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Kim Lawgun

From: Russell Glenister
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2020 7:55 AM
To: Kim Lawgun
Subject: Fwd: shared cycle ways

In light of the current situation I feel I do not wish to add risk and will not be attending the meeting. I would only be reiterating my case as stated in my original email dated 3 March. I therefore request that this email be tabled.

Many thanks
Russell Glenister.

On 3 Mar 2020, at 1:25 pm, Russell Glenister wrote:

Hi,

I am a regular user of the waterfront footpath/cycle way between Mission Bay and St Heliers and regularly see cyclists travelling at unrealistic speeds which would cause serious injury or worse to little kids (or adults) who wonder across the white line.

I came close myself when stepping on to the pavement from between parked cars narrowly avoiding a "high speed" cyclist and getting abused at the same time.

If I had taken one more step it would have been "nasty".

Surely there has to be warnings with suggested max speeds on these cycle ways before serious injuries or worse occur. This is a high risk area when an 85 kg cyclist plus bike is travelling at maybe 40 kph (or more)
at very close proximity to sometimes unaware pedestrians, in particular little kids.

I rang a community board member who suggested maybe I should come along to one of your meeting to state my case,

I thrust this gets a positive response and we can get something done before it is too late,

Yours sincerely Russell Glenister.
18th March 2020

Orakei Local Board
135 Albert Street
Auckland Central

Dear Scott, Sarah, Troy, Colin, Troy, David and Margaret,

The purpose of this letter is to give a brief update.

As you are now aware the bulk of The Landing users have recently come together and have formally become "TOLSA" – The Okahu Landing Stakeholders Association. TOLSA was created to umbrella, coordinate and facilitate the development and operations of the Multi-sport Paddling Centre identified in the Concept plan for The Landing at Pokana Point, Okahu Bay, adopted by the Orakei Local Board in 2013.

The Trust has been established by the following stakeholders/user groups;

- Auckland Canoe Club
- Hauraki Sports Club
- Okahu Bay Waterwise
- Orakei Water Sports
- The Orakei Marina
- The Okahu Landing Hardstand

The association is made up of representatives, who are from the bulk of the key user groups that created the formalised 2013 concept plan, Chaired by Donna Tamaariki from Orakei Water Sports.

As a group, TOLSA have recently been made aware that the Orakei Local Board are considering revisiting or "refreshing" the 2013 Concept plan for the site.
TOLSA are expressly against this happening and question both the ethics and legality of doing so.

The Orakei Local Board worked with us, as stakeholders, to create the concept plan.

As users and stakeholders, we have waited patiently for the AMST to complete their build (the original programme was two years, it has in fact taken seven years) and now it seems that as a Board you are justifying “refreshing” the concept plan due to “changes” taking place at The Landing. The reality is that there are changes at The Landing – a fourteen-million-dollar function centre and café have been built within the footprint that was given to the AMST as part of the concept plan. Had the eastern end development been implemented first, there would be considerable changes on / in the site as well! This is not a reason to refresh the concept plan.

Sometime after the completion of the concept plan, when it was obvious the AMST did not have the funds to progress the project, the eastern end users asked the then Orakei Local Board for permission to start the development of eastern end. All other components of the concept plan were to wait until the completion of the AMST (then the Royal Akarana Yacht Club) development. This directive from the Board, compounded by the seven years it has taken for the AMST to complete their building has resulted in no further implementation of the agreed concept plan at The Landing.

Since the Concept Plan was adopted, stakeholders have presented to the Orakei Local Board, several times.

Some examples:

*Orakei Local Board 01 May 2014 - MINUTES*

9.2 Ōkahu Moana - Marine Activities and Education Centre Resolution number OR/2014/5 MOVED by Chairperson DEC Simpson, seconded by Member CH Cooke: That the Orakei Local Board: a) thanks Tupara Morrison and Donna Tamaariki, Ngāti Whātua Orakei, Moana Tamaariki-Pohe, Orakei Watersports, Jim Walker, Waterwise Auckland and Ian Calhaem, Canoe Club for their presentation on Ōkahu Moana - Marine Activities and Education Centre. b) notes that The Landing- Eastern End Development Proposal will be discussed at item 13. CARRIED

13 The Landing - Eastern End Development Proposal

Resolution number OR/2014/13 MOVED by Chairperson DEC Simpson, seconded by Member CRJ Davis: That the Orakei Local Board: a) receives the report. CARRIED

Resolution number OR/2014/14 MOVED by Chairperson DEC Simpson, seconded by Member CH Cooke: That the Orakei Local Board: b) approves in principle the concept design for the eastern end development of Ōkahu Moana - Marine Activities and Education Centre at The Landing as presented, noting that as the design...
progresses the location of public ablutions and the use of the event facility space noted on the concept is to be agreed with the Board. CARRIED

Orākei Local Board 01 May 2014 Minutes Page 9 Resolution number OR/2014/15
MOVED by Chairperson DEC Simpson, seconded by Member CH Cooke: That the Orākei Local Board: c) notes that a food outlet or café operated by the Ōkahu Moana - Marine Activities and Education Centre is supported in principle but its purpose should be complementary to the users and that the nature and location of any food outlet needs to be confirmed with the Board. CARRIED

Secretarial Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 3.15.5, Member’s Churton and Parkinson requested that their dissenting vote be recorded.

Resolution number OR/2014/16 MOVED by Chairperson DEC Simpson, seconded by Member CH Cooke: That the Orākei Local Board: d) confirms its intention to work with Orākei Water Sports, Auckland Canoe Club, Hauraki Water Sports, Ferris kayak, Waterwise Auckland and Auckland Sailing Club to progress a Ngāti Whātua Orākei led development of a proposal for a marine activities and education centre at the eastern end of The Landing, noting that further discussions are required to agree an appropriate structure for any future potential lease arrangement. CARRIED

Secretarial Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 3.15.5, Member Churton requested that his dissenting vote be recorded.

As a group, we ask you, the Board to support and help us as users and stakeholders to deliver the remaining components of the concept plan, primarily the eastern end development so we can get on with creating a world class paddling precinct. Ideally, in time for the Americas Cup (AC36).

The TOLSA members have several ideas to activate and invigorate the landing and the bay. This includes waka ama races, concerts on a barge, sailing waka exhibitions races and hosting spectators of the AC races.

Oakahu Bay and Orakei are unique we would like the opportunity to share them.

We are aware that Council have ended all leases on the buildings (again this is one of the deliverables that council committed to as part of the concept plan) at the eastern end of the site and as a result ask that you support TOLSA taking the leases on the buildings. This will allow us to continue our funding process and commit to the next stage of detailed design.

Lastly, we ask that you make it a priority, to secure funding from within Council that will prioritise the implementation of the main entrance reconfiguration and the dinghy ramp installation on the site as they were both highlighted as considerable Health and Safety issues in 2013 and whilst we understand that reports and designs have been considered, nothing has changed on site.
Members are available to meet with all or any of you in person at any time to discuss any of the above.

Kind Regards,

The Landing Stakeholders

Scott Fickling
Donna Tamaariki
Mark Schmack
Ian Calhaem
Graeme Godbehere

Okahu Bay,
Hardstand
Orakei Water
Sports
Orakei Marina
Auckland Canoe Club
Hauraki Water Sports
That the Ōrākei Local Board:

i) support the principle of Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs) and does not support the re-integration of the activities and services that the CCOs currently deliver back into the Governing Body. The Board is aware that this is more difficult in any case for Watercare and Auckland Transport which are governed by and operate under different legislation to the other CCOs.

ii) wish to see a change of culture in a number of the CCOs, especially Panuku and Auckland Transport, where there is a perceived lack of understanding of local interests and the effects of their decisions on communities, a poor level of communication and explanation of actions and at times an attitude bordering on arrogance, especially on the part of Auckland Transport. There seems to be a lack of understanding and/or recognition of the two equal parts of Auckland Council i.e. the Governing Body and Local Boards. Local communities regularly tell us that there seems to be no accountability on issues raised with Auckland Transport to local residents and ratepayers.

iii) queries the role of ATEED which seems to have ever-reducing input into local economic development and ever-increasing role in bypassing local issues and concerns with its regional events. The Board advocate that the activities and functions of ATEED should either be brought in-house or contracted out.

iv) believe a substantial re-writing of the statements of intent or MOUs for a number of CCOs (AT and Panuku) is overdue. Better mechanisms of accountability and communication with Local Boards are necessary.

v) recommend that the Governing Body has a stronger role in appointing CCO boards. There should be guidelines and directions to board appointees that clearly reflect an agreed strategy set by Council (Governing Body and Local Boards) for the direction they wish the CCOs to take. In the process of being appointed to a Board, applicants should acknowledge and agree to operate by these guidelines. Board appointees should be censured during their term by the Governing Body if they do not adhere to these guidelines. There could also be a mechanism set up (like an ombudsman or Local Government Commission appeal process) to address conduct issues or to resolve governance issues when a CCO Board’s decision conflicts with the Governing Body decisions.

vi) believe the financial imperative for Panuku to be profit-driven should be rebalanced as it is currently compromising good community outcomes as experienced by Local Boards. Rationalisation of open space has merit in some instances, but more commonly it runs against the need for open space in a rapidly growing city. Local Boards views on open space needs within its own area seem to be ignored by Panuku.

vii) wish to note the Local Board’s experience of the optimisation process has been extremely positive in how it has enabled a new community facility to be built, hopefully at a much reduced cost to ratepayers.

viii) believe feedback mechanisms, both directly to the Board and/or via the Governing Body, should be developed to enable Local Boards to inform CCOs about local effects of CCO action and that actions resulting from such feedback form part of the annual review of CCO performance. There should also be free and frank financial accountability (disclosure) to the elected members and within the Council family – not
the attitude that seems to prevail where information is provided on a "need to know" basis.

ix) note an absence of relationship building in recent times and an element of autonomous decision making which lacked consultation and collaboration.

x) note that under section 11.3.3 of the Auckland Council Governance manual states:

a. “Local Board Engagement Plans - CCOs are accountable to the Council through the Governing Body”. They are required to **proactively build relationships with Local Boards**, as well as develop engagement plans with them. The requirements for Local Board engagement plans are set out in the Governance Manual.

The Board wishes to see this section of the manual implemented.

xi) recommend that CCO executive management be measured on tangible KPIs and performance measures eg. reduction in expenditure; number of days certain arterial routes have not been obstructed or closed due to road works; transparency and equity of spend in the 21 Local Board areas.

xii) recommend that CCO strategic and operational plans have environmental, social and governance goals which are planned down to Local Board level.

xiii) recommend that service level agreements be established for the 21 Local Boards with AT – so the Local Board can decide collaboratively how planning initiatives, public works and projects will be effectively and efficiently delivered for the Board’s areas; on a timely basis.
1. The Ōrākei Local Board has only one of the 14 Maunga under the administration of the Tupuna Maunga Authority viz Ōhinerau-Mount Hobson. Another Maunga, Maungarei-Mount Wellington is on the boundary between the Tāmaki-Maungakiekie and the Ōrākei Local Boards and the Stonefields suburb.

2. The summary background information about the Tūpuna Maunga Authority is very interesting and informative.

3. However, the Board notes that the summary does not refer to the Tūpuna Taonga o Tāmaki Makaurau Trust. We understand that the Trust is the entity that holds the title of and is therefore the legal owner of the Maunga.

4. The Board is aware that the Trust has retained specific ownership and control of a few buildings on Maunga. One such property is at 11 Mt Hobson Lane, adjacent to Ōhinerau – Mount Hobson. In the particular context of Ōhinerau – Mount Hobson and the Operational Plan and Auckland Council funding, reference to the Trust is considered very important.

5. No. 11 Mt Hobson Lane is at the end of a cul-de-sac, adjacent to one of the entrances to the Maunga. While retention of the building may not be considered by some to fall within the seven Tupuna Maunga values expressed in the summary document, the villa, built ca1900-1915, was recorded by the Auckland Council’s Specialist Built Heritage – Policy, Heritage Unit, Plans and Places Department, Chief Planning Office, as having heritage characteristics important to the area’s history, and while it might not be eligible for statutory scheduling in the Unitary Plan, it nonetheless should be retained and its history further investigated. The Board considers restoration is consistent with and could be considered as supporting one of the seven Tūpuna Maunga Values listed in the Plan – Mana Aoturoa/Cultural and Heritage values, one of which is to “recognise European and other histories and interaction with the Maunga”.

6. It is understood that Auckland Council's CCO, Panuku, had been managing this property at the time the asset was transferred and was rented as a residential tenancy. Unfortunately, the house is no longer tenanted, and it is not known why the empty house has been allowed to deteriorate to a very poor state of repair which detracts from the amenity of the street of well-kept buildings and grounds. The Board is concerned that if the building is allowed to remain empty it will attract the homeless, be vandalised (graffiti is visible on interior walls) and could be a target for arson.

7. While the legislation provides for funding and staff resourcing through the Auckland Council for the maintenance of the Maunga, it is understood the Trust, as owner of the Maunga and specific properties associated with the Maunga, such as 11 Mt Hobson Lane, is not so funded. The Board would like to offer to assist the Trust in its role of kaitiaki for the property at 11 Mt Hobson Lane which might then enable Council's funding to be used to renovate the building to a habitable condition for tenancy, for use by the Trust and/or the Authority, or made available for community groups and meetings. This is also reinforced under the Development section of priority programme and projects – “commercial activities to develop alternative
revenue streams to invest in the protection and enhancement of the values of the Tupuna Maunga”. The outcome could be beneficial for iwi and the wider community.

8. The draft Operational Plan is light on detail on specific projects to be delivered or commenced in the coming financial year and subsequent years. While the Board supports in principle projects such as protection and restoration of the tihi, pest eradication, making quality access and pathways, and protection of historic sites, it is difficult for the Board to be more specific in its feedback as there is very little information provided to assist the Board to comment on projects which might be carried out on Ōhinerau – Mount Hobson.

9. Of concern, is the statement under “Development” – removal of redundant infrastructure. Although some examples are given, the Board is concerned that this outcome is subjective and would prefer in the case of Ōhinerau – Mount Hobson for a positive statement that the war memorial seat and daffodil plantings will not be removed as part of this programme (this would satisfy the concerns of residents of the area) and on a wider note that the trig stations on various Maunga will not be removed.

10. Under “Healing”, mention is made of “removing inappropriate exotic trees and weeds”. The Annual Vegetation Maintenance programme for Ohinerau – Mount Hobson includes control of Dutch Elm and mature vegetation along Remuera Road, with a budget of $25,000 for each of the next three years. The Board and residents of the area would be concerned if this programme meant removal of the long-established oak trees along the Remuera Road side of, in particular, and other significant healthy exotic specimens. The Board strongly recommends their retention. By retaining these trees there is recognition of European histories and interaction with this Maunga, as expressed in the Mana Aoturoa/Cultural and Heritage values of the document.

Ōrākei Local Board