urban Development Bill gives Kāinga Ora access to a ‘tool box’ of development powers. Most of these powers can only be used within a specified development project but some are also available for use in business as usual developments that Kāinga Ora undertakes. Each of the powers has been designed to address a specific barrier to development. Not all powers will be needed by every project.

10. Development powers are set out under the following categories;
   a) Infrastructure – scope potential works, three waters and drainage infrastructure, roading, parking, public transport, transfer of ownership, bylaw powers
   b) Planning and Consenting – amendments to district plan, regional plan or regional policy statement, issue consents, shortened consent process, requiring authority powers, veto or amend applications of resource consents or plan changes in the project area
   c) Funding – Set and asses targeted rates, require development contributions, require betterment payments, require infrastructure and administrative charges
   d) Land Acquisition and Transfer – exchange, revoke, reconfigure some reserves, create, classify and vest reserves, transfer and set apart Crown owned land, acquire private land, transfer of ownership, buy, sell and hold land in own name, transfer of former Māori land.

11. The full text of the Bill is available on the Parliament website – [www.parliament.nz](http://www.parliament.nz). Attached are two useful summaries on the Bill including a one page summary from the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development and a summary of the Bill and considerations for local government by DLA Piper (see Attachments 1 and 2).

**Next steps**

12. Staff are currently working through the detail of the Bill to highlight key areas and considerations for Auckland Council. We will have subject matter experts available at the workshop on 31 January.

13. A workshop on the Urban Development Bill in conjunction with the Infrastructure Funding and Finance Bill is available to all local board members on Friday 31 January from 10am – 12pm. You will shortly be receiving an invitation to this meeting. Feedback from this workshop will feed into the draft submission.

14. We are attending Planning Committee on 4 February to seek confirmation of the direction of the submission. A verbal summary of the workshop on 31 January will be provided to Committee.

15. It is requested that any formal feedback from local boards is provided by Friday 7 February. This will be appended to the Auckland Council submission.

**Attachments**

Attachment 1 – MHUD Summary of Powers

Attachment 2 – DLA Piper Summary
## Summary of Powers available to Kāinga Ora

The Urban Development Bill gives Kāinga Ora access to a toolkit of development powers that it can use when undertaking specified development projects. Each power is designed to address a specific barrier to development. Not all powers will be needed by every project, and the development plan will set out which ones are needed to progress each specified development project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development power category</th>
<th>Description of power</th>
<th>Act currently enabling this power</th>
<th>Agency currently responsible for this power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Infrastructure**         | ● Scope potential works including:  
  ○ Having access to private property for the purposes of surveying  
  ○ Require the Local Authority to provide information or change a file to the Local Authority to attain that information for themselves  
  ● Construct, remove, amend and replace ‘3-waters’ and drainage infrastructure  
  ● Construct, stop, amend and re-aligning roads  
  ● Create, amend, remove carparking areas, public transport facilities and ancillary infrastructure  
  ● Transfer ownership and operation of new infrastructure to a local authority (but not debt)  
  ● Ability to request a Local Authority to make, amend or suspend a bylaw for a defined area and time period, to support development activities. Approval of the request may not be unreasonably withheld. | Local Government Act 2002  
Government Reading Powers Act 1989  
Public Works Act 1981  
Land Transport Management Act 2013 | Department of internal Affairs  
Ministry of Transport  
New Zealand Land Transport Agency  
Land Information New Zealand |
| **Planning and consenting** | ● Overrule, add to, or suspend provisions in the district plan, regional plan, or regional policy statement  
● Issue resource consents (City/District level – land use and subdivision consents)  
● Shortened resource consent process  
● Act as a requiring authority under the RMA to create designation inside and outside of the project area  
● Remove, change or replace designations for infrastructure within a project area  
● Veto or amend the applications of resource consents or plan changes in the project area. | Resource Management Act 1991 | Ministry for the Environment |
| **Funding**                | ● Set and assess targeted rates within a specified development project area  
● Require development contributions  
● Require betterment payments  
● Require infrastructure and administrative charges | Local Government (Rating Act) 2002  
Local Government Act 2002  
Resource Management Act 1991 | Department of internal Affairs  
Ministry for the Environment |
| **Land acquisition and transfer** | ● Exchanging, revoking or reconfiguring some types of reserves  
● Creating, classifying and vesting of reserves  
● Transferring and setting apart of Crown owned land  
● Compulsory acquisition of private land  
● Ability to transfer ownership of land to a developer to deliver urban development works. This may be necessary when a developer needs to own the land to be able to access development finance.  
● Ability to buy, sell or hold land in own name  
● Transfer of former Māori land | Reserves Act 1977  
Public Works Act 1981  
Crown Entities Act 2004  
Housing Act 1955 | Department of Conservation  
Land Information New Zealand |

New Zealand Government
Urban Development Bill

DLA Piper has prepared this article as a summary of the content of the new Urban Development Bill. It was introduced on 5 December 2019, had its First Reading on 10 December 2019 and has now been referred to the Environment Committee. Submissions are due on 14 February 2020.

We have focussed on the new process proposed for urban development and the land acquisition powers. Of note, urban development is defined to include housing for any purpose, development and renewal of urban environments (whether or not this includes housing) and development of related commercial, industrial, community or other amenity, infrastructure, facilities, services or works. We have then identified some of the implications for territorial authorities, regional councils and Māori.

This is a significant piece of legislation that gives central government significant powers in relation to urban development and creates a “bespoke” resource management process for specified development projects.

General process for development

We have set out in the Appendix a step by step diagram that shows the process for proceeding with a development under this Bill, which incorporates the following steps:
- Selection of an urban development project
- Assessment of an urban development project
- Preparation of a project assessment report
- Decision on whether to establish a specified development project
- Preparation of a draft development plan
- Decision on draft development plan
- Effect of a development plan becoming operative

Land acquisition powers

The Bill gives Kāinga Ora the power to acquire land for ‘specified works’ that it is initiating, facilitating or undertaking. Specified works are a work for the purpose of urban development and which includes 1 or more of the following:
- housing
- urban renewal
- a transport network
- water, energy, or telecommunications infrastructure
- a community facility
- a facility for emergency services
- a waste disposal or recycling facility
- a reserve or other public space
- a crematorium or cemetery (including urupā)
- a work to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects of natural hazards or climate change
- the reinstatement elsewhere of a work located on land that is set apart, acquired, or taken pursuant to these provisions of the Bill
- any other work that is a public work within the meaning of section 2 of the Public Works Act 1981

However, where the work is to be used for a commercial or industrial purpose, ‘specified work’ is limited to where it is for community facilities, it supports the development of housing or it involves urban renewal.
The land that can be acquired for a specified work falls into three main categories:

1. Land containing an existing public work
2. Crown land or a part of the common marine and coastal area
3. Private land and other land

In each case Kāinga Ora may make a request to the Minister of Land for the transfer of the land whether or not it intends to undertake the development itself or to transfer the land for the purposes of development.

Before making the request, the responsible Minister must consult the Minister for Treaty of Waitangi Negotiations, then the consent of the Minister for Transport or the Minister of Conservation (as appropriate) if the request is to set apart a part of the common marine and coastal area (except where a development plan already provides for the setting apart).

For existing public works, the Minister of Land may, at Kāinga Ora’s request, transfer an existing public work and transfer, acquire or take the land on which the public work is located. The transfer will be in accordance with the provisions for acquiring Crown land or other land where the land is owned by a local authority.

Where Crown land or part of the common marine and coastal area is being acquired the Minister may declare that the land set apart for the specified work by notice in the Gazette.

Where private or other land is being acquired the Minister must do so in accordance with Part 2 of the Public Works Act 1961, which applies as if the specified work were a government work. The Minister must publish a notice in the Gazette, twice give public notification and serve a notice on the owner and persons with a registered interest in the land.

Where private or other land is acquired then compensation may be claimed in accordance with Part 5 of the Public Works Act 1961 or alternatively the person entitled to compensation can agree the compensation, of any amount and in any form, in writing with Kāinga Ora.

Once acquired, the land will vest in fee simple with Kāinga Ora, rather than with the Crown. The Record of Title for the land must note the specified work for which the land is held.

Kāinga Ora has the power to transfer land for specified work to developers. However, any transfer is subject to preconditions relating to a development agreement, consultation requirements, and compliance with particular requirements if the land is former Māori land or right of first refusal land.

The Bill places restrictions on the acquisition of land defined as ‘protected land’ (in fact, the exercise of any power in the Bill in relation to this land) which is land that is absolutely protected from acquisition and development. That land is nature and scenic reserves, national parks, conservation areas, wildlife sanctuaries, refugee or management reserves, Māori customary land, Māori reserves and reservations, any part of the common marine and coastal area in which customary Māori title or protected customary rights have been recognised, land that is a natural feature that has been declared by an Act to be a legal entity or person and the maunga listed in the Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act.

Other categories of land are protected from compulsory acquisition but may be developed using powers under the Bill if the owners of the land provide their prior consent. This includes Māori freehold land, certain types of general land held by Māori, land held by a post-settlement governance entity, and land held by or on behalf of an iwi or hapū if the land was transferred with the intention of returning the land to the holders of mana whenua. The Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011 (MACA Act), is to prevail over the Bill in the event of any inconsistency, however no specific protection is provided in the MACA Act in respect of any area that is subject to pending proceedings under the MACA Act. The Bill is also subject to any Treaty Settlement Act or deed, and Tūranga Whenua Māori Act 1993.

Implications for territorial authorities

The specified development project assessment process (which is set out in detail in the Appendix) and short statutory timeframes for a territorial authority to respond to a draft report, highlight the importance of early engagement between Kāinga Ora and territorial authorities and the importance of dialogue on an ongoing basis.

The implications of a specified development project being established are that in the transitional period which starts once the development project is established by Order in Council and generally ends when the project’s development plan becomes operative:

- The planning instruments that apply in a project area continue to apply
- A local authority that has functions in respect of activities to be undertaken in a project area will continue to be the consent authority, unless it decides to transfer consenting functions under the RMA to Kāinga Ora
- When preparing or changing a plan that would apply in the relevant project area, the territorial authority must have regard to the project area and project objectives to the extent that their content has a bearing on resource management issues in the district.
When a plan change is being prepared, Kāinga Ora has the power to decide that the plan change or any part of it will not apply in the project area and to give written notice to the local authority of that decision. Kāinga Ora may only do so if it considers that it is reasonably necessary to make that decision in order to achieve the project objectives for the relevant specified development project. There is a right of appeal to the High Court on matters of law only in relation to the Kāinga Ora decision.

During the transitional period, for an activity within the project area, if a resource consent application or application to change conditions is received for within the project area, then before consent may be granted, or a condition changed, it must give the application and certain information to Kāinga Ora for a decision from it. The application cannot be granted if Kāinga Ora decides it should be declined and conditions cannot be imposed that are inconsistent with that decision. There is a right of objection in relation to the Kāinga Ora decision.

Once a development plan for a specified development project is notified as taking effect there are significant implications for a territorial authority. For example:

- Kāinga Ora becomes the consent authority under the RMA for all resource consent applications in the project area if a territorial authority would otherwise be the consent authority. The specific steps set out in the Bill apply to the processing of the application.
- By contrast, this is not the case if a regional council, the Minister for the Environment or the Environmental Protection Authority would be the consent authority. Consent authority status remains with those entities, albeit they will need to follow the specific steps set out in the Bill that apply to the processing of the application.
- Kāinga Ora also has monitoring and enforcement functions in a project area for resource consents which it grants, as well as for activities specified as permitted activities in the district plan or development plan.
- A designation in the project area, other than a designation for a defence area or nationally significant infrastructure, ceases to apply in the project area and only designations included in the development plan have effect in the project area.
- Kāinga Ora becomes the territorial authority for Notices of Requirement for designations within the project area.

As well as replacing many of their functions in project areas, territorial authorities need to be aware that the Bill sets out statutory tests for specified development projects, which are different to those under the RMA. This could result in different environmental outcomes to those under the RMA.

For example, similar to Part 2 of the RMA, clause 5 of the Bill sets out specified principles for specified development projects. In promoting sustainable management of natural and physical resources the matters of national importance in section 6 of the RMA must be recognised and provided for and particular regard must be had to the other matters in section 7 of the RMA. However, clause 5 of the Bill specifies that it is to be recognised that amenity values may change. The clause 5 principles, coupled with the requirement for development plans to not be inconsistent with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and other national policy statements as opposed to the requirement to give effect to those instruments under the RMA, could result in a lesser level of amenity and environmental protection for a project area and the surrounding environment.

Territorial authorities also need to be aware that:

- Kāinga Ora may have existing powers for roads within a project area and it has a range of powers to fund specified development projects. These include the power to set rates, if authorised by the Governor General and the power to require development contributions from persons undertaking developments.
- It will need to include in the electronic versions of its planning instruments a map showing the project area and advice on how to access the relevant development plan.
- There are powers given to Kāinga Ora in relation to proposing amendments to existing bylaws, revoking existing bylaws and making new ones within a specified development project area, in relation to roads and non-road infrastructure that connects or services non-road infrastructure.

Implications for regional councils

The implications for regional councils are more limited but potentially still significant:

- It remains the consent authority within specified development project areas during both the transitional period and once a specified development project becomes operational, unless it chooses to transfer consenting functions to Kāinga Ora in the project area.
- During the transitional period, if a resource consent application or application to change conditions is received for within the project area, then before consent may be granted, or a condition changed, it must give the application and certain information to Kāinga Ora for a decision from it. The application cannot be granted if Kāinga Ora decides it should be declined and conditions cannot be imposed that are inconsistent with that decision. There is a right of objection in relation to the Kāinga Ora decision.
- When preparing or changing a plan that would apply in the relevant project area, the regional council must have regard to the project area and project objectives to the extent that their
content has a bearing on resource management issues in the region.

- When a plan change is being prepared, Kāinga Ora has the power to decide that the plan change or any part of it will not apply in the project area and to give written notice to the local authority of that decision. Kāinga Ora may only do so if it considers that it is reasonably necessary to make that decision in order to achieve the project objectives for the relevant specified development project. There is a right of appeal to the High Court on matters of law only in relation to the Kāinga Ora decision.

- Once a development plan for a specified development project is operative the specific steps set out in the Bill apply to the processing of resource consent applications.

- There are amendments to regional council's functions where there are joint hearings.

- It will need to include in the electronic versions of its planning instruments a map showing the project area and advice on where to access the relevant development plan.

**Implications for Māori**

The Bill complements the Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities Act 2019. A function of that Act is to understand, support, and enable the aspirations of Māori in relation to urban development. It also provides that one of the operating principles of Kāinga Ora is that it will partner and engage early and meaningfully with Māori communities when undertaking urban development. The Bill sets out in more detail the obligations of Kāinga Ora to Māori in urban development.

Clause 4 of the Bill states that in achieving the purpose of the Bill, all persons performing functions or exercising powers under it must take into account the principles of Treaty, imposing a legal duty on decision-makers to consider the Treaty principles in the same way as under the RMA. The principles of the Treaty are woven throughout the Bill.

As part of the specified development project process, Kāinga Ora will be required to engage with Māori entities and the former owners of, and the hapū associated with, any former Māori land within a proposed project area, when assessing a proposal to establish a specified development project. This includes seeking expressions of interest from Māori entities to develop, as part of the project, any land within the project area in which they have an interest. It is intended that this will provide an opportunity for Māori to shape the project area and project objectives. Notably, in seeking engagement with Māori, Kāinga Ora must allow adequate time for engagement, taking into account tikanga Māori.

The Bill may create opportunities for Māori developers. The Bill sets out a new approach to rights of first refusal (RFRs), designed to support Māori aspirations in urban development and to enable participation in development opportunities. Where Kāinga Ora wishes to undertake an urban development project on RFR land it holds or controls, it would be required to engage with the RFR holder and offer the opportunity to undertake the development on specified terms. A development may not proceed unless the RFR holder agrees to participate in the development on those or other terms or to the development going ahead without its involvement. In such a case, the RFR would continue to apply, meaning the RFR holder will (subject to any other requirements) be offered the first opportunity to purchase the land and improvements if they are sold.

**Requiring authorities**

As part of its planning and consent powers under the Bill, Kāinga Ora will have the ability to act as a requiring authority under the RMA to create designations inside and outside of project areas. Kāinga Ora is recognized as a requiring authority within a project area, as if it were a network utility operator, subject to the conditions in clause 137(3) being met. The conditions that apply are that the activity:

- is necessary for, or related to, the project objectives for a specified development project, and
- is an activity in which Kāinga Ora
  - is in a significant contractual relationship with the developer, operator, or service provider, and
  - has a direct financial interest in the outcome.

It may also operate as a requiring authority outside the project area of the conditions in clause 137(4) are met. Namely that the activity is one that distributes water for supply, including irrigation; operates a drainage or sewage systems; constructs or operates a road or a railway line and is intended to connect to or support, the development of a specified development project and is necessary for or related to, achieving the project objectives for a specified development project; and is work in which Kāinga Ora is in a significant contractual relationship with the developer, operator, or service provider, and has a direct financial interest in the outcome.

Please contact Kerry Anderson or any of the team if you would like to discuss the Bill, its implications or the submission process in further detail.

Submissions close on 14 February 2020.
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### Appendix - process for specified development projects

**Urban development project selected by:**

- Kāinga Ora assesses the project, or
- Joint Ministers direct Kāinga Ora to assess the project
- Can be a potential project or one already being carried out

**‘Key features’ of specified development project are identified by Kāinga Ora, which must be:**

- Project objectives (key outcomes and outputs that the project aims to deliver)
- Defined project area (which does not need to be contiguous)
- Project governance body

**Kāinga Ora assesses project:**

- Identifies constraints and opportunities listed in clause 34
- Seeks engagement from Māori and identified stakeholders and expressions of interest from Māori in developing any land within the project area
- Considers the identified constraints and opportunities, feedback from engagement and anything else it considers relevant
- Refines ‘key features’ if necessary
- Publicly notifies the assessment and considers any feedback received
- Determines whether to recommend the project be established and if so, the key features to recommend

**Kāinga Ora prepares project assessment report:**

If recommending not establishing project the report must ‘broadly’ describe and assess project

If recommending it is established, then report must include:

- Summary of the project assessment
- Recommendation that it is established, together with recommended key features
- Concept plan showing general layout once project is delivered
- Confirmation from Minister of Conservation (if conservation-related area included)
- If governance body is not Kāinga Ora, confirmation that the governance body has agreed to be appointed
- Responses from each relevant territorial authority (they are required to indicate whether they support it and any conditions)

**Joint Ministers make a decision whether to establish specified development project (discretionary, even if the criteria are met):**

The following criteria apply to the decision:

- Appropriate for a project to be established with the key features recommended (having regard to clauses 3-5)
- Project objectives are consistent with the purpose and principles in clauses 3-5 and consistent with national directions under the RMA
- The project area contains only land that is generally suitable for urban development and if it contains conservation-related land, that the Minister of Conservation has provided approval
- The boundaries of the project area are clearly defined and identifiable
- If the governance body is not Kāinga Ora, be satisfied that the governance body has agreed to be appointed
- That engagement was appropriate
- That there is general support from relevant territorial authorities or the project is in the national interest

---

**Attachment A**

**Item 22**
If joint Ministers decide to establish, an Order in Council is issued

Kāinga Ora prepares a draft development plan

For the purpose of preparing, amending or reviewing a development plan, Kāinga Ora has the following functions:

- Establishing, implementing and reviewing the objectives of any planning instrument and the policies, rules and methods to achieve the project objectives
- Controlling the actual or potential effects of the use development and protection of land to achieve the project objectives, ensure there is sufficient land for residential and business development, avoid or mitigate risks from natural hazards and to develop or provide for development of infrastructure.
- Ensuring that there are rules to control the emission of noise and mitigate its effects, about any actual and potential effects of activities in relation to the surface water in rivers and lakes and to control subdivision.

It must have regard to:

- Regional policy statements, regional plans and district plans
- Regional land transport plans
- Long term plans of local authorities
- Relevant planning documents recognised by an iwi authority and lodged with a TA
- Emissions reduction plan or national adaptation plan

It must take into account:

- Matters set out in section 101(3)(a) and (b) of the LGA 2002 if it considering including development contributions, targeted rates, or an administrative charge as a funding source
- A development plan must not be inconsistent with an NPS, NZCPs, NES or other regulations, the National Planning Standards and any national land transport policy

It must consult with:

- Owners and occupiers of land within the project area
- Maori and key stakeholders set out in clause 35(2) and (3)
- Reserve administrators
- Members of a standing committee in the project area, who were appointed under iwi participation legislation (It must also have particular regard to any comment given)
- Any Minister of the Crown affected

It may choose to consult with any other person who has an interest.

The development plan must enable the project objectives to be achieved and make provision for any Treaty settlement obligations applying in the project area.

The draft development plan must:

- Include a structure plan
- Include conditions, if imposed by the Minister of Conservation, on the use of a specified reserve or the coastal marine area, acquisition of land

Transitional period commences

Local authorities are notified of the establishment order and specified development projects are published on the internet

The transitional period means that plan changes, new resource consent applications and changes or cancellations of conditions of existing resource consent in the project area are subject to the powers and process changes in the Bill and other requirements, as follows:

- A map of the project area must be included in all electronic versions of planning instruments, without using a Schedule 1 process
- Consenting functions can be transferred to Kāinga Ora
- During any district or regional plan change the Council must have regard to the project area and relevant project objectives
- Any plan change must be notified to Kāinga Ora 20 working days prior to approval/adoptions of the plan change
- Where a plan change applies to a project area, Kāinga Ora can decide that the plan change will not apply to the project area, provided notice is provided within 15 working days of receiving notice of the proposed plan change. This decision can be appealed to the High Court on matters of law only
- Any resource consent application for an activity within the project area or change to conditions
subject to a conservation interest and the use of any other land integral to those conditions

- Describe any relevant participation arrangement or redress under any iwi participation legislation
- Set out any modifications to be made to objectives, policies, methods and rules in planning instruments to enable the project objectives to be achieved
- Set out any applicable statement of resource management issues of significance to a Māori entity within the district or region as required by iwi participation legislation
- Set out the rules for public notification of a controlled or restricted discretionary activity (unless the evaluation report justifies not doing so)
- Set out any designations that apply in the project area
- State whether Kāinga Ora has or does not have the roading powers for the project, the relevant date from which it has those powers, the extent of non-roading infrastructure and whether bylaw changes are proposed
- Set out the sources of funding and if they include a development contribution or targeted rate, administrative charges the draft policies/details of those mechanisms, including any remissions
- Identify any material incorporated by reference

Kāinga Ora prepares supporting documents to the draft development plan:

An evaluation report that addresses:

- Whether the proposals in the draft development plan are the most appropriate way to achieve the project objectives
- Costs and benefits (quantified, if practicable)
- The risk of acting or not acting
- Consistency with a relevant NES
- Summaries of the responses from key stakeholders
- Information on specific land within the project area
- How environmental constraints and opportunities will be managed, a broad assessment of the likely effects and if relevant, how heritage values have been provided for

An infrastructure statement that:

- Describes the infrastructure proposed and the effect of the proposed infrastructure on existing infrastructure
- States whether Kāinga Ora has entered into any binding agreements with any infrastructure provider
- Discloses whether Kāinga Ora proposes to construct new infrastructure on land not controlled by Kāinga Ora and whether it has obtained the consent of the owner of that land
- States where further information will be available about the progress of the construction of the proposed infrastructure
- Identifies the expected total costs of construction of the proposed infrastructure

application must be provided by the Council to Kāinga Ora

- Kāinga Ora can then decline to grant all or part of the consent or modify conditions of the consent. The applicant or consent holder may object to this decision
Preconditions to public notification of the draft development plan

Kāinga Ora must be satisfied the requirements of clauses 62-74 have been met, and it must:

- Advise the responsible Minister and the Ministers for the Environment, Māori Development, Māori Crown Relations—Te Arawhiti and Treaty of Waitangi Negotiations of the draft development plan
- Have confirmation from the Minister for Māori Crown Relations—Te Arawhiti that any participation arrangement or redress having effect in all or part of the project area has been identified in the draft development plan; and the draft development plan provides adequately for those matters
- If any Māori land is included in a project area, have confirmation from the Minister for Māori Development that the plan is consistent with the principles set out in the Preamble to Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993

It must also have:

- Approval from the Minister of Conservation for any provisions which suspend or override a regional coastal plan
- Land owner agreement to any revocation or cancellation of conservation interest in land that is not owned by Kāinga Ora
- If a coastal marine area, reserve, or land subject to conservation interest is affected, approvals are required from the Minister of Conservation

Kāinga Ora publicly notifies the draft development plan and calls for submissions and then considers and makes recommendations on them to the IHP

Minister appoints IHP to consider draft development plan and submissions and provide recommendations to the Minister

IHP must consider and provide recommendations with 9 months of the close of submission to the Minister. It must have regard to:

- All information provided by Kāinga Ora
- Any information obtained by the IHP in response to an information request
- The purpose and principles of the Act in clauses 3-5
- Any relevant matters in a NPS, NZCPS, NES, national planning standards, regulations, any national land transport policy, regional policy statements, regional plans, district plans, regional land transport plans, regional public transport plans, long term plans, Urban Design Protocol (2005), any relevant planning documents recognised by an iwi authority and emissions reduction plan or national adaptation plan

- The project objectives

Kāinga Ora provides advice to the Minister on IHP’s recommendations

Minister decides on development plan and must consider the planning documents referred to above that the IHP must consider and give reasons for decision
If Minister accepts the development plan, notified as operative in the Gazette

Appeals to High Court on questions of law only

Effect of development plan becoming operative:
From the date of notification Kāinga Ora has the following powers:

- It is the consent authority for resource consent applications and it must follow the decision making framework in the Bill (see below)
- It is the territorial authority for notices of requirements for designations in the project area
- Only designations included in the development plan have effect in the project area - any other one ceases to apply
- It can set apart reserves or create new ones and can also revoke or cancel conservation interests
- It can exercise infrastructure powers and may use funding mechanisms

Planning instruments continue to apply in the project area, unless overridden by, added to, or suspended by the development plan. In the event of inconsistency, the development plan prevails. However, the development plan does not override or have any effect on an iwi planning document.

Kāinga Ora also takes on the functions of monitoring, enforcing and promoting compliance in the the project area for resource consents granted by Kāinga Ora, and permitted activities in the district plan or development plan. Kāinga Ora may authorise enforcement officers.

Review of development plan

Kāinga Ora may review a development plan at any time.

A development plan must be reviewed not later than 10 years after notification, unless a different time period is specified in the development plan.

Amendment of a development plan

Kāinga Ora may amend a development plan, provided the appropriate process is followed, and the amendment is required to achieve the project objectives.

A private plan change may be made to request the way in which a planning instrument is modified by a development plan, subject to limitations, including that the request must be two years after the development plan became operative and must be made in writing and include the purpose and reason for the change, together with an evaluation report.

The resource consent decision making framework:

The Bill includes a process that:

- addresses the form of the application and what amounts to a complete application
- applies certain provisions of the RMA (sections 88A-88E, 89, 89A, 91, 91A-91C, 92, 92A and 92B) and provisions relating to making submissions, hearings, conditions and commencement
- applies the RMA notification provisions, unless the development plan either requires or precludes notification
- requires a decision within 10 working of lodgement on non-notified consents that are controlled or restricted discretionary land use or subdivision activities and within 20 working days for all other application. For notified applications, it is within 15 working days of the hearing or 20 working days after the close of submissions if no hearing
- provides for appeals to the Environment Court, as if it were an appeal under section 120 of the RMA
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Governance Forward Work Calendar

File No.: CP2020/01741

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To present the board with the governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The governance forward work calendar for the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board is in Attachment A.
3. The calendar aims to support local boards’ governance role by:
   • ensuring advice on meeting agendas is driven by local board priorities
   • clarifying what advice is required and when
   • clarifying the rationale for reports.
4. The calendar is updated every month. Each update is reported to business meetings. It is recognised that at times items will arise that are not programmed. Board members are welcome to discuss changes to the calendar.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:
a) note the attached Governance Forward Work Calendar.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Calendar February 2020</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tracey Freeman - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Puketapapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reports highlighted in blue text reflect a change where a new report is expected or change on the planned date has occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Business meeting report topic</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Auckland Climate Action Framework</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March/April</td>
<td>Signage Bylaw 2015</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Auckland Waters Strategy</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water supply and wastewater bylaw review</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Annual planning (LBA) agree feedback and advocacy</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Open Space Management Framework</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Record of Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Workshops

File No.: CP2020/01804

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide a summary of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board workshops for 4, 11 and 18 February 2020.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Local board workshops are held to give board members an opportunity to receive information and updates or provide direction and have discussion on issues and projects relevant to the local board area. No binding decisions are made or voted on at workshop sessions.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) note the local board record of workshops held on 4, 11 and 18 February 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Record of Workshops February 2020</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tracey Freeman - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Puketapapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workshop record of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board held on 4 February 2020, commencing at 10.00am.

PRESENT

Members present for all or part of the workshop day:

- Chris Makoare
- Debbie Burrows
- Don Allan
- Maria Meredith
- Nerissa Henry
- Peter McGlashan
- Tony Woodcock

Apologies: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assurance Services – Conflicts of Interest</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board members are well informed on conflicts of interest, as well as the services that the Assurance Services team provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Glassey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Governance</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board are aware of how financial governance works, and the role the board members play in their decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Gan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaki Reserve Development</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board members were provided with an update on the progress of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Keat, Catalina Vorcelli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities Leasing</td>
<td>Keeping informed &amp; setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>The board members discussed the CF Leasing work programme and provided feedback to help inform next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Vui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 2.30pm.
Workshop record of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board held on 11 February 2020, commencing at 10am.

**PRESENT**

Members present for all or part of the workshop day:

- Chris Makoare
- Debbie Burrows
- Don Allan
- Maria Meredith
- Nerissa Henry
- Peter McGlashan
- Tony Woodcock

Apologies: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Board Plan</strong></td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>The board members provided feedback on the strawman to help inform next steps in developing the Local Board Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie McFadyen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Places work programme</strong></td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>The Community Places work programme for FY 19/20 was discussed, and the board provided feedback on the recommendations provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Waugh, Jenni Heka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks, Sport and Recreation</strong></td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>The board provided feedback and input into the proposed activation programme for FY 20/21 that was presented to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Gear, Darryl Hamilton, Sanjeev Karan, Peter Caccioppoli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waikaraka Park Draft Reserve Management Plan</strong></td>
<td>Keeping informed &amp; setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>The board received an update on the progress of the draft reserve management plan, and provided feedback on the draft vision, objectives and policies as well as the board’s expectations on the draft masterplan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Lee, Shyrel Burt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Southern Initiative – Youth Connections</strong></td>
<td>Keeping informed &amp; setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>The board received an update on the progress of various programmes delivered for Youth Connections. The board also provided feedback on the proposed work programme for FY 20/21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhaya Haran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 2.30pm.
Workshop record of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board held on Tuesday 18 February 2020, commencing at 10.00am.

**PRESENT**

Members present for all or part of the workshop day:

- Chris Makoare
- Debbie Burrows
- Don Allan
- Maria Meredith
- Nerissa Henry
- Peter McGlashan
- Tony Woodcock

Apologies: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of the Grants Programme 2021</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>The board provided feedback to help develop the grants programme for FY 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manon Davies, Moumita Dutta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEU – Rent Smart</td>
<td>Keeping informed &amp; Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>The board members were provided with an update on the progress of the Rent Smart programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Foster, Natalie Hansby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Facilities Auckland</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board members were provided with an update on all that Regional Facilities Auckland manages, including Mt Smart Stadium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Parkinson, Paul Hisbet, Judy Lawley, Maree Laurent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Oro</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>A discussion took place around the six key priorities within the Te Oro Charter. The board has requested another workshop to determine what the governance model might look like which will help to inform next steps going forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities Risk Adjusted Programme</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Board members were advised what the Risk Adjusted Programme (RAP) is, and how it can be utilized within the board’s community facilities work programme lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui Foll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 2.30pm.