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1 Welcome

Deputy Chair Julie Fairey will deliver the welcome message.

2 Apologies

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

3 Declaration of Interest

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

4 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Thursday, 20 February 2020, as true and correct.

5 Leave of Absence

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

6 Acknowledgements

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

7 Petitions

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

8 Deputations

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

8.1 Deputations - YMCA Auckland - Sharing the plan from Raise Up the YMCA Youth Development Programme running at Lynfield Youth and Leisure Centre

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To provide an opportunity for YMCA and YMCA North to present to the board the plan for Raise Up the YMCA development programme running at the Lynfield Youth and Leisure Centre.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. Chelsey Harnell (YMCA) and Adam Brown-Rigg (Youth Development Manager YMCA North) will be present to speak on the plan.
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) thank Chelsey Harnell (YMCA) and Adam Brown-Rigg (Youth Development Manager YMCA North) for their presentation

Attachments
A 20200319 Deputation - YMCA ................................................................. 169

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 Public Forum - Care and Respect in the Community - Chair of Body Corporate for Onyx Apartments

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To deliver a presentation to the Local Board during the Public Forum segment of the business meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Paul Hemsley, Chair of Body Corporate for Onyx Apartments will be in attendance to present on the subject titled “Care and respect in the Community”.

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

a) receive Paul Hemsley – Chair of Body Corporate of Onyx Apartments presentation and thank Paul for his attendance and presentation.

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.”

11 **Notices of Motion**

Under Standing Order 2.5.1 (LBS 3.11.1) or Standing Order 1.9.1 (LBS 3.10.17) (revoke or alter a previous resolution) a Notice of Motion has been received from Member Fairey for consideration under item 12.
Notice of Motion - Member Fairey - Three Kings Development Issues

File No.: CP2020/03315

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

https://acintranet.aklc.govt.nz/EN/workingatcouncil/techandtools/infocouncil/Pages/ExecutiveSummary.aspx

1. Member Fairey has given notice of a motion that they wish to propose.

2. The notice, signed by Member Fairey and Chair Doig as seconder, is appended as Attachment A.

3. Supporting information is appended as Attachment A.

Motion

That the Puketapapa Local Board

a) request an urgent update on progress to complete the second land exchange between Auckland Council and Fletcher Residential Ltd (FRL) in relation to the Three Kings Reserve and depot area, as agreed by Auckland Council, FRL and the Societies and as laid out in the settlement agreement reached between Three Kings United and South Epsom Planning Group with FRL, in lieu of further Court action, noting:

i) the importance of this land exchange to achieving the open space and connection goals laid out in the Three Kings Plan, and as noted in the Environment Court decisions;

ii) that the agreement between FRL and the Societies allows FRL to build on the Western Reserve after June 2020 and for the Societies to take a Judicial review or other proceedings, neither of which would be positive outcomes; and

iii) the strong support of the local board for this land exchange to proceed.

iv) noting that PSR is developing a concept plan for the Western Reserve and that any alternative access to and from adjacent streets should be consistent with this plan; the development of the Western Reserve could be taken into account when finalising commercial terms for the land exchange

b) seek advice as to how Auckland Council’s regulatory and compliance officers are taking a holistic approach to resident complaints in relation to works on the quarry site, and looking at them as a group of issues that are impinging on local residents over a long period of time and may have a cumulative effect, rather than as one-off incidents occurring in isolation.

c) ask FRL to work with the Local Board to improve their public communications regarding changes to the carpark on Grahame Breed Dr, and access points to the area usually referred to as Western Reserve, Three Kings Reserve and Big King Reserve, during works in the carpark area, and encourage them to liaise closely with Tupuna Maunga Authority and the Local Board as adjacent land owners, including at the least;
Item 12

i) maps at all park entrances of the closures and redirections;

ii) a letter drop to the local area

iii) meeting with each of the facilities in the area to discuss the carpark changes, including the Mt Roskill Library, CAB, Club Physical, and regular hirers at the Fickling Centre

iv) visiting those living adjacent to the remaining access points, in particular on Fyvie Ave, and monitoring the impact on them through the alternative access arrangements

d) ask FRL to investigate

i) providing sections of the Grahame Breed carpark as an unsealed informal carparking area for users of local facilities as construction works allow, once remediation is complete.

ii) providing more accessible alternative routes to Western Park, Three Kings Reserve and Big King Reserve than they have proposed.

e) request FRL and Auckland Council to reinstate the quarterly Site Liaison Group meetings in regard to the quarry site operations and filling, as per the Fill Management Plan.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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Notice of Motion – Three Kings Development Issues

In accordance with Standing Orders, please place the following Notice of Motion on the agenda for the Puketapapa Local Board meeting being held on 19th March 2020:

Recommendation/s

That the Puketapapa Local Board

a) request an urgent update on progress to complete the second land exchange between Auckland Council and Fletcher Residential Ltd (FRL) in relation to the Three Kings Reserve and depot area, as agreed by Auckland Council, FRL and the Societies and as laid out in the settlement agreement reached between Three Kings United and South Epsom Planning Group with FRL, in lieu of further Court action, noting:
   i) the importance of this land exchange to achieving the open space and connection goals laid out in the Three Kings Plan, and as noted in the Environment Court decisions;
   ii) that the agreement between FRL and the Societies allows FRL to build on the Western Reserve after June 2020 and for the Societies to take a Judicial review or other proceedings, neither of which would be positive outcomes; and
   iii) the strong support of the local board for this land exchange to proceed.
   iv) noting that PSR is developing a concept plan for the Western Reserve and that any alternative access to and from adjacent streets should be consistent with this plan; the development of the Western Reserve could be taken into account when finalising commercial terms for the land exchange.

b) seek advice as to how Auckland Council’s regulatory and compliance officers are taking a holistic approach to resident complaints in relation to works on the quarry site, and looking at them as a group of issues that are impinging on local residents over a long period of time and may have a cumulative effect, rather than as one-off incidents occurring in isolation.

c) ask FRL to work with the Local Board to improve their public communications regarding changes to the carpark on Grahame Breed Dr, and access points to the area usually referred to as Western Reserve, Three Kings Reserve and Big King Reserve, during works in the carpark area, and encourage them to liaise closely with Tupuna Maunga Authority and the Local Board as adjacent land owners, including at the least;
   i) maps at all park entrances of the closures and redirections;
   ii) a letter drop to the local area
   iii) meeting with each of the facilities in the area to discuss the carpark changes, including the Mt Roskill Library, CAB, Club Physical, and regular hirers at the Fickling Centre.
iv) visiting those living adjacent to the remaining access points, in particular on Fyvie Ave, and monitoring the impact on them through the alternative access arrangements

d) ask FRL to investigate

i) providing sections of the Grahame Breed carpark as an unsealed informal carparking area for users of local facilities as construction works allow, once remediation is complete.

ii) providing more accessible alternative routes to Western Park, Three Kings Reserve and Big King Reserve than they have proposed.

e) request FRL and Auckland Council to reinstate the quarterly Site Liaison Group meetings in regard to the quarry site operations and filling, as per the Fill Management Plan.

Background

The redevelopment of the former quarry site at Three Kings has been a longstanding issue the local board has been working on since our establishment in 2010.

Fletcher Living Limited (FRL) intends to develop, for housing, the land made available by the filling of its quarry on Mt Eden Rd. To this end Fletcher submitted a Private Plan Change 372 to the former Auckland District Plan. This plan change was opposed by the South Epsom Planning Group, the Three Kings United Group, community members and the Puketapapa local Board. PC 372 was adopted by Council and then appealed by the community societies to the Environment Court. The Environment Court deliberations were favourable to the community societies on a range of issues however the introduction of the Unitary Plan overrode these decisions. A settlement agreement was subsequently reached between the community societies and Fletcher that, amongst other things, secured the Western Park as open space. Subsequently Auckland Council agreed to a second land exchange, with final commercial terms to be determined by Auckland Council and FRL. The two land exchanges and consequent plan changes was recommended by Council officers as a way of achieving the final desired outcome.

Land exchanges

The first land exchange enables FRL to develop the playing fields set out in its development plan BUT also enables Fletcher to build on part of the Western Reserve. The plan change associated with this first land exchange is Plan Change 11 which is now operative. The second land exchange and plan change would secure the Western Park as open space. The local board has in the past encouraged Council officers to actively participate in ensuring the settlement agreement is honoured, by pursuing the second land exchange. The local board has not had a recent update on progress of this discussion and June 2020 is a critical date for finalising details of the second land exchange. Completing the second land exchange is pivotal to secure the open space and connection opportunities identified in the Three Kings Plan.

Compliance issues

As a result of the quarry remediation and construction preparation work already underway local board members have been fielding concerns about the impact of noise, dust and vibration on residents living nearby, some in the apartments newly constructed on Mt Eden Rd and others in long-standing dwellings. There is a concern that complaints might be seen in isolation as opposed to a holistic approach that looks at cumulative effects on local residents.

Grahame Breed carpark and Western Reserve access

FRL have recently closed off the Grahame Breed carpark area for remediation, with minimal notice to the community, and there have been concerns raised regarding the sudden loss of
these carparking spaces and the impact on nearby facilities. There have also been changes made by Fletchers to the Western Reserve access which then impact on community use of that open space as well as adjacent ones at Big King Reserve and Three Kings Reserve. There is some uncertainty about the suitability of the alternative access points Fletchers is providing, in particular in regard to gradient and access for maintenance machinery.

Site Liaison Group

One of the aggravating factors of the above issues for the community has been the cancellation of the Site Liaison Group meetings by Fletchers, which has meant the loss of an important communication mechanism regarding work on the site and future development. We seek to have these reinstated.

Conclusion

This Notice of Motion seeks to bring together a number of emerging issues and long-standing concerns in regard to the development of the former Three Kings Quarry site to be comprehensively addressed by Auckland Council as an organisation. Informal approaches to the organisation and Fletchers have been made, and we now seek to make the requests of the local board formal.
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Purpose of the report
To provide an update to the Puketāpapa Local Board (the Board) on Auckland Transport (AT) matters in its area and an update on its local board transport capital fund (LBTCF).

Executive summary
1. Progress on the Board’s LBTCF funded projects (2016-2019) is noted, along with the Community Safety Fund projects.
2. The Board has $2,244,897 in its transport capital fund for this political term.
3. Other LBTCF projects completed since 2012 are included for information.
4. Progress on the Griffen Park/Hillsborough Rd/Commodore Drive intersection improvement is noted along with AT’s response to the Puketāpapa Youth Board’s report on public transport.
5. An update on the Frost and Carr Road safety around schools project is given along with a starting date for construction.
6. A meeting organised to present the safety findings of the independent safety audit for the proposed bus route on Carlton Street to invited guests is noted.
7. Public consultations that the Board has been informed about are also included.

Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
a) receive the Auckland Transport March 2020 report

Context
8. AT is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. It reports on a monthly basis to local boards, as set out in its Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important engagement role of local boards within and on behalf of their local communities.
9. The LBTCF is a capital budget provided to all local boards by Auckland Council and delivered by Auckland Transport (AT). Local boards can use this fund to deliver transport infrastructure projects that they believe are important but are not part of AT’s work programme. Projects must also:
   • be safe
   • not impede network efficiency
   • be in the road corridor (although projects running through parks can be considered if there is a transport outcome).
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

Local Board Capital Fund

10. For the 2019 – 2022 political term, the Puketāpapa Local Board currently has $2,244,897 in its LBTCF. At it’s February workshop the board were advised of the process for considering projects for potential funding.

11. At its workshop at the end of March 2020, the Board will consider which projects it wishes to be assessed for a rough order of costs (ROC). The projects selected by the Board for RoC assessment will be put forward for decision at the April 2020 business meeting.

12. Auckland Transport will report to the Board at its May 2020 workshop with costings and advice on these projects. The Board will decide at its June 2020 business meeting which projects will then be funded through the LBTCF.

13. Advice to the Board listing potential projects, including member suggestions, AT staff input, projects previously put before the Board and unfunded community safety fund projects will be circulated before the March 2020 workshop.

14. Further details on the key stages of the project identification approach for the LBTCF can be found in Attachment A.

Projects in Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenways Route D – Frost Rd to Hillsborough Rd (Local Board Transport Capital Fund).</td>
<td>In detailed design.</td>
<td>The project manager presented an update to the board at a workshop on 27 February 2020. He advised that there were anticipated additional costs, brought about by a number of factors, in particular an additional raised table added to the design. The project manager will report back on possible options in the April 2020 workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian island at 65 Hillsborough Rd, by Delargey Avenue (Local Board Transport Capital Fund).</td>
<td>Internal consultation within AT.</td>
<td>Currently working on issues regarding the current location of a bus stop and potential issues with a nearby tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossing at 244 Hillsborough Rd, by Goodall Street (Local Board Transport Capital Fund).</td>
<td>Design complete</td>
<td>This project is about to go out to tender.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Completed Projects 2021-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waikowhai School</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halsey Drive School</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Rd / Dominion Rd Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson Oakdale Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Albert Rd Pedestrian Crossing Facilities</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham Rd Cycle Route - SH20 to Wesley Community Centre</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncumb Street Greenway</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parau/Duke Street Improvements</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Hay Park Lighting Stage 1 and Stage 2</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynfield Reserve Cycleway</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearon Park Shared Path</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH20 Cycleway Seat</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilletta Rd Safety Works</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson Carpark Shared Path</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa Smart Stud Sites</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominion Rd 1077 Bus Stand</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Roskill Village Improvements</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Safety Fund

15. As part of an initiative to advance safety across Auckland, $20m was allocated for local boards to recommend local safety projects. The Puketāpapa Local board’s allocation was $604,664. Potential projects were workshoped by the Board, assessed by AT staff and then it’s 20 June 2019 meeting, resolved as follows:

Approve Auckland Transport Community Safety Fund projects in the following priority order:

i) 65 Hillsborough Road to provide a safe crossing place ($90,000)
ii) 244 Hillsborough Road pedestrian crossing facility ($338,000)
iii) 383 Hillsborough Road pedestrian crossing facility ($348,000)
iv) 639 Richardson Road pedestrian crossing facility ($15,000)
v) Pah Road crossing awareness ($10,000)

vi) Safety measures around Wesley Primary School ($130,000)

vii) 40 Stoddard Road near Tory Street - improved pedestrian crossing safety ($170,000)

viii) Melrose Road - pedestrian refuge island near shops ($80,000)

ix) Hillsborough Road/ Mt Albert Road crossing safety ($195,000)

x) Arundel Street, Stamford Park Rd, Rogan Street intersection improvements ($350,000)

and

note that the two highest priorities: 65 Hillsborough Road and 244 Hillsborough Road may not need to be funded by the Local Board
Transport Community Safety Fund because they are currently set to be funded from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund. The availability of this funding for these two safety projects will be confirmed shortly.

16. The projects at 65 Hillsborough Road and 244 Hillsborough Road were subsequently funded by the Transport Capital Fund making the 383 Hillsborough Road the highest priority project for the Community Safety Fund (CSF).

17. Since then AT staff have been assessing the projects that were able to be funded with the Board’s allocation. These being:

- 383 Hillsborough Road pedestrian crossing facility ($348,000)
- 639 Richardson Road pedestrian crossing facility ($15,000)
- Pah Road crossing awareness ($10,000)
- Safety measures around Wesley Primary School ($130,000)

### Progress on Community Safety Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossing at 383 Hillsborough Rd, by Waikōwhai Primary (Community Safety Fund).</td>
<td>In detailed design.</td>
<td>Initial design for signalised mid-block crossing is completed, public consultation scheduled to start prior to Easter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossing improvements at 639 Richardson Rd, by Waikōwhai Intermediate and Hay Park School (Community Safety Fund).</td>
<td>Construction.</td>
<td>Awaiting estimate and delivery date from contractor on the red carpet SLOW patches on this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pah Road crossing awareness (Community Safety Fund).</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Investigating potential location for a driver feedback sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter Ave raised table to replace kea crossing for Wesley Primary School (Community Safety Fund).</td>
<td>Investigation.</td>
<td>Further investigation on the raised zebra crossing is necessary, including high friction surfacing on approaches are being considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Griffen Park/Commodore Drive/Hillsborough Rd Intersection**

18. The Griffen Park Rd/Commodore Dr/Hillsborough Rd intersection safety improvement project is currently undergoing internal review. After the internal review is completed, AT will brief the Board on a draft concept before public consultation begins. Consultation is likely to be in April 2020.

**Puketāpapa Youth Board Bus Issues**

19. Last term the Board received a report on bus issues from the Puketāpapa Youth Board. AT’s Service Network Development Manager has reviewed the report and appreciates the feedback and issues raised. He would like to meet with the Youth Board, in conjunction with the Local Board, to discuss how the issues raised can be progressed.

**Frost and Carr Road Safety Improvements**

20. The Mt Roskill Safer Communities Project is a project to improve safety on Frost and Carr roads, particular for pedestrians. Included in the project are a number of raised crossing and footpath widening.

21. The project is on track to begin construction on March 8 – 9 2020. Traffic Management will be in place before construction begins. The contractor will start by removing the pedestrian islands on Frost Road and Carr Road roundabout directly outside the Mt Roskill Grammar
School. Following this the next stage on both sides of Frost Road to the south east of the roundabout. This stage is expected to take two weeks, weather permitting.

22. AT met with businesses in the area on the week of 26 February 2020 and, on the week 2 March 2020 a letter will be sent to all businesses, schools and residents in the area. A press release has already been drafted to inform the public prior to construction starting. Copies of this material will be circulated to the Board.

23. The Board will be briefed in a workshop on the construction methodology, construction impacts and timing on Thursday 12 March 2020.

Carlton Street Safety Audit

24. The physical works for the Carlton Street are now complete. The safety audit that was commissioned as a result of some residents’ concerns will be presented on Tuesday 10 March 2020 at Hillsborough School. The presentation will be made by the consultants, Beca Ltd, who undertook the independent audit.

25. Concerned residents, Cr Fletcher, Board members Fairey and Turner have been invited and AT staff will be present. A verbal update can be given to the Board at it’s meeting in March 2020 on the outcome of the presentation.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi

Climate impact statement

26. Auckland Transport engages closely with Council on developing strategy, actions and measures to support the outcomes sought by the Auckland Plan 2050, the Auckland Climate Action Plan and Council’s priorities.

27. Auckland Transport’s core role is in providing attractive alternatives to private vehicle travel, reducing the carbon footprint of its own operations and, to the extent feasible, that of the contracted public transport network.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

28. 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

29. The Board receives update reports from AT as part of its monthly business meeting agendas.

30. The Board also holds regular workshops with AT between business meetings, with briefing memos provided as necessary.

31. Local board members may direct queries on issues via electedmember@at.govt.nz

32. There is one Transport Control Committee decision for the Puketāpapa Local Board area on the following streets.

- Sandringham Road Extension,
- Gifford Avenue,
- O’Donnell Avenue,
- Skeates Avenue,
- Farrelly Avenue, William Blofield Avenue
- Stoddard Road
33. The decision relates to permanent traffic and parking changes, including lane arrow marking a shared path, a cycle lane, shared path, bus stop bus shelter, traffic island, pedestrian crossing and traffic signal.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

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

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

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

36. The LBTCF summary is printed below.

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

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

37. The proposed decision of receiving this report has no risks. Auckland Transport has risk management strategies in place for the transport projects undertaken in the local board area.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

38. The next step for the Board is to select LBTCF projects to go forward to rough order of costing. These will be formalised at the April 2020 business meeting.

39. AT will prepare another report to the Board in April 2020.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20200319 Auckland Transport Guide Local Board Transport Capital Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Bruce Thomas – Elected Members Relationship Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jonanthan Anyon – Manager Elected Member Relationship Member Unit Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Local Board Transport Capital Fund – Project identification approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Direction setting for local transport projects generally begins with the identification of transport outcomes in the local board plan (LBP). The local board plan may also identify more specific initiatives. Building on the LBP content, local boards should develop high-level criteria to help guide the identification of projects that could be funded through the LBTCF (stage 2) and provide a high-level framework that can be used by Auckland Transport to support assessment and advice (stage 3).</td>
<td>A list of possible projects is developed taking into account: • Existing desired projects • New projects identified by local boards, e.g. to deliver on desired transport outcomes identified in the LBP • Projects identified by Auckland Transport, these may be existing or new The number of listed projects may depend on the scale of projects.</td>
<td>Auckland Transport undertakes a high-level assessment and develop advice for all projects identified. This includes an assessment and advice against the local board value proposition criteria, as well as Auckland Transport assessment including do-ability, likelihood of success and strategic alignment and high-level costs (Rough Order of Costs (ROCs)). The purpose of the high-level assessment is to inform initial prioritisation, to allow a smaller set of projects to be identified for more in-depth analysis. Local boards consider the high-level assessment across all projects provided by Auckland Transport and identify the top priorities for design &amp; construction. Decisions on projects under $300K, provided within 10% of ROC, OR for design and a firm estimate for projects over $300K. This approach recognises the amount of work required to undertake detailed design work, and the limited resource available to undertake this work.</td>
<td>Detailed design(s) and/or options prepared and firm estimates for projects over $300K - developed using AT approved methodology. Develop formal advice to local boards.</td>
<td>[Need further discussion with LB teams on how this works in practice]</td>
<td>AT provide a formal report covering all projects needing a decision and providing detailed advice on each.</td>
<td>Depending on nature and size of project. Projects are either delivered under a maintenance contract variation (AT previously negotiated contract rates), or to be tendered to companies on one of AT’s Tender Panels. (Different panels depending on dollar value of job)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Local boards</th>
<th>Local boards</th>
<th>Auckland Transport</th>
<th>Local boards</th>
<th>Auckland Transport</th>
<th>Local boards</th>
<th>Auckland Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Transport role</strong></td>
<td>• Inform the LBP • Provide generic baseline criteria</td>
<td>• Support the development of value proposition criteria and initial assessment as to whether project meet criteria • Support local boards to develop scope of projects to meet specific needs</td>
<td>• Undertake high-level assessment taking into account: local board direction/value proposition criteria, plus do-ability and any viable alternative options • Develop quality advice on project options</td>
<td>• Present assessment / advice and support discussion / respond to local board questions • Advice on projects under $300K, with a view to decisions be made to proceed to design &amp; construction.</td>
<td>• Develop formal advice This should summarise previous informal advice given as part of project development and Rough Order of Cost (ROC) process. • Deliver formal advice as for Step 5.</td>
<td>• Lead implementation • Keep local board informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Local Board role** | • Seek early advice • Identify transport outcomes, and if possible specific initiatives in the LBP | • Identify and list possible projects • Facilitate discussion and input across all relevant parties (including Ward Councillors) • Tailor high-level local transport project value proposition criteria | • Provide additional information as required | • After consideration of advice, lead discussion and make resolutions to proceed on • Projects for design & construction • Projects for design, firm estimates and with any options | • Provide additional information as required | • To resolve at public meeting • Oversight |

| **Timing** | LBP outcomes and initiatives prepared as part of first three quarters of each new political term. | End of March | Suggested - end of May To be agreed with AT* | End of June | From July To be agreed with AT* | From August | Typically, between 6-24 months. |

| **Tools / attachments** | AT Baseline criteria AT Baseline criteria - LBTCF.docx | High level value proposition criteria that can be adapted for each local board Value proposition criteria - LBTCF.docx | Quality advice guidelines |

*Reasonable timeframes should be agreed with AT considering resources available and total workload (all 21 LBS considered).
*Reasonable timeframes should be agreed with AT considering resources available and total workload (all 21 LBs considered).
Renewal and variation of community lease to The Fairholme Tennis Club Incorporated, Newsome Park, 6 Fairholme Avenue, Epsom

File No.: CP2020/03006

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To approve a renewal and variation of community lease to The Fairholme Tennis Club Incorporated, Newsome Park, 6 Fairholme Avenue, Epsom.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The Fairholme Tennis Club Incorporated has a community lease with Auckland Council for part of Newsome Park, 6 Fairholme Avenue, Epsom. The lease commenced on 1 March 2010 for a term of five years to 28 February 2015. The lease contains two five-year renewal terms. The first renewal term from 1 March 2015 to 28 February 2020 has been executed.

3. The club submitted a comprehensive application on 1 October 2019 seeking to exercise the second and final renewal term for the period 1 March 2020 to 28 February 2025.

4. Community groups exercising a right of renewal are asked to consider having their community lease varied to include a community outcomes plan and the inclusion of a Smoke-free Policy clause.

5. The club informed council in writing that it would like to include a Smoke-free Policy clause but does not wish to include a community outcomes plan.

6. This report recommends a renewal and variation of community lease be approved for The Fairholme Tennis Club Incorporated for a further term of five years commencing 1 March 2020 to 28 February 2025.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) approve a renewal of community lease to The Fairholme Tennis Club Incorporated located on part of Newsome Park, 6 Fairholme Avenue, Epsom (Attachment A), subject to the following terms and conditions:
   i) term – five years commencing 1 March 2020 to 28 February 2025
   ii) rent - $500.00 plus GST per annum.

b) approve a variation to the renewal of community lease to:
   i) include a Smoke-free Policy clause

c) note that all other terms and conditions are in accordance with the Deed of Lease dated 12 June 2012.
Horopaki
Context
7. This report considers the renewal and variation of community lease to the tennis club located on part of Newsome Park, 6 Fairholme Avenue, Epsom.
8. The Puketāpapa Local Board is the allocated authority relating to local, recreation, sport and community facilities, including community leasing matters.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
Newsome Park
9. The club occupies part of the land on Newsome Park described as Lot 41 DP 15865. The land is held by the Department of Conservation and vested in the Auckland Council, in trust, for recreation purposes as a classified recreation reserve.

The Fairholme Tennis Club Incorporated
10. The club has been incorporated under the Incorporated Societies Act since 6 October 1931. The objectives of the club are:
   • to encourage and promote at reasonable cost to members the playing of tennis
   • to affiliate with and become a member of if appropriate the United Tennis Association and/or any other Club or Association whose objectives are similar to those of the Club.
11. Total membership is 31 and the building and improvements are council owned. The rent is $500.00 plus GST per annum.
12. The club meets the criteria required for a renewal of lease as follows:
   • the club is a registered incorporated society
   • the club has complied with the terms of the current lease
   • the club has a history of delivering its services to the local community.
13. The clubroom is a single-story building constructed circa 1933. There are two tennis courts which are covered with artificial grass. There is no court lighting available.
14. An asset assessment was undertaken on 2 October 2019. The asset is in a moderate condition commensurate with its age and usage.
15. Under the terms of the lease the club are required to maintain the grounds and surrounds of the premises in a tidy and attractive condition and maintain the building and improvements in good, clean and substantial order, repair and condition.
16. The club is a member of the United Tennis Association which provides for interclub games and tournaments. The club hosts a tennis tournament on a monthly basis called Ultra Club.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement
17. There is no impact on greenhouse gas emissions as the proposal does not introduce any new source of emissions.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
18. Staff have obtained input from colleagues in Parks, Sport and Recreation, Community Development and Operational Management and Maintenance.
19. Parks and Recreation Policy are currently investigating open space provision in the Royal Oak area. This will be discussed with the Puketāpapa Local Board at future workshops.
20. The proposed renewal and variation of community lease has no identified impact on other parts of the council group.
21. The views of council-controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of this report’s advice.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
22. The Puketāpapa Local Board is the allocated authority to approve a renewal and variation of community lease.
23. The renewal and variation of community lease was workshop with the Puketāpapa Local Board on 20 February 2020.
24. The recommendations within this report support the Puketāpapa Local Board 2017 plan outcome of:
   - connected community with a sense of belonging
   - improved wellbeing and safety

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
25. Auckland Council is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and its broader legal obligations to Māori. The council recognises these responsibilities are distinct from the Crown’s Treaty obligations and fall within a local government Tāmaki Makaurau context. These commitments are articulated in the council’s key strategic planning documents, the Auckland Plan, the Long-term Plan 2015-2025, the Unitary Plan and Local Board Plans.
26. There are no changes in use or operational activities being conducted on the land.
27. Additionally, the objectives of community leases are to ensure community facilities are well maintained and accessible to all members of the community, including Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
28. There is no direct cost to Auckland Council in approving this renewal and variation of community lease.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
29. The provision for a renewal of community lease is granted to the club. As such, where a group meets the criteria stipulated in the lease agreement, council has a contractual obligation to affect the renewal.
30. If the renewal of lease is not approved this will compromise the club’s ability to provide its services to the community and impact the Puketāpapa Local Board outcomes.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
31. Subject to the local board approving a renewal and variation of community lease, council staff will work with key representatives of the club to finalise the deed of renewal and variation of community lease.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Attachment A - Lease area plan</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Michelle Knudsen - Lease Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authoriser      | Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities  
| Nina Siers      | Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Puketāpapa |
Leased area outlined in red for The Fairholme Tennis Club Incorporated, Newsome Park, 6 Fairholme Avenue, Epsom
Renewal and variation of community lease to Waiata Epsom Tennis Club Incorporated, Fernleigh Avenue Reserve, 20-24 Fernleigh Avenue, Epsom

File No.: CP2020/02980

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve a renewal and variation of community lease to Waiata Epsom Tennis Club Incorporated for Fernleigh Avenue Reserve, 20-24 Fernleigh Avenue, Epsom.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Waiata Epsom Tennis Club Incorporated has a community lease with Auckland Council for part of Fernleigh Avenue Reserve, 20-24 Fernleigh Avenue, Epsom. The lease commenced 1 March 2010 for a term of five years to 28 February 2015. The lease contains two five-year renewal terms. The first renewal term from 1 March 2015 to 28 February 2020 has been executed.

3. The club submitted a comprehensive application on 1 October 2019 of its intent to exercise its second and final renewal term for the period 1 March 2020 to 28 February 2025.

4. Community groups exercising a right of renewal are asked to consider having their community lease varied to include a community outcomes plan and the inclusion of a Smokefree Policy clause.

5. The club informed council in writing that it would like to include a Smokefree Policy clause and a community outcomes plan.

6. This report recommends a renewal and variation of community lease to be approved for Waiata Epsom Tennis Club Incorporated for a further term of five years commencing 1 March 2020 to 28 February 2025.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) approve a renewal of community lease to Waiata Epsom Tennis Club Incorporated, located on part of Fernleigh Avenue Reserve, 20-24 Fernleigh Avenue, Epsom (Attachment A), subject to the following terms and conditions:
   i) term – five years commencing 1 March 2020 to 28 February 2025;
   ii) rent - $250.00 plus GST per annum.

b) approve a variation to the renewal of community lease to:
   i) include a Smoke-free Policy clause;
   ii) include a community outcomes plan (Attachment B) to be attached as a schedule to the renewal of lease document.

c) note that all other terms and conditions are in accordance with the Deed of Lease dated 24 February 2011.
Horopaki

Context

7. This report considers the renewal and variation of community lease to the tennis club located on part of Fernleigh Avenue Reserve, 20-24 Fernleigh Avenue, Epsom.

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

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

Fernleigh Avenue Reserve

9. The club occupies part of the land on Fernleigh Avenue Reserve described as Lot 89 DP 732, 961m² and Lot 77 DP 732, 1796m². The land is held by the Department of Conservation and vested in the Auckland Council, in trust, for recreation purposes as a classified recreation reserve.

Waiata Epsom Tennis Club Incorporated

10. The club has been incorporated under the Incorporated Societies Act since 6 October 1931. The objectives of the club are:

- promote the game of tennis;
- foster sport and recreation generally;
- provide and maintain courts, grounds, and playing areas, the clubhouse, other building and other amenities and facilities;
- do all such other lawful things as are relevant or conducive to the attainment of those aims.

11. A site visit to the club on 12 July 2019 ascertained the leased area is in a neat and tidy condition. The club is responsible for the maintenance of the courts, building, grounds and fences.

12. The site is fully developed with four sealed and floodlit courts surrounded by 3.5-meter-high posts and wire mesh fencing. A wooden pavilion adjoins the rear boundary of the site. Three of the clubs four courts have recently been resurfaced by Tiger Turf with the assistance of grants.

13. The club meets the criteria required for a renewal of lease as follows:

- the club is a registered incorporated society;
- the club has complied with the terms of the current lease;
- the club has a history of delivering its services to the local community;
- the club is financially viable.

14. The club has 81 members and a strong commitment to junior tennis. The club provides coaching for over 160 young people who are regarded as having an equivalent connection with the club.

15. The facility is well utilised by numerous groups within the local community including Mt Eden Hockey Club and Royal Oak Primary School.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi

Climate impact statement

16. There is no impact on greenhouse gas emissions as the proposal does not introduce any new source of emissions.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
17. Staff have obtained input from colleagues in Parks, Sport and Recreation, Community Development and Operational Management and Maintenance.
18. Parks and Recreation Policy are currently investigating open space provision in the Royal Oak area. This will be discussed with the Puketāpapa Local Board at future workshops.
19. The proposed renewal and variation of community lease has no identified impact on other parts of the council group.
20. The views of council-controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of this report’s advice.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
21. The Puketāpapa Local Board is the allocated authority to approve a renewal and variation of community lease.
22. The renewal and variation of community lease was workshopped with the Puketāpapa Local Board on 20 February 2020.
23. The recommendations within this report support the Puketāpapa Local Board 2017 plan outcome of:
   - connected community with a sense of belonging
   - improved wellbeing and safety

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
24. Auckland Council is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and its broader legal obligations to Māori. The council recognises these responsibilities are distinct from the Crown’s Treaty obligations and fall within a local government Tamaki Makaurau context. These commitments are articulated in the council’s key strategic planning documents, the Auckland Plan, the Long-term Plan 2015-2025, the Unitary Plan and Local Board Plans.
25. There are no changes in use or operational activities being conducted on the land.
26. Additionally, the objectives of community leases is to ensure community facilities are well maintained and accessible to all members of the community, including Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
27. There is no direct cost to Auckland Council in approving this renewal and variation of community lease.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
28. The provision for a renewal of community lease is granted to the club. As such, where a group meets the criteria stipulated in the lease agreement, council has a contractual obligation to affect the renewal.
29. If the renewal of lease is not approved this will compromise the club’s ability to provide its services to the community and impact the Puketāpapa Local Board outcomes.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

30. Subject to the Puketāpapa Local Board approving a renewal and variation of community lease, council staff will work with key representatives of the club to finalise the deed of renewal and variation of community lease.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Attachment A Site Plan</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Attachment B Community Outcomes Plan</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Michelle Knudsen - Lease Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leased area outlined in yellow for the Waiata Epsom Tennis Club Incorporated, Fernleigh Avenue, 20-24 Fernleigh Avenue, Mt Roskill
## Attachment B: Waiata Epsom Tennis Club Incorporated, Fernleigh Avenue Reserve, 20-24 Fernleigh Avenue Epsom

### Name and Location of Land/Facility
Fernleigh Avenue Reserve, 20-24 Fernleigh Avenue, Epsom

### Name of the Community it serves
Puketāpapa and wider community

### Local Board Area
Puketāpapa

### Name of Community Group
Waiata Epsom Tennis Club Incorporated

### Contact person
Bronwen Barton/Bob Eades

### Name of Community Lease Advisor
Michelle Knudsen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Council and Local Board Priorities</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Outcome</td>
<td>Promote the club’s facility and purpose</td>
<td>Develop two promotional initiatives</td>
<td>List the initiatives developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected communities with a sense of belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td>eg approach to local schools</td>
<td>Illustrate how these initiatives were implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People will feel connected to each other and this place. Our diversity can be celebrated as a unifying force, and barriers overcome so everyone can be included and contribute to community life</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold at least one annual open day to promote the multi-use and value of the facility</td>
<td>List the community groups who use the tennis club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Plan Outcome</td>
<td>Open Day</td>
<td>Facility is well utilised, and opportunities are created within the community</td>
<td>Club will produce an annual report that includes membership numbers and details of programmes delivered Seek family memberships and participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a strong, inclusive and equitable society that provides opportunity for all Aucklanders</td>
<td>Tennis club will deliver tennis programmes and activities designed for players of all ages and abilities</td>
<td>Support opportunities that celebrate Māori identity and heritage (eg: Matariki and Māori language week activities)</td>
<td>List an activity that supports Māori identity and heritage but also recognises diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment B: Waiata Epsom Tennis Club Incorporated, Fernleigh Avenue Reserve, 20-24 Fernleigh Avenue Epsom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board Outcome</th>
<th>Provide volunteers to support the operations of the club</th>
<th>List the number of volunteers and how they help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership is open and inclusive</td>
<td>List the number of members aged 21 years and under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leased area to be designated as a smoke free area</td>
<td>List the number of members aged 22 years and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Plan Outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td>Club to comply with any smoke free policy adopted by the Landlord and any legislation governing smoke free areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair safe and healthy Auckland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Walmsley Park Temporary Services Provision Plan

File No.: CP2020/03446

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To approve the Temporary Services Provision Plan for Walmsley Park submitted by Watercare Services Ltd at a workshop with the Puketapapa Local Board on Wednesday 05 February 2020.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. Watercare Services Ltd (WSL) will be occupying Walmsley Park during construction of the Central Interceptor Tunnel having already obtained a designation for the land, and approval from Auckland Council for a licence to occupy and easement for permanent infrastructure.

3. The Central Interceptor Tunnel is a major upgrade of sewerage infrastructure to allow for growth in population and development. The route and sites for the Central Interceptor were designated in 2013.

4. The Puketapapa Local Board subsequently approved the grant of a licence to occupy for temporary occupation of Walmsley Park and easement for permanent infrastructure and access.

5. The Temporary Services Provision Plan is the operational and detail document that complements the previous approvals. The plan was discussed at a Workshop with the Local Board on Wednesday 05 February 2020.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) approve the Temporary Services Provision Plan submitted by Watercare Services Limited for the occupation of Walmsley Park,

b) note that the plan is the outcome of the designation and landowner approvals previously granted to Watercare Services Ltd for occupation of the land.

Horopaki
Context

6. The Central Interceptor is a major public work designed to provide for future wastewater needs of Auckland due to population growth and existing combined water and sewerage systems.

7. The tunnel will run from Grey Lynn and Western Springs, to the Māngere Wastewater Treatment Plant. It will have several link sewers and shafts along the route for collecting and transferring wastewater into the tunnel.

8. The appointed WSL Contractor is Ghella-Abergeldie Joint Venture (GAJV). GAJV is a joint venture between Italian and Australian tunneling and complex infrastructure groups. The GAJV has more than 150 years’ experience in tunneling and underground infrastructure provision around the world.

9. The tunnel will be 14.7 kilometers in length and 4.5 metres in diameter.
10. As part of the works, Watercare contractors have been given approvals and consents to occupy various parks and reserves along the route of the Central Interceptor.

11. One of those parks is Walmsley Park. The Temporary Services Provision Plan sets out the operational day to day management of the land and details of the project. The object it to ensure the works are aligned with councils need to ensure public safety and protection of the land as far as possible as the period of works is significant.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu  
Analysis and advice

12. Watercare, the GAJV and Council staff formed a working party to discuss and agree the various aspects providing for safe occupation of Walmsley Park and minimizing inconvenience to the public as much as possible.

13. The result of this consultation is the plan appended to this report.

14. The works on Walmsley Park are scheduled to commence in March or April 2020.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi  
Climate impact statement

15. The decision to approve the Temporary Services Provision Plan is an administrative completion of a designation and landowner process.

16. There will be minor impacts on the environment from vehicle movement on the site.

17. The overall Tunnelling operation over six years will have some minor impact although much of the tunnelling infrastructure is electric.

18. In terms of the overall life of the decision and climate change, the approval of the services plan has no effect.

19. The overall project has factored climate change and sea level rise and the tunnels have been designed to manage those effects.

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

20. Staff in Community Facilities and Parks Sport and Recreation were part of the working group that developed the plan with Watercare and their contractors.

21. The plan will allow WSL to begin its work on site. The relationship between council and council group is strong and collaborative.

22. The project was fully consulted with all council group members and departments at the time of the Notice of Requirement for the designation process. In addition, the landowner approval process included consultation with council and WSL specialists. The plan has also been supported by council and WSL staff.

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

23. The Puketapapa Local Board has been consulted extensively regarding the entire project and the Walmsley Road site and Watercare has endeavoured to keep the Board up to date throughout the project.

24. Members views on the services plan were sought at a Workshop on 05 February 2020. It was explained that the services plan is an outcome of previous consents and approvals and is not a landowner approval in itself.

25. Local residents directly and indirectly impacted by the project have been invited to open days by WSL and the GAJV where they may learn about the project and what will be happening in their local area over the course of the project.
26. Watercare has also used letter drops and signage to advise local residents of the project.

27. The Temporary Services Provision Plan aims to reduce the impact on users and owners of Walmsley Park over the occupation of the land.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

28. Iwi consultation was undertaken by WSL at the commencement of the planning of the process. Iwi have supported the project and are included in employment and training initiative through the GAJV.

29. A training centre at the Mangere site has been established to progress Maori outcomes and facilitate employment induction and training for the six-year life of the project.

30. The decision to approve the Temporary Services Provision Plan is an operational and management plan and reflects the earlier consultation.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

31. There are no financial implications as a result of the decision. The budget and contingencies around the Project are managed by WSL. Approving the service plan will all the works to commence and reduce delays.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

32. The decision is considered to be of low risk in the context of the overall Central Interceptor project.

33. The plan sets out the ‘how’ of the occupation and land use and compliments the conditions of the landowner approval and occupational instruments.

34. There is no associated financial or public risks in approving the plan.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

35. Upon approval being given for the plan, Watercare will be notified so that they may make the necessary preparations to occupy the park from March 2020, in alignment with their consent, landowner approval and conditions of licences to occupy.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**
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1. Introduction

The Central Interceptor Project involves a wastewater tunnel that will run between Western Springs and the Māngere Wastewater Treatment Plant. It includes the construction of the 13km underground wastewater tunnel, above ground facilities, and two link sewers referred to as Link Sewer B and Link Sewer C. Along the route, the Central Interceptor will connect to the existing wastewater network, which will divert flows and overflows into the tunnel. Construction of the Project will take approximately 6 years.

Walmsley Park is located on the Central Interceptor main tunnel alignment and contains a shaft used for inspection of the tunnel boring machine. The shaft works at this site are scheduled to commence in late March 2020 and will take approximately ten months. All the works at the site will be completed with commissioning of the tunnel in late 2024.

1.1 Purpose of this plan

This temporary park service provision plan sets out measures proposed during the construction of the shaft and sewer connections to enable the ongoing maintenance and operation of activities within Walmsley Park during the works.

This plan is a requirement of the Licence Agreement between Watercare and Auckland Council for temporary occupation of Auckland Council parks for the Central Interceptor. The Fifth Schedule to that agreement requires that Watercare submit a temporary park service provision plan for the duration of the works to the Puketāpapa Local Board for approval. The plan needs to be approved prior to works the commencement of works affecting the park.

This plan has been informed by discussions with Auckland Council Community Facilities staff including a meeting on site held 23 January 2020. Further pre-commencement meetings are proposed as part of the pre-start activities set out in Section 3.5 of this Plan.

A discussion was held with representatives of Friends of Oakley Creek in regard to the recent stream enhancement planting undertaken within the designated site and options for retaining the planting during construction. The team have also liaised with the Te Whangai Trust who are responsible for maintaining the planting regarding maintenance requirements and access to the planted area during the works.

The team met representatives from Auckland Council and the Te Whangai Trust to discuss the potential relocation of two trees that were planted within the construction area in December 2019. It was agreed that the kowhai, on the north side of the stream, planted as an unveiling/memorial tree for a young local man (Rima) will be retained. To accommodate this, the construction area boundary will exclude this tree. The Trust will relocate the tree planted on the south side of the stream.

1.2 Site details

The Walmsley Park site is located at the eastern end of Walmsley Park on Sandringham Road extension. The site address is 26A Beagle Avenue, Owairaka and the legal description of the site is Lot 112 DP 43048. The site is located on both sides of the Oakley Creek with the shaft site and main construction area located on the southern side of the creek and a small laydown area located on the northern side of the creek.

The Central Interceptor works will be undertaken within the area shown on Figure 1. Figure 2 provides further detail on how the construction site will be laid out.
1.3 Existing park activities/features

Existing activities/features in the park include the following:

- Passive recreation areas; and
- Two shared paths used by pedestrians and cyclists, one located on the southern side of the creek and the other on the northern side.

These features are shown on Figure 1 and in the photographs contained in Appendix B.

Oakley Creek runs through the construction site and Auckland Council (Healthy Waters) have recently undertaken enhancement works in Walmsley Park as part of the Te Auaanga (Oakley Creek) Walmsley and Underwood Reserves Restoration Project. The enhancement works included the removal of a redundant pedestrian bridge, removal of a short section of path on the northern side of the creek, construction of a new shared path on the southern side of the creek, enhancement of the stream alignment and riparian planting on either side of the creek. Some of the enhancement works are located within the designated construction area for the Project and will be affected by the works.

The site is located directly opposite the Wesley Community Centre and Youth Facility. That facility includes a carparking area on the corner of Sandringham Road and Gifford Avenue where community markets are held on Tuesday and Friday mornings.

2. The proposed works

2.1 Summary of the works and programme

The Walmsley Park shaft site is located along the main tunnel alignment for the Central Interceptor. The shaft is located within the northern section of the tunnel which will be commissioned once the tunnelling works have been completed and the tunnel boring machine has been retrieved at the Western Springs construction site. The primary purpose of the Walmsley Park shaft site during the operation of the Central Interceptor is to establish a connection with the Branch 9 sewer through the Mt Roskill sewer and divert overflows.

The temporary construction works at the Walmsley Park shaft site will take approximately 10 months. Site establishment works will begin in late March 2020 and shaft construction will conclude with temporary site reinstatement in late 2020/early 2021. The tunnel boring machine is anticipated to arrive at the Walmsley Park shaft site in May 2023 and there will be further activity at the site during that period. All the works at the site will be complete in late 2024.

Table 1 table below sets out the proposed works at the site and key timnings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed works</th>
<th>Indicative dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site establishment including vegetation removal</td>
<td>Late-Mar to Mid April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piling platform</td>
<td>Mid-May to late-May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install steel casing</td>
<td>Mid-May to late-May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drill shaft</td>
<td>Late-May to late June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install liner and finish shaft top</td>
<td>Late-Jun to late July 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Park assets affected by the works

The works will affect the park features/assets set out in Table 2 and shown in Figure 2.

As part of the construction planning for the site, the team has identified the opportunity to retain some of the recent riparian planting adjacent to Oakley Creek by extending the northern construction area to the edge of the existing shared path. This will retain the ability to use the area to the north of the stream for construction activities such as for laydown and storage without removing the existing planting in this location. The plans are based on this proposal.
### Table 2: Park features affected by the construction works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park feature</th>
<th>Impact during construction</th>
<th>Post construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trees within the construction area</td>
<td>Remove four trees within the construction area:</td>
<td>Replace on the basis of two-for-one as part of the Open Space Restoration Plan for the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                       |  1. Pohutukawa (7m) within the southern area;  
|                                       |  2. She Oak (5m) on the southern boundary of the site;  
|                                       |  3. She Oak (13m) in the south western corner of the site;  
|                                       |  4. She Oak (13m) in the south western corner of the site.  
|                                       | Retain and protect the other trees during construction in accordance with arboricultural assessment.                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|                                       | The noisy activities associated with tree removal (chipping of the material) will be minimised during Tuesday and Friday mornings when the Sandringham Community Markets are in operation.                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| The section of shared path located adjacent to the main shaft site and running between Sandringham Road Extension and the pedestrian bridge and park access opposite Wesley Primary School | Close a section of path of approximately 275m in length for approximately 10 months to provide for shaft construction. Provide a shared path diversion route with appropriate signage on the northern side of the creek via the existing shared path. | Reinstate the affected section of shared path to the same standard. The alignment of the reinstated path will be influenced by the permanent infrastructure on the site including the shaft and trafficable surface. |
| The section of shared path located adjacent to the northern laydown area | Not affected by the works                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | N/A                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Park sign, bollards and rubbish bin   | Temporarily remove the park sign, bollards and rubbish bin for the duration of the works.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Reinstate in their current locations.                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Planted vegetation in various locations | If required, remove to provide for the site access and site laydown areas.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Reinstate with details provided in the Open Space Restoration Plan.                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Grassed areas                         | Grass and topsoil removed to provide for the compacted metal area for site laydown or haul routes.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Reinstate as per Council requirements set out in the Landowner Agreement.                                                                                                                                                              |
Figure 2. Park features affected by shaft works.
3. Managing the works in Walmsley Park

3.1 Temporary fencing

Fencing and hoarding will be installed to demarcate the works areas and provide for public health and safety. The temporary fencing will be a combination of 1.8m high movable chain-link fencing and 2.4m high plywood hoardings. A noise barrier will be constructed along the boundary with residential properties on O’Donnell Avenue. Figure 3 shows the proposed arrangements.

Access to the recent restoration planting (the area labelled “protected vegetation” on the plan below) will be maintained during the works to allow for pest plant removal and other maintenance activities.

Figure 3: Fencing, hoardings and noise walls

The 2.4m hoarding will be wrapped and will depict project information and possibly artwork developed by the local schools. The design of the hoarding wrap is still being developed and further details will be provided when available.

3.2 Public access during construction

The works will require relocation or management of existing paths/pedestrian access as set out in the table below.
Table 3: Management of existing paths/pedestrian access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public footpath at site entrances</td>
<td>Information signs and traffic management during trucks entering and exiting site.</td>
<td>From late March 2020. 2 weeks initially for site set up and then 10 months for main works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared path adjacent to northern construction area</td>
<td>Section of path to remain open throughout the works.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared path within southern construction area</td>
<td>Section of paths closed for the duration of the works.Temporary diversion via northern shared path and fencing and diversion signs installed at either end.</td>
<td>From late March 2020 for 10 months. For one month in mid-2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure below shows the existing shared path and public access affected by the works and the proposed alternative route during construction.

Figure 4: Shared path closure and alternative route

[Diagram showing shared path closure and alternative route]
3.2.1 Temporary signs

Signs will be installed where existing access is affected informing the public of diversion routes. Project information signs will also be installed to explain the works and the duration of any access changes.

Examples of typical information and wayfinding signs are contained in Appendix A.

3.3 Park maintenance and operations

Auckland Council maintenance and operations considerations for the park include access for Council’s contractors to mow the area of park on the southern side of Oakley Creek between the construction area boundary and the pedestrian bridge. Alternative access to this area is available from Beagle Avenue.

3.4 Other activities in the park and vicinity

Other programmed works or existing activities occurring in the park or the vicinity during the timeframe of the Central Interceptor works include the following:

- Changes to the existing pedestrian crossing by Auckland Transport. Discussions are underway with Auckland Transport regarding the timing and scope of these works.
- Sandringham Community Market held every Tuesday and Friday Markets at the Community Centre. During these times the area is particularly busy with additional pedestrians and vehicles in the area.

3.5 Pre-construction activities

Prior to construction commencing, the project team will be undertaking a number of pre-construction activities. The table below provides a summary of the pre-construction activities that are of particular relevance to works in the park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Bulletin for site neighbours setting out summary of works, notification of the start of the works and an invitation to the Meet the Contractor event</td>
<td>Early March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet the Contractor event</td>
<td>20 March 2020 (date to be confirmed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Health and Safety documentation to Auckland Council staff as per Land Owner Agreement</td>
<td>Mid-March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographic survey of existing park assets</td>
<td>Prior to works commencing – March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographic survey of Sandringham Road extension</td>
<td>Week prior to works commencing on 31 March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site meeting with Council parks staff to agree details for site establishment</td>
<td>Mid-March 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Key contacts during construction

The Auckland Council, Watercare and Ghella Abergeldie JV key contacts during the works are as follows:

Table 5: Key contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Tony Putt</td>
<td>E: <a href="mailto:Tony.tpcivil@gmail.com">Tony.tpcivil@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUA key contact</td>
<td>Jody Morley</td>
<td>P: +64 27 235 0545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E: <a href="mailto:Jody.Morley@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz">Jody.Morley@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghella Abergeldie Joint Venture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Engineer</td>
<td>Seyon Navarathnam</td>
<td>P: +64 22 393 2650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E: <a href="mailto:SNavarathnam@ga-jv.com">SNavarathnam@ga-jv.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Supervisor</td>
<td>Chris Baker</td>
<td>P: +64 22 010 5618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E: <a href="mailto:CBaker@ga-jv.com">CBaker@ga-jv.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder and Community Manager</td>
<td>Carol Moffatt</td>
<td>P: +64 27 703 0672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E: <a href="mailto:CMoffatt@ga-jv.com">CMoffatt@ga-jv.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watercare Services Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Engineer</td>
<td>Antoine Foulon</td>
<td>P: +64 21 542 936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E: <a href="mailto:Antoine.Foulon@water.co.nz">Antoine.Foulon@water.co.nz</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A - EXAMPLES OF WAYFINDING SIGNS
APPENDIX B - PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE SITE
Photo 1: Shared path in the southern construction area

Photo 2: Southern construction area and Oakley Creek planting

Photo 3: Northern construction area and planting

Photo 4: Shared path and planting adjacent to northern construction area
Public feedback on proposed new Food Safety Information Bylaw 2020

File No.: CP2020/02884

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To seek input on public feedback to the proposed new Food Safety Information Bylaw 2020.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. To help the Puketāpapa Local Board decide whether to input into deliberations on public feedback to the proposed new Food Safety Information Bylaw 2020 (proposal), staff have summarised and attached all feedback from people in the local board’s area.

3. The proposal continues to require the same food businesses as in the existing Food Safety Bylaw 2013 to display a food safety information certificate (food grade) and contains new rules about the physical and online food grade display.

4. Staff recommend that the local board consider providing input into deliberations on public feedback to the proposal by resolution by 20 March 2020, and by presenting those views to the Bylaw Panel on 30 March 2020.

5. There is a reputational risk for the local board that feedback from the local board area is from a limited group of people and does not reflect the views of the whole local board area. This report mitigates this risk by providing local boards with a summary of all public feedback (including by local board area and demographic) for comparison and transparency.

6. The Bylaw Panel will consider all formal local board input and public feedback, deliberate and make recommendations on 30 March 2020. A final decision on any new bylaw will be made at the Governing Body meeting on 30 April 2020.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) note the public feedback to the proposed new Food Safety Information Bylaw 2020 by people from the Puketāpapa Local Board area contained in this agenda report.
   [Recommendations (b), (c) and (d) are optional]

b) adopt the following views on the public feedback in (a) to assist the Bylaw Panel in its deliberations on all public feedback to the proposal:
   i) [local board to determine at meeting]

c) appoint [insert one or more local board members] to present the views in (b) to the Bylaw Panel on Monday 30 March 2020.

d) delegate authority to the local board chair to make replacement appointment(s) to the persons in (c) if a member is unavailable.
Horopaki

Context

The local board can input into deliberations on proposed new food bylaw

7. The local board can input into deliberations on public feedback to the proposal to make a new Food Safety Information Bylaw 2020 at its meeting in March 2020.

8. The local board can also choose to present those views to the Bylaw Panel on 30 March.

9. The nature of the input is at the discretion of the local board. Any input must however remain inside the scope of the proposal and public feedback. For example, the local board could:
   - indicate support for public feedback by people from the local board area
   - recommend how the Bylaw Panel should address matters raised in public feedback.

The proposed new food bylaw aims to better protect public health


11. The proposal arose from the review of the existing Food Safety Bylaw 2013 (Figure 1), and aims to better protect public health by improving food grade display rules to:
   - clarify that the requirement to display a food grade applies to all food businesses that operate under a Template Food Control Plan\(^1\), serve the public and are registered and verified by council (meaning most Auckland-only cafés, restaurants and takeaways)
   - specify physical locations for food grade display
   - introduce a new rule for food grade display on the homepage or similar of online platforms that the food business has control over (for example a café website managed by the café owner).

---

\(^1\) Food Act 2014, section 39 template food control plans.
Feedback on the proposal was received from 1498 people from across Auckland

12. The proposal was publicly notified for feedback from 2 December 2019 to 2 February 2020. During that period, council had received feedback from 1498 people (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Summary of public feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation reach (number of responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Online and written feedback provided by 1300 people, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o 188 via the online ‘Have Your Say’ feedback form, including 80 from food business operators and organisations. Five of those organisations also provided feedback by email (Attachment B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o 1112 via an online feedback form by a representative People’s Panel sample (Attachment C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attendee feedback at ‘Have Your Say’ events by 198 people (Attachment D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key stakeholders were invited to provide feedback in person to the Bylaw Panel. No stakeholders however opted to provide feedback in this manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

The majority of feedback from people in the local board area support the proposal

13. A total of 41 people from the Puketāpapa Local Board area provided feedback to the proposal via online and written feedback. The majority agreed with the proposal, which is consistent with the total support from all people who provided feedback (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Percentage support of proposal in Puketāpapa Local Board area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Food grade display by certain food businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Food grade display at physical and online sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Physical display location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Online display location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Key themes from public feedback include:
• grade display is useful for the public
• proposal is reasonable and important
• require display at specific preferred physical location/s
• require display on online platforms regardless of control by the food business.

15. Attachments B, C and D contain a summary of all public feedback (including by local board area). A copy of all public feedback related to the local board is in Attachment E.

The local board should consider whether to provide input into deliberations

16. Staff recommend that the local board note the public feedback, and consider whether it wishes to input into deliberations on the proposal by:

---
2 ‘Have Your Say’ events were drop-in opportunities for the public to learn more about the proposal, ask questions and provide feedback to council officers and panel members. ‘Have Your Say’ events were held at Avondale Market on 8 December 2019, Otara Market on 14 December 2019, Henderson Night Market on 16 January 2020, Pakuranga Night Market on 18 January 2020 and Glenfield Night Market on 19 January 2020.
3 Local board information of people who gave feedback at ‘Have Your Say’ events is unknown.
 adopts views on the public feedback by Friday 20 March 2020
• presenting those views to the Bylaw Panel on Monday 30 March 2020.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

17. The impacts of a “business-as-usual” climate change scenario over the next five years will impact food in terms of food resilience and a continued need for food waste minimisation.

18. The above impacts will not however impact the proposed requirement for certain food businesses to continue to display a food grade. This means that the proposal is not inconsistent with the aims to reduce emissions in the Low Carbon Strategic Action Plan.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

19. The proposal impacts the operation of the Environmental Health Unit. Input was sought during the review of the existing Food Safety Bylaw 2013. Council units are aware of the impacts of the proposal and their implementation role.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

20. Local board member views were sought in June 2019 as part of the review of the current Food Safety Bylaw 2013.

21. Generally, local board members supported the current Bylaw and food grading scheme. Key concerns included public confusion, for example about how not all Auckland food businesses that serve the public are required to display a food grade and display requirements for market stalls and mobile shops.

22. The proposal addresses concerns about public confusion by clarifying requirements. Display for other Auckland food businesses may be inconsistent with the Food Act 2014.

23. This report provides an opportunity for the local board to input into deliberations on public feedback to the proposal.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

24. Kai is significant for Māori as it is embedded in the tikanga of manaakitanga. There is specific tikanga around its preparation and consumption. The sharing of kai with manuhiri is an essential part of marae tikanga. Marae are exempt from verification under the Food Act 2014 where kai is prepared for customary purposes (for example, at a tangi).

25. Marae committees that responded to staff requests for feedback in mid-2019 support food grading for businesses that sell food to the public. The proposal supports this view by continuing to require most food businesses to display a food grade.

26. One marae committee provided feedback on the proposal. The Makaurau Marae Trust – Te Ahiwaru agrees with the proposal and notes the importance of food grades being current.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

27. Local board input into deliberations will be met within existing budgets.

---

Auckland’s temperature is expected to increase and seasonal distribution of rainfall to change. Auckland region climate change projections and impacts, National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA), 2018.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamauratanga
Risks and mitigations

28. There is a reputational risk for the local board that feedback from the local board area is from a limited group of people and does not reflect the views of the whole local board area. This report mitigates this risk by providing local boards with a summary of all public feedback (including by local board area and demographic) for comparison and transparency.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

29. A Bylaw Panel on 30 March 2020 will consider all formal local board input and public feedback, deliberate and make recommendations. A final decision on any new bylaw will be made at the Governing Body meeting on 30 April 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Action Framework - Proposed changes

File No.: CP2020/03313

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. The purpose of this report is to outline key amendments to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework and to obtain the local board’s views.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. In February 2018, the Environment and Community Committee resolved to develop an integrated climate action plan for the Auckland region (ENV/2018/11).

3. To meet this requirement, Auckland Council led the development of Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework, (‘ACAF’) with extensive collaboration and engagement with mana whenua, public, private and voluntary sectors.

4. In June 2019, the Environment and Community Committee approved a consultation draft of ACAF and associated materials.

5. In February 2020, a memorandum was circulated to share key findings from the public consultation (Attachments A and B).

6. To address the feedback from the consultation, this report outlines key structural changes proposed for the framework including:
   - introducing three pillars representing the core drivers to which all actions will align (i.e., a place-based approach; emissions reduction; preparing for climate change).
   - moving from eleven key moves to eight priorities to streamline actions and address feedback.

7. It is also proposed that the title of the document is changed from Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Action Framework to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan to reflect feedback and the greater focus on the impact of actions against our climate goals and roles in delivery. In addition, this provides certainty for roles and responsibilities with regards to implementation.

8. The proposed changes meet the requirements of a climate action plan as defined by C40 Cities.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Puketapapa Local Board:

a) provide feedback on the changes to the draft Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework including:
   - introducing three pillars representing the core drivers for climate action (i.e., a place-based approach; emissions reduction; preparing for climate change)
   - moving from eleven key moves to eight priorities
   - changing the title from Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan.
Horopaki

Context

9. In February 2018, the Environment and Community Committee resolved to develop an integrated climate action plan for the Auckland region, addressing both emissions reduction (i.e. mitigation) and preparing for the impacts of a changing climate (i.e. adaptation) (ENV/2018/11).

10. To meet this requirement, Auckland Council led the development of *Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework,* (‘ACAF’) with extensive collaboration and engagement with mana whenua, public, private and voluntary sectors, reaching hundreds of Aucklanders.

11. Local board engagement and insights were sought throughout development of the framework, including meetings and cluster workshops. A summary of feedback from local boards is available in [Attachments C and D](#).

12. In June 2019, the Environment and Community Committee approved the consultation draft of ACAF and associated materials.

13. In February 2020, a memo was circulated to all local boards to share key findings from the public consultation on the draft ACAF ([Attachment A and B](#)).

14. This report provides an overview of key proposed changes to the draft ACAF to address the feedback received through the consultation. Local Board views will be reflected in the final version, which will be reported to the Environment and Climate Change Committee in May 2020.

15. More detailed changes reported in the consultation summary are not repeated here but will be reflected in text changes in the final version.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

16. The proposed changes to ACAF have been informed by consultation feedback received on the draft document. Some key themes that arose include:

- **Urgency and scale of action** needs to be better articulated
- **Lack of clarity on how key moves work together** and how they address our climate goals. In addition it was felt that there are too many.
- **Need to be clearer about roles and responsibilities** with a request for more information on who is responsible for actions at each level.
- **Need for partnership working across sectors** and with central government and mana whenua in particular.
- **Greater focus on equity** across feedback points.
- **Need for a strong Māori voice** with widespread support for working with Māori, using mātauranga Māori and Māori practices in designing and implementing climate action.
- **Need for a system shift** and scale of change required, and to better articulate this with Aucklanders.
- **Need for communication and behaviour change** and a request for campaigns to raise awareness across the region and enable action at an individual level.
- **Need for a significant shift in transport (of all key moves)** with the identified actions supported but a need for these to be delivered at pace and scale.

17. To address this feedback a number of key structural changes are proposed.

18. The first of these is establish three core drivers for action – our ‘pillars’ ([Attachment E](#)). These provide greater clarity on the goals of the framework and all actions will align to how they deliver against these goals:
• **A Tāmaki response**: This pillar reflects the uniqueness of Auckland and our place-based response to climate change. It is informed by learning from Māori principles and practice, provides a greater focus on equity and a better definition of roles and responsibilities and collective action across governance and sectors.

• **Reducing our emissions**: This pillar reflects the need to provide greater clarity on our emissions target and the need to halve emissions by 2030 and reach net zero emissions by 2050. It improves alignment with the actions and how we will deliver and prioritise emissions reductions.

• **Preparing for climate change**: This pillar enables a greater focus on how we will approach climate change adaptation and take a precautionary approach for the region and also provides greater alignment with the actions.

19. The second structural change is that the eleven key moves are streamlined into eight priorities (*Attachment F*). This proposed change is to address feedback on where areas are more foundational and therefore should be embedded throughout all priority areas, or where there is confusion and overlap.

• It is proposed that Key Move 3: Make development and infrastructure climate compatible and Key Move 4: Transform existing buildings and places are combined into a single built environment priority area.

• It is proposed that *Key Move 1: Lay the foundation* is embedded into our three pillars in recognition of the cross-cutting nature of the actions.

• Similarly, *Key Move 9- Rangatahi (Youth & Inter-generational equity)* is embedded into pillar 1 to reflect the need to consider actions across the framework.

20. Actions contained within Key Moves 1 and 9 will still be maintained and reflected in the updated document.

21. Actions contained within Key Moves 1-11 will be carried through into Priorities 1-8 (Figure 2) and updated to:

• clarify any ambiguities that were raised in consultation

• remove repetition or overlapping actions

• make additions in response to consultation feedback

• strengthen alignment to delivery of the three pillars.

22. Overall, the intent of the actions between the Key Moves 1-11 and Priority areas 1-8, remain the same. *Attachment G* briefly summarises how the actions have changed from the consultation document to the updated priority areas.

23. It is also proposed that the title of the document is changed from *Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework* to *Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan* to reflect feedback and the greater focus on the impact of actions against our climate goals and roles in delivery. In addition, this provides certainty for roles and responsibilities with regards to implementation.

24. The proposed changes meet the requirements of a climate action plan as defined by C40 Cities.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

25. The changes identified in this report have been made to reflect feedback received and updated emissions modelling. As such, they will further deliver and strengthen climate action already identified.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

26. Regular meetings and workshops took place across the council group for development of the framework.

27. In addition, a working group was established from the outset to provide expertise from across the council group, central government and district health boards.

28. This group has continued to provide input post-consultation and has reviewed and provided input into the proposed changes.

29. In addition, the team has been working closely across the Council group in the development of costed actions for consideration in the Long-term Plan. This process is running concurrently with the finalisation of the plan.

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

30. The framework will have implications for all local boards.

31. In June 2018, the Chief Sustainability Office attended workshops of 19 of the 21 local boards and obtained informal email feedback from the other two local boards to identify their main priorities related to climate change. This was followed up in September 2018 at cluster workshops to assess and test a series of ‘must haves’, which were the precursors to the actions included in the draft framework.

32. Priorities included:
   • coastal erosion and inundation concerns
   • affordable and accessible transport
   • long-term infrastructure development to consider climate impacts
   • better stormwater management
   • climate-related education and awareness
   • building community resilience
   • for Auckland Council to lead by example.

33. This report seeks Local Board formal views on proposed changes to the draft *Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework* outlined in this report. These views will be reflected in the final version.

34. Local boards will be key in taking climate action at a local level. Support will be provided for local board planning and alignment with outcomes.

35. The Chief Sustainability Office and Quality Advice Unit will implement a programme of work for the whole council family to provide guidance and training on how to embed climate action in Local Board plans and what to expect in climate impact statements.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

36. Climate change impacts and associated policy and action will have significant impacts for Māori communities.

37. A Tāmaki and climate change subject matter expert rōpū (group) was established in March 2019 which has been supporting and advising mana whenua and council on climate change issues for Māori and providing direct advice and narrative for the draft framework.

38. A rangatahi Māori and Pasifika rōpū has also been working in partnership with council on this kaupapa to develop rangatahi-focused actions for the framework.
39. A joint mana whenua and Māori expert task group is finalising a Tāmaki and climate change position paper, Te ora ō Tāmaki, which will be used as the bridging document to weave key anchor points into the climate action framework.

40. Anchor points include:
   - weaving the narrative into the framework, specifically the following sections: Climate change and Māori, Impacts on Māori and Developing the Plan with Māori
   - a section developed by rangatahi (the Youth and intergenerational equity key move)
   - a separate key move of Te puawaitanga o te tangata (Resilient Māori communities).

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

41. Actions within the framework will result in budgetary implications for organisations across the region; identifying and unlocking appropriate funding and financing streams in the future will be critical.

42. Taking climate action will require a range of finance and/or funding mechanisms. For instance, green bonds have been a useful tool for financing council-owned assets such as electric trains but investment in clean tech may require crowd-sourcing, grants or venture capital.

43. To support this, a climate finance work package is underway to identify partnerships and broader funding mechanisms across actions such as bonds, grants, equity instruments and public/private partnerships.

44. The final framework and specific Auckland Council actions being developed will need to inform on-going Long-term Plan discussions to support delivery and avoid costs associated with inaction, such as increased maintenance costs and infrastructure failures through to missed opportunities to Auckland’s economy in delivering the transition.

45. Not all actions within council’s remit will require additional budget. Some actions can result in long-term cost avoidance – for example electrifying fleets can reduce fuel and maintenance costs. Some actions could require existing funds to be redirected if priorities change.

46. Also, not all actions will require funding, for example those related to advocacy to central government or expert input into actions led by other organisations.

47. The costs associated with different council-specific actions will consider funding sources as described above.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

48. No high or extreme risks have been identified with the proposed approach.

49. Moderate risks exist, including:
   - preparing for the implications of climate change may not comply with current rules and regulations
   - potential strategic risk with non-alignment with New Zealand Government direction and policy
   - potential governance risk in shared leadership and ownership of the framework across sectors.

50. A risk mitigation plan has been developed to address the above, including targeted engagement approaches, a legal review of the final framework, on-going partnership with central government and establishment of clear governance structures for the implementation of the framework.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

51. Workshops will be held in April 2020 with the Environment and Climate Change Committee and Independent Māori Statutory Board to discuss updated framework text, and the final text will be presented to the Environment and Climate Change Committee for approval in May 2020.

52. The draft digital plan layout will be workshopped with the Environment and Climate Change Committee in June 2020 and finalised in July 2020.
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Memorandum

3 February 2020

To: Environment and Climate Change Committee; Local Boards and IMSB

Subject: Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri - Auckland’s Climate Action Framework:
Consultation Summary Report

From: Sarah Anderson, ACAF Lead, Chief Sustainability Office, APSR

Contact information: sarah.j.anderson@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
alec.tang@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

1. To share key findings from the public consultation on Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri - Auckland’s Climate Action Framework and provide an update on next steps.

Summary


3. 2,967 responses were received, including above average responses from Māori (n=578), Pacific Peoples (n=500) and youth (n=556 in the under 25 age bracket).

4. These were analysed by the project team to identify key findings and proposed changes to the framework.

5. Overall there was broad support for the framework.

6. 91% of respondents thought that the framework either fully, or partially takes us in the right direction to act on climate change.

7. 79% of respondents thought that Auckland Council should facilitate action and bring stakeholders together.

8. 93% either fully, or partially fed back that the key moves were right for Auckland.

9. 86% supported or partially supported the view that the key moves will drive organisational action.

10. However, a range of improvements were also suggested. A summary of feedback and proposed changes are in Appendix 1. These proposed changes will be workshopped with the Environment and Community Committee in February/early March and will be reported to Committee on 12th March for decision prior to finalisation of the text.

11. Local Boards will also be consulted for formal feedback on the proposed changes in March.

12. Final text for the plan will be taken to the Environment and Community Committee in May with an aim for the final digital plan to be launched in July 2020.

Context

13. In February 2018, the Environment and Community Committee approved the development of an integrated climate action plan for the Auckland region to address both emissions reduction (mitigation) and preparing for the impacts of a changing climate (adaptation).

15. Consultation on the framework opened on 17 July and closed on 30 September 2019.

16. 2,967 responses were received, and a report of key findings and proposed changes are provided in Appendix A.

Discussion

17. Four specific questions were asked during the consultation period, with an opportunity to provide further feedback if needed.

18. Of those that responded directly to the questions:

   91% of respondents thought that the framework either fully, or partially takes us in the right direction to act on climate change (n=1,543)

   79% of respondents thought that Auckland Council should facilitate action and bring stakeholders together (n=1,798)

   93% either fully, or partially fed back that the key moves were right for Auckland (n=1,796)

   86% supported or partially supported the view that the key moves will drive organisational action (n=1,502)

19. Responses were received from 80 organisations, representing major businesses such as energy providers and industry; subject matter expert networks such as New Zealand Green Building Council and Forest and Bird; academic institutions; community groups; trade unions; and youth (amongst others).

20. Targeted engagement also took place during the consultation period resulting in above average responses from Māori (n=578), Pacific Peoples (n=500) and youth (n=556 in the under 25 age bracket).

Key overall findings

21. Extensive and detailed feedback was received, much of which is informing on-going development of an implementation plan as well as the framework itself.

22. Overall a number of key themes emerged:

   **Urgency and scale of action** needs to be better articulated throughout. This was strongly reflected in the feedback with many comments suggesting it does not accurately reflect the climate emergency declaration. The scale of change required was regularly cited with a need to better articulate this with Aucklanders.

   **Bolder, accelerated targets are needed across key moves and overall.**

   **There is a lack of clarity on how key moves work together** with a view that the current format implies prioritisation and doesn’t demonstrate interlinkages.

   **Clarity of roles and responsibilities** is seen as key, with a request for more information on who is responsible for actions at each level and the need for partnerships, particularly in relation to Central Government, rangatahi and mana whenua.

   **Transparent monitoring and evaluation** was also highlighted. In addition, there was a strong appetite for independent bodies to monitor progress and support action development, including representation from communities and rangatahi.

   **Greater focus on equity** came through across feedback points and was seen as needing greater definition in the framework.

   **A strong Māori voice** with widespread support for working with Māori, using mātauranga Māori and Māori practices in designing and implementing climate action

   **Clear policy and regulation** and leading by example was a key piece of feedback, with a strong appetite for Council to lead and increase direction for the region.
**Communication and behaviour change** was strongly supported with a request for campaigns to raise awareness across the region and enable action at an individual level.

**Of all key moves, transport** was the most cited as needing significant change, with the identified actions supported but needing to be delivered at pace and scale.

**Next steps**

23. This memorandum and report provides an overview of feedback received and will inform the next stages as set out below:

- **January**
  - Circulate consultation report to Elected Members, Local Boards and IMSB (this memo and report)

- **February**
  - Workshop between ECC and MWKF (19th)
  - Workshop 1 (of 2) to review proposed changes to the framework - focus on emissions and adaptation (26th)

- **March**
  - Workshop 2 (of 2) to review proposed changes - focus on key moves (4th)
  - Report on proposed changes and approach
  - Proposed changes to Local Board meetings for formal feedback

- **April**
  - Workshop updated text with ECC and IMSB

- **May**
  - Final text to ECC for approval prior to handover to digital

- **June**
  - Workshop digital layout with ECC

- **July**
  - Digital plan completion

**Attachments**

- Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework Consultation Summary
Attachment E: ACAF Proposed Three Pillars

- Adaptation
  - What are we talking about?
  - Resilience for Children

- Mitigation
  - What are we talking about?
  - Reducing our emissions

- Our story
  - What are we talking about?
  - A place approach

Eight Priorities

- Natural Environment
- Transport
- Economy
- Community & Coast
- Te Ao Māori
- Wellbeing
- Health Environment
- Food
- Energy

Dynamic adaptive governance
### Attachment E: Proposed Priority Areas and action updates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Moves (July 2019)</th>
<th>Updated Priority areas (Feb 2020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Key Move 1:** Lay the Foundation  
Nine actions to deliver this Key Move | The nine actions under Key Move 1 are embedded into the three foundational pillars of ACAF. |
| **Key Move 2:** Enhance, restore and connect our natural environments  
Seven actions | Priority 1: Natural Environment  
Retains the focus on enhancing, restoring and connecting our natural environments but actions have been reviewed for clarity and reduced to six actions to remove duplication. |
| **Key Move 3:** Make development & infrastructure climate compatible  
Eight actions | Priority 2: Built Environment  
This Priority area contains key actions for a sustainable built environment:  
13 actions have now been combined into 10 to address overlap. These are grouped into four main thematic areas:  
- Sustainable growth  
- Sustainable infrastructure  
- Sustainable buildings  
- Sustainable places. |
| **Key Move 4:** Transforming existing buildings and places  
Five actions |  
Priority 3: Transport  
This Priority area still deals with sustainable transport but actions have been split out to eight. This reflects the priority placed on this area through the consultation feedback.  
The eight action areas are still concerned with:  
- encouraging mode shifts  
- supporting a transition to low carbon vehicles  
- supporting an efficient freight system.  
Additional actions focus on encouraging behaviour change and ensuring resilient transport infrastructure. |
| **Key Move 5:** Deliver clean, safe and equitable transport options  
Five actions |  
Priority 4: Economy  
There are now six actions that underpin this Priority area to address repetition. The action areas still maintain a focus on:  
- supporting businesses transition to a low carbon future with increased resilience |
| **Key Move 6:** Move to a zero carbon, climate resilient economy  
Seven actions |  
<p>|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Moves (July 2019)</th>
<th>Updated Priority areas (Feb 2020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Key Move 7: Help Aucklanders become more resilient and reduce their carbon footprint Four action areas to achieve this Key Move | Priority 5: Community This remains at four actions but an additional focus on communication and engagement been adopted from Key Move 1. The intent of the actions remains the same as Key Move 7, which is to:  
• support community-based action for low carbon future and to reduce emissions  
• support resilience building at the community level  
• long term management of our coast. |
| Key Move 8: Te puawaitanga o te tangata Priority 6: Te puawaitanga o te tangata Updates are in development, but this will remain a priority area | |
| Key Move 9: Youth and Intergenerational equity This key move has been moved into the foundational pillar. Updates and actions are being finalised by rangatahi | |
| Key Move 10: Shift to decentralized renewable energy Four actions | Priority 7: Energy There are now seven actions that underpin this Priority area. The intent of the actions remains the same, that is:  
• to drive innovation in renewable energy sources  
• to build resilience in the energy system.  
Additional actions in this Priority area were adopted from the former Key Move 4. |
| Key Move 11: Grow a low-carbon resilient food system Six actions | Priority 8: Food There are now five actions that underpin this Priority area to address repetition. The intent of the key moves remains the same, that is:  
• the focus on retaining productive soils  
• reducing food wastage  
• supporting food security. |
Local Board feedback to the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review

File No.: CP2020/03314

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an opportunity for local boards to provide formal feedback on the Council-Controlled Organisations (CCO) Review to the Independent Panel.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Governing Body approved the Terms of Reference for an Independent Panel to undertake a review of substantive CCOs at its meeting on 26 November 2019 [GB/2019/127].
3. The review covers Auckland Transport, Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development, Panuku Development Auckland, Regional Facilities Auckland and Watercare. The overall objectives are to examine:
   • whether CCOs are an effective and efficient model for delivering services to the council and Aucklanders, and
   • whether the CCO decision-making model provides sufficient political oversight, public transparency and accountability.
4. The review asks the Independent Panel to examine three areas: the CCO model and its accompanying roles and responsibilities; the accountability of CCOs; and CCO culture.
5. The Independent Panel is seeking the views of local boards on these areas.
6. Local boards are advised that their views are requested by the Independent Panel by 3 April 2020.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) provide formal feedback on the Council-Controlled Organisations Review to the Independent Panel.

Horopaki
Context
7. The Governing Body approved the CCO review Terms of Reference on 26 November 2019 [GB/2019/127]. The Independent Panel was appointed by the Governing Body on 12 December 2019 and is comprised of Miriam Dean, Doug Martin and Leigh Auton. Miriam Dean has been appointed panel chair [GB/2019/149].
8. Briefings on the CCO Review were provided to local board chairs in December 2019 by staff and in February 2020 by panel member Leigh Auton. The panel wrote to local board chairs in February asking for advice on what constitutes good engagement between CCOs and local boards.
9. Monthly updates on the review are reported to the CCO Oversight Committee and circulated to all local boards.

10. The Independent Panel is seeking comprehensive engagement to obtain a range of views about the issues forming the subject of the review (Attachment A). Community engagement on the review is occurring alongside the Annual Budget 2020/2021 in February/March 2020. An engagement document has been developed and a summary document has been translated into five languages and a New Zealand Sign Language video. A webpage provides information on the review, including stakeholder updates, relevant documents (including the Terms of Reference) and a contact for further information.

11. All feedback on the CCO Review will be provided to the Independent Panel. The Panel will report on the key issues and community and stakeholder feedback in May and will provide a final report and recommendations in July 2020.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

12. To identify the scope of their work, the Independent Panel has distilled the essence of the review terms into a list of issues, that forms the basis of the engagement and eventual report. The list and prompts, at Attachment A, provide a structure for local boards to give feedback.

13. The three key areas of focus set out in the list of issues are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Area of Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCO model, roles and</td>
<td>The essential question here is whether the CCO model delivers council services with the maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td>of operational efficiency, transparency and accountability, or whether there are better ways to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deliver such services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO accountability</td>
<td>Here the key question is whether the council’s current approach to holding CCOs to account on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>behalf of Aucklanders could be improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO culture</td>
<td>The central issue here is whether CCOs need to improve how they consult, engage with and respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to the wider community and council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

14. Local boards have an opportunity to consider suggestions that might improve climate change outcomes/mitigation in their feedback on the CCO Review.

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

15. The Independent Panel is engaging across the council group on the review, including:

- the chair of the independent panel wrote introducing the panel and the review objectives to all CCO chairs and chief executives, councillors, local board chairs, chief executive of IMSB and the co-chairs of the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum on 20 December 2019
- the panel met briefly with the CCO chief executives and chairs on 28 January 2020 to discuss the proposed review process and CCO engagement. Each CCO was asked to provide the panel with key stakeholders/customers

---

• individual meetings have taken place with CCO chief executives and board chairs over February and March 2020, and the panel is meeting with CCO stakeholders.

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

16. Local board formal feedback on the CCO Review, including issues experienced with CCOs, good practice and options for improvement, is sought by the Independent Panel by 3 April 2020.

17. Material on the CCO Review was available at Have your Say local board events for the Annual Budget.

18. Following the conclusion of the Independent Panel’s review, as part of the development of the next 10-year budget, local boards will have the opportunity to provide formal views on any proposals for change to the CCO model.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**
**Māori impact statement**

19. Staff presented to the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum on 19 December 2019. The panel met with one of the Forum co-chairs and mana whenua are invited to provide feedback to the panel. Mana whenua have also been invited to a hui with panel members on 18 March 2020.

20. The panel has met with the Independent Māori Statutory Board.

21. Panel members spoke on Radio Waatea to promote Māori interest and feedback on the CCO review. Material on the CCO review is being provided at mataawaka events for the Annual Budget and mataawaka organisations have been briefed on the review during the public engagement period.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**
**Financial implications**

22. There are no financial implications from this report.

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

23. There are no risks associated with the recommendations in this report.

**Ngā korinnga ā-muri**
**Next steps**

24. The Independent Panel is due to report on key issues, community and stakeholder feedback in May and to provide a final report, with recommendations, in July 2020.
## Ngā tāpirihanga
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CCO REVIEW

Independent review of council-controlled organisations: list of issues:

This list is intended as a guide to the high-level issues on which the review will focus. The issues in this list may be subject to revision during the course of this review.

Objectives

The review's overall objectives are to examine:

- whether CCOs are an effective and efficient model for delivering services to the council and Aucklanders
- whether the CCO decision-making model provides sufficient political oversight, public transparency and accountability.

The terms of reference require us to examine the following three issues:

CCO model, roles and responsibilities

The essential question here is whether the CCO model delivers council services with the maximum of operational efficiency, transparency and accountability, or whether there are better ways to deliver such services. In particular:

- Are there any problems, real or perceived, with the current model, including the risk of duplication with in-house council activities?
- Is the purpose of each CCO clear and current, and is the council giving each adequate direction?
- Are the roles and responsibilities of CCOs and the council towards one another clearly defined and well understood?
- Are there viable alternatives and what are their advantages and disadvantages?

CCO accountability

Here the key question is whether the council has adequate mechanisms to hold CCOs to account and is using them appropriately, and whether improvements, including new mechanisms (such as those provided for through the Local Government Act 2002 Amendment act 2019), are needed. In particular:

- Do current accountability mechanisms, monitor CCOs’ performance effectively and ensure CCOs respond appropriately to the concerns of the council, local boards and the public?
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- Do CCOs understand the need to act in a way that reflects their accountability to the community, as well as the council’s accountability to the community for CCO performance?
- Are there adequate mechanisms to ensure CCO board members and senior management meet the legislative requirements towards Māori, and that CCOs have developed sufficient capability to achieve this?
- Do CCOs have adequate guidance about when to act in their best commercial interests and when to act in the best interests of the public?
- Are council policies that are applicable to all CCOs (group policies) adequate, or should they be extended to other areas, such as remuneration?
- Is the process for appointing CCO board members, including the skills criteria used in the selection process, appropriate?

CCO culture

The central issue here is whether CCOs need to improve how they consult, engage with and respond to the community and council. In particular:

- Are the working relationships between the various levels of council (political, executive and staff) and CCOs (and between CCOs themselves) based on mutual trust, respect and confidence?
- Do recruitment processes and job descriptions sufficiently address the need for CCO chief executives and senior managers to respond to council directions and work effectively with senior council managers?
- Do CCO boards, executives and staff demonstrate accountability to Aucklanders, including by consulting sufficiently with Aucklanders and responding sufficiently to their concerns, or could their performance be improved?
- Are CCOs giving adequate public acknowledgement (such as through branding) to council-funded activities?
- Do CCOs give the council quality advice?

The full terms of reference can be found at https://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/Open/2019/11/GB_20191126_AGN_9506_AT_WEB.htm

20 December 2019
Puketāpapa Local Board feedback on the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality

File No.: CP2020/03528

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek formal input from the Puketāpapa Local Board into Auckland Council’s submission on the proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Ministry for the Environment have publicly released their proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality (NESAQ). Submissions close on 24 April 2020.
3. The NESAQ was introduced in 2004 and last amended in 2011. It sets standards for ambient air quality, woodburner emissions, and rules prohibiting certain activities with significant discharges of toxic pollutants.
4. The proposed amendments to the NESAQ aim to better regulate fine particulate material that can adversely affect human health and to better target controllable sources of air pollution.
5. The amendments specifically relate to the standards regarding particulate matter concentrations within airsheds, emissions standards for domestic fuel burners and the emission of mercury.
6. A memo dated 11 March was sent to board members about this matter (refer Attachment 1)
7. The deadline for local board feedback is 27 March 2020. A proposed draft council submission outlining the key submission points will be presented to the Planning Committee on 2 April 2020 for approval.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) provide input into Auckland Council’s submission on the proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality.
Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
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<td>91</td>
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<td>- Attachment A</td>
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</table>

Ngā kaihaina
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Memorandum 11 March 2020

To: Planning Committee and Local Board members
Cc: Environment and Climate Change Committee members
Chief Executive, Independent Māori Statutory Board

Subject: Preparing Auckland Council’s submission on central government’s proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality and an opportunity for input

From: Dave Allen Manager Natural Environment Strategy
Jess Gerry Analyst Strategy, Natural Environment Strategy
Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research department, Chief Planning Office

Contact information: jessica.gerry@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose
1. To overview central government’s proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality (NESAQ), highlight how the Auckland Council group will submit on these proposals and to give an opportunity for succinct input from elected members.

Summary
2. Central government have publicly released their proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality (NESAQ).
3. The proposed amendments to the NESAQ aim to better regulate fine particulate material that can adversely affect human health and to better target controllable sources of air pollution.
4. The amendments specifically relate to the standards regarding particulate matter concentrations within airsheds, emissions standards for domestic fuel burners and the emission of mercury.
5. Opportunities for input to the council group submission are tight, with the submission closing date of 24 April 2020. A proposed draft submission outlining the key submission points will be presented to the Planning Committee on 2 April 2020 for approval. Given the timing of the consultation period, it is not anticipated that the submission will be fully complete at that time.
6. Council staff will seek a resolution of the Planning Committee on 2 April 2020, such that the council group submission will be considered and signed off by the Planning Committee Chair and Deputy Chair, the Environment and Climate Change Committee Chair and Deputy Chair and a member of the Independent Māori Statutory Board, with the proposed final submission likely being provided to them by no later than Monday 20 April 2020.

Context
7. On 25 February 2020, the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) began consultation on a review of the NESAQ. The NESAQ was introduced in 2004 and last amended in 2011, and sets standards for ambient air quality, woodburner emissions, and rules prohibiting certain activities with significant discharges of toxic pollutants.
8. Broadly, the proposed amendments to the NESAQ aim to better regulate fine particulate matter (PM) that can adversely affect human health and to better target controllable sources of air pollution. Central government is proposing amendments to the particulate matter standards, domestic fuel burner standards and the introduction of standards for mercury emissions.
9. Central government has recognised that the mauri and hau of our air can be compromised in many ways, particularly through the release of contaminants. The proposed amendments to the NESAQ are seeking to protect and enhance the mauri and hau of our air through the exercise of kaitaikitanga.

Discussion

Particulate matter standards – proposals and implications

10. The NESAQ currently limits PM contaminants in our air. PM is a collective term for particles suspended in the air that are small enough to be inhaled. PM can be generated from both human activities and natural sources.

11. PM is often classified according to its size because size determines how it interacts with the environment and the human body. While PM$_{10}$ has a diameter of 10 micrometres (µm) or less, PM$_{2.5}$ has a diameter of less than 2.5µm and is a subset of the PM$_{10}$ range. Generally, finer particles have the potential to cause more acute health problems.

12. A growing body of international evidence has shown that PM$_{2.5}$ has significant health impacts. These particles can penetrate deep into the lungs, can enter the bloodstream and cause a range of health impacts, from asthma to more chronic respiratory disease.

13. For the purpose of determining an exceedance against the standard, PM concentrations are measured in µg/m$^3$ (micrograms per cubic metre).

14. Since the implementation of NESAQ, the lack of a PM$_{2.5}$ standard has been discussed through various avenues, and it is accepted by many (including OECD Environmental Performance Review and the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment) that a PM$_{2.5}$ standard is a sensible regulatory threshold.

15. Amendments to particulate matter (PM) standards within the NESAQ include:
   
   - implementation of a daily (24hr) average PM$_{2.5}$ standard of 25 µg/m$^3$ (three or less exceedances allowed in a 12-month period)
   - implementation of an annual average PM$_{2.5}$ standard of 10 µg/m$^3$
   - retention of the PM$_{10}$ standard and requirement to monitor for coarse particles
   - requirement to publicly notify any exceedances of PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ standards
   - replacing the current PM$_{10}$ standard with PM$_{2.5}$ standards as the primary measure for managing air quality, and
   - changes to the way airsheds are determined to be polluted and subsequent mitigation requirements are triggered.

16. In short, these will mean that in addition to having a daily standard for PM$_{10}$, PM concentrations will also be managed through a maximum daily average concentration of PM$_{2.5}$ and an annual average concentration of PM$_{2.5}$. Rather than being triggered by PM$_{10}$ exceedances, existing mitigation measures will instead be triggered by the exceedance of PM$_{2.5}$ standards. All exceedances of these standards will have to be publicly notified.

17. Both the 24hr average PM$_{2.5}$ standard of 25 µg m$^3$, and the annual average PM$_{2.5}$ standard of 10 µg m$^3$ are considered reasonable standards to implement. This is supported by the fact that both are currently included:
   
   - in the World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines; and,
   - are the Ambient Air Quality Targets within the Auckland Unitary Plan. The implementation of a PM$_{2.5}$ standard gives Auckland Council a target to manage airsheds$^1$ towards, and
   - endorses the Unitary Plan’s approach of setting standards for PM$_{2.5}$.

$^1$ A NESAQ airshed is a defined geographic area for air quality management which extends upwards from ground level, with no upper limit.
18. In preparation for the review of the NESAQ, council technical staff reviewed historic PM$_{2.5}$ data collected as part of Auckland Council’s ambient air quality monitoring program, to assess the ability of the Auckland Urban Airshed to comply with new PM$_{2.5}$ standards$^2$. An internally reviewed report has been completed, the findings of which will guide Auckland Council group’s submission on the proposed changes.

19. The internal report suggests that:
   - the 24hr PM$_{2.5}$ standard of 25 µg m$^{-3}$ could be met by the Auckland Urban Airshed$^3$. Given that compliance has only been achieved since 2015, some allowable breaches may be required; and
   - annual PM$_{2.5}$ standard of 10 µg m$^{-3}$ could be met by the Auckland Urban Airshed, having been compliant since 2009.

20. At present, when the PM$_{10}$ standard is breached, the following mitigation requirements are triggered:
   - prohibiting of discharges from open fires installed after the threshold breach threshold (regulation 24A)
   - declining new resource consent applications for discharges in polluted airsheds (regulation 17).

21. Central government is proposing that this be altered such that these mitigation requirements instead be triggered by a breach of the daily or annual PM$_{2.5}$ standards.

**Domestic fuel burner standards – proposals and implications**

22. Central government is also proposing amendments to more stringently manage domestic solid-fuel burners. Specifically the emission standard for new solid-fuel burners is proposed to be reduced to no more than 1.0g/kg (down from 1.5g/kg) and it is proposed that regulations pertaining to emissions limits and thermal efficiency be expanded to include all types of new, domestic solid-fuel burners (including coal burners, multi-fuel burners, pellet burners, open fires, cookers, and water boilers).

23. Since the release of the NESAQ in 2011, wood burner technology has improved. Central government are proposing stricter emissions standards for all new burners and consider that this will continue to drive innovation to further reduce emissions. Solid-fuel burners currently available in New Zealand would meet the proposed new standard.

**Mercury emission standards – implication and compliance**

24. New Zealand signed the Minamata Convention on Mercury in 2013. In order to ratify this Convention, one of the three main steps needed is to set controls on emissions to air from mercury. As such, central government is proposing that the NESAQ will:
   - prohibit the use of mercury in particular listed industrial processes. These have not been carried out in New Zealand, and they are not likely to be as technology has improved and alternative mercury-free processes are available, and
   - require applications for specified, new activities involving emissions of mercury to air, to consider international best practice guidance. This only applies to new or substantially modified sources and few point sources fall within these source categories (except coal-fired industrial boilers). It is highly unlikely there will be many resource consent applications to operate a new facility for particular industrial processes.

---

$^2$ Note that this analysis is limited to current and former monitoring sites and their associated data. Any new sites commissioned (particularly those in areas with significant solid fuel use for home heating) may impact the respective airshed’s ability to comply with a PM$_{2.5}$ NESAQ

$^3$ Auckland Urban Airshed is the geographic extent of the urban area of Auckland, the remainder of the region is covered by the Rural Airshed.
Next steps

25. The Auckland Plan Strategy and Research department is coordinating the preparation of the Auckland Council group submission. Key steps include:

- information memos forwarded to elected members, mana whenua and CCO’s following the 25 February 2020 public release of the consultation document, advising of the opportunity to provide succinct input into the council group submission process. Any feedback will need to be provided by 27 March 2020, to enable staff to inform the discussion at the Planning Committee on 2 April.

- specialist staff to review the proposals and potential implications and bring together an initial council group view.

- an agenda report outlining the key submission points, to be presented to the Planning Committee on 2 April 2020. Given the timing of the consultation period, relative to the nearest Planning Committee meeting date, it is not anticipated that the submission will be complete at this time. At that meeting a delegation to the Planning Committee Chair and Deputy Chair, the Environment and Climate Change Committee Chair and Deputy Chair, and a member of the Independent Maori Statutory Board will be sought to finalise the submission.

- finalise a council group submission for consideration by the delegated members of the Planning Committee (no later than Monday 20 April 2020).

26. Following the close of the consultation period, central government staff will consider the submissions received. It is understood that advice is scheduled to be put to Cabinet for decision in late 2020, following the general election.
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To inform the Puketāpapa Local Board of Auckland Council’s submission on the Government’s Policy Statement on Transport 2021 and to request that the local board delegate a member to provide input into this submission on behalf of the local board.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. It is expected that the Government’s Policy Statement on Transport 2021 will be released mid-March 2020.

3. The Policy Statement on Transport is produced every three years and provides an indication of the government’s policy for funding over the next three years.

4. The Policy Statement on Transport 2021 will give a high-level indication of what projects central government is likely to fund. It is also expected to include funding for rail, which in the past has been discussed elsewhere.

5. Auckland Council will be preparing a submission on this statement. It is expected that this submission will be required by 24 April 2020.

6. A memo and discussion document will be sent to local boards from Auckland Council staff after the policy statement is released. Local board members will have the opportunity to attend a workshop on 25 March to discuss this matter further.

7. Local boards can provide input into the Auckland Council submission. The due date for local board feedback into this submission is yet to be confirmed.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) delegate a member of the local board to provide input, on behalf of the local board, into Auckland Council’s submission on the Government’s Policy Statement on Transport 2021.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.
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Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To inform the Puketāpapa Local Board of Auckland Council’s submission on the New Zealand Transport Agency’s Accessible Streets consultation and to request that the local board delegate a member to provide input into this submission on behalf of the local board.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The Associate Minister of Transport is proposing a package of rule changes known as the Accessible Streets Regulatory Package. The aim of this package is to increase the accessibility and safety of footpaths, shared paths, cycle lanes, cycle paths and roads.

3. Consultation on this topic is open until 22 April 2020.

4. A summary of the overview for this package is provided in Attachment A. Further information on this topic can be found at https://www.nzta.govt.nz/about-us/consultations/accessible-streets.

5. Auckland Council is preparing a submission on this topic. This will be discussed by Auckland Council’s Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee on 4 April 2020.

6. Local boards can provide input into the Auckland Council submission. A memo will be provided to local boards in March that outlines the consultation and details when local board feedback is required.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) delegate a member of the local board to provide input, on behalf of the local board, into Auckland Council’s submission on the New Zealand Transport Agency’s Accessible Streets Consultation.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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ACCESSIBLE STREETS – SUMMARY TO THE OVERVIEW
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ACCESSIBLE STREETS OVERVIEW – A SUMMARY

The Associate Minister of Transport is proposing a collection of rule changes known as the Accessible Streets Regulatory Package.

These rules are designed to:

- make our footpaths, shared paths, cycle lanes and cycle paths safer and more accessible for you
- accommodate the increasing use of micro-mobility devices like e-scooter on our streets and footpaths.
- encourage active modes of transport and support the creation of more liveable and vibrant towns and cities
- make social and economic opportunities more accessible to you, and
- make public transport (buses) and active transport such as walking or cycling safer and more efficient.

Our proposed rules also support the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport and help road controlling authorities, like local councils, to better regulate their local areas.

Accessible Streets will create a national framework clarifying the types of vehicles and devices that are allowed on footpaths, shared paths, cycle paths and cycle lanes, and how they can use these spaces. This will include a 15km/h speed limit on the footpath and a requirement for all other footpath users to give way to pedestrians.

The rules also clarify how road controlling authorities may regulate pedestrians, devices and spaces like the footpath; and propose changes to the priority given to a range of road users to remove barriers to walking, device use and cycling.

We’ve summarised our proposed changes below.
Proposal 1:

Change and re-name the types of devices that are used on footpaths, shared paths, cycle paths and cycle lanes

To improve regulation on footpaths, shared paths, cycle paths and cycle lanes, we propose to change some of the current vehicle and device categories to reflect how these vehicles and devices are used in these spaces.

This change will help to clarify where particular devices or vehicles can go.

For your information:

A **shared path** is designed to be used by pedestrians, people using mobility devices, cyclists and people using devices. A sign or a marking on the path can be used to prioritise a particular user, (like a pedestrian or cyclist) or to exclude particular users.

A **cycle path** is a part of the road that is physically separated from motor traffic. They are usually located next to the roadway, within the road reserve. They are intended for cyclists but pedestrians and people using mobility devices may use them when a footpath is not available.

A **cycle lane** is a lane within the roadway (often painted) designed for the passage of cycles, meaning users are in a separate lane from other traffic. They can be located next to parking, next to the kerb, and between two traffic lanes (for example, between a bus lane and a general traffic lane.

The following table outlines the current vehicle/device/user type categories and what they’ll become should the proposed changes come into effect:
### Current categories and proposed categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current categories: Pedestrians and powered wheelchair users</th>
<th>Proposed categories: Pedestrians and powered wheelchair users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A pedestrian currently includes:</td>
<td>We propose to create a new category for powered wheelchairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- people on foot</td>
<td>Under this change, users of powered wheelchairs will be treated as pedestrians because powered wheelchairs are crucial to the movement of the people using them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- people using unpowered wheelchairs</td>
<td>A powered wheelchair will be defined as a wheelchair:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- everyday items such as prams and shopping trolleys when used by a person walking</td>
<td>- propelled by mechanical power, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- operated by a joystick or other software.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedestrians are the main people using the footpath. If there’s no footpath available, they can also use:

- cycle paths
- cycle lanes
- shared paths and
- the roadway

A powered wheelchair is treated as a mobility device but is not specifically defined as one in legislation. (Please note that the definition of Mobility devices is outlined in the section below.)

As a mobility device, a powered wheelchair can be used on:

- footpaths and shared paths
- roads, cycle lanes and cycle paths when footpaths are not available.

Currently, while an unpowered wheelchair is included in the pedestrian category, a powered wheelchair is not. This is inconsistent as both powered and unpowered wheelchairs are around the same size and share the same purpose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current category: Mobility devices</th>
<th>Proposed category: Mobility devices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility devices are defined as devices:</td>
<td>Powered wheelchairs will no longer be considered a mobility device and will be re-categorised as pedestrians. There will be no other changes to devices in this category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- intended for people who require mobility assistance due to a physical or neurological impairment, and are</td>
<td>We’ll review the mobility device category as part of later work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- powered by a motor with a maximum power output up to 1500 watts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current categories and proposed categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current category:</th>
<th>Proposed category:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wheeled recreational devices</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transport devices</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wheeled recreational devices (also known as WRDs) are defined as a device with wheels, propelled by:

- human power, or
- gravity, or
- a small auxiliary motor with a maximum power output of up to 300 watts.

They include:

- push-scooters
- skateboards
- roller blades or skates
- low powered motorised versions of the same devices (like e-scooters).

It currently excludes cycles with a wheel diameter over 355mm. This means that most bicycles are excluded. But, bicycles and e-bikes with a wheel diameter under 355mm are both a cycle and a wheeled recreational device.

You can use a WRD on footpaths and roads, and shared paths if permitted by road controlling authorities.

There are two key issues with the current definition of WRDs:

First, powered and unpowered devices are treated the same, despite major differences:

Devices classed as WRDs are considered part of the same group even though they travel at different speeds and are used in different ways. For example:

- some privately-owned e-scooters can reach speeds up to 70km/h while roller blades average about 12km/h
- it’s rare to use roller blades on the road, but common for e-scooters.

Second, WRDs are also defined as motor vehicles and this is confusing for users:

Under the current definition, a range of low-powered WRDs, such as e-skateboards, powered unicycles and hoverboards, are also considered motor vehicles. These are not technically permitted on the footpath.

This can be confusing because people expect that if a device fits the definition of a WRD, they can use it on the footpath.

Our proposed change will replace wheeled recreational devices with two new categories:

- The first is **unpowered transport devices**, which will include devices such as push-scooters and skateboards.
- The second is **powered transport devices**, which will include devices such as e-scooters and YikeBikes.

Together, unpowered and powered transport devices will be referred to as transport devices.

**Unpowered transport devices**

Our proposed change will create a category that includes small unpowered devices like skateboards, push scooters and roller blades. The device must be propelled by human power or gravity. The new definition will remove wheel diameter requirements.

Unpowered transport devices can be used on:

- footpaths under certain conditions
- cycle paths
- cycle lanes
- shared paths if a road controlling authority permits it.

**Powered transport devices**

Our proposed change will create a category for low-powered devices that are propelled by a motor and have been declared by the Transport Agency not to be a motor vehicle. The new definition will remove wheel diameter requirements.

The Transport Agency can declare a device isn’t a motor vehicle if its maximum power output is under 600 watts. The Transport Agency can also impose conditions on the use of a powered transport device if the maximum power output is between 300 and 600 watts.

The Land Transport Act 1998 sets out these criteria. Powered transport devices can be used on:

- footpaths under certain conditions
- cycle lanes
- cycle paths and
- shared paths if a road controlling authority permits it

Under this change, only e-scooters and Yikebikes are powered transport devices. All other powered devices, like e-skateboards, powered unicycles and hoverboards are motor vehicles and will not be allowed on the footpath, unless the Transport Agency makes a declaration.
## Current categories and proposed categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current category: Cycles and e-bikes</th>
<th>Proposed category: Cycles and e-bikes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cycles, including adult tricycles and e-bikes, are treated as their own vehicle category. Adult cycles are too large to be considered a wheeled recreational device. Cycles with a wheel diameter less than 355mm, the average size for a six-year-old, are both a WRO and a cycle. Cycles and e-bikes are not permitted on the footpath. They can use:  
- cycle paths, cycle lanes and the road  
- shared paths if a road controlling authority permits it.  | Cycles and e-bikes will continue to be a separate category of vehicle. Small-wheeled cycles and e-bikes that are propelled by cranks will be classified as cycles. A crank is a bicycle part that connects its pedals to a chain which helps the wheels to move forward and backward. Under our proposed changes cycles and e-bikes can be used on:  
- the footpath under certain conditions  
- cycle paths, cycle lanes and the road  
- shared paths if a road controlling authority permits it. |

By creating new vehicle and device categories, and re-categorising some devices, we’ll:

- remove inconsistencies within the current categories
- reflect how different devices and vehicles are now used.

Our proposed changes will regulate devices based on how they're used.
Proposal 2:

Establish a national framework for the use of footpaths

Currently, people using a device on the footpath must behave in a courteous and considerate manner, travelling in a way that is not dangerous for other people using the footpath. There are no restrictions on the speed they can travel or the size of the device.

Fast-moving devices such as e-scooters are now commonly used on the footpath. To ensure they’re used safely and continue to provide mobility benefits to everyone using them, we propose a new rule – the Land Transport Rule: Paths and Road Margins 2020. Our proposed new rule aims to:

- redefine the users of the footpath,
- establish a national framework for vehicle and device use on the footpath, and
- enable road controlling authorities, like local councils, to lower the speed limit or restrict users on the footpath if needed.

For the safety of others sharing the footpath, users riding on the footpath under the new rule must:

- behave in a courteous and considerate manner,
- travel in a way that is not dangerous for other people using the footpath,
- give right of way to pedestrians,
- travel no faster than 15km/h, and
- ride a device less than 750mm wide so multiple people can still use the footpath.

Everyone using the footpath, except pedestrians walking or running, must follow the above requirements. Under the new framework, the vehicles and devices that can be used on the footpath are:

- mobility devices,
- transport devices (formerly wheeled recreational devices),
- cycles, including e-bikes, and
- wheelchairs (although these users won’t need to follow the width restriction).

We propose that road controlling authorities, like local councils, will be able to lower the speed limit on the footpath to 10km/h or 5km/h. They will not be able to increase the speed limit.

We also propose that road controlling authorities will have the ability to ban or restrict some vehicles or devices from the footpath. However, they would need to consult with their community before making this decision.
Proposal 3:

Establish a national framework for the use of shared paths and cycle paths

Rules for using footpaths, shared paths and cycle paths are unclear. However, more people are using them more frequently, and using more devices in these spaces. This creates challenges around access for all new and existing users of these paths.

To manage these challenges, we propose a new rule – the Land Transport Rule: Paths and Road Margins 2020.

The new rule aims to redefine and provide clear rules for the users of shared paths and cycle paths. It will establish a national framework for the use of devices in these spaces, by:

- allowing road controlling authorities to declare a path to be a shared path or cycle path by resolution
- clarifying that all users must give way to pedestrians on shared paths, and
- setting a speed limit on shared paths and cycle paths.
  - This means, if a path is located beside a roadway, the speed limit on the path will match the roadway.
  - If a path is not located beside a roadway, the maximum speed limit will be 50km/h.

The new rule will also enable road controlling authorities, like local councils, to lower the speed limit or restrict users in these spaces if needed.
Proposal 4:
Enable transport devices to use cycle lanes and cycle paths

Our proposed change will allow transport devices, including e-scooters and skateboards, to be used in cycle lanes and all cycle paths. Pedestrians and mobility devices can still use cycle lanes and cycle paths if a footpath is not available.

The change is intended to encourage faster transport devices, like e-scooters or skateboards, to move off the footpath and onto parts of the road when they’re less likely to come into conflict with pedestrians or fast-moving motor vehicles. They can still use the footpath if they keep to the speed limit. They can use shared paths, most cycle paths and the road as they do currently.
Proposal 5:

Introduce lighting and reflector requirements for powered transport devices at night

Currently, cycles must use a headlamp, a rear facing position light, and reflectors when riding on the road at night. Powered transport devices, while also permitted on the road, do not have any lighting or reflector requirements. This inconsistency can be dangerous as it means transport devices can travel at night without being visible to others. The risk is increased if the user is on the road with fast-moving traffic.

Our proposed change would only permit powered transport devices on the road (and paths) at night provided the device is fitted with:

- a headlamp
- a rear-facing position light, and
- a reflector (or if the user is wearing reflective material).

If proposal 4 and 6C are introduced, these lighting and reflector requirements would apply when riding in a cycle lane or cycle path at night too.

For your information:

A **headlamp** is a light on the front of a bicycle or device. attached to the front of a bicycle or device.

A **position light** is another light attached to a bicycle or device.

**Reflectors** work by bouncing light back to where it came from. They can either be attached to a bicycle or device or worn as reflective clothing.
Proposal 6:

Remove barriers to walking, device use and cycling through rule changes

Proposal 6 makes changes to the priority of a range of road users.

Proposal 6A). Allow cycles and transport devices to travel straight ahead from a left turn lane

We propose that cycles and transport devices will be allowed to travel straight ahead from a left turn lane, unless it is unsafe to do so. Travelling straight ahead from a left turn lane is pictured below in Figure A.

When cycle lanes are not available, riding straight ahead from a left turn lane can often be safer than travelling through heavy, high-speed traffic in the straight-through lane. The left turn lane usually has less traffic, travelling at slower speeds.

Figure A.

Under the proposed changes, the cyclist pictured (labelled A) will be able to travel straight ahead from the left turn lane with one left turning car (labelled B) instead of the lane with two cars (labelled C and D).
Proposal 6B). Allow cycles and transport devices to carefully pass slow-moving vehicles on the left, unless a motor vehicle is indicating a left turn

We propose that cyclists and transport device users will be allowed to pass slow-moving traffic on the left. Passing on the left is known as ‘undertaking’ and many cyclists do this already.

On the road, cycles and transport devices must ride as far left as practicable. ‘Undertaking’ allows them to maintain a safe, steady speed past slow, stop-start traffic, while avoiding travelling between motor vehicles.

Figure B.

Under the proposed change, the cyclist pictured (labelled A) can pass slow-moving cars (labelled B and C) on the left. If the cyclist is passing slow-moving vehicles on the left and parked cars on the right (labelled D and E), the cyclist will need to pass carefully.
Proposal 6C. Give cycles and buses priority over turning traffic when they’re travelling through an intersection in a separated lane

We propose to clarify that turning traffic must give way to cycles, transport devices and buses when those users are travelling straight through an intersection in a separated lane, as pictured below in Figure C.

By separated lane, we mean a lane that is physically separated from other traffic lanes with the use of a device like a concrete barrier or planter box. These separated lanes are usually used by cycles, transport devices and buses.

This will clarify who has the right of way at intersections. Buses, cycles and transport devices can expect fewer delays as they do not have to wait for turning traffic. It is also expected to reduce risks for users of these modes as traffic is more likely to slow down before turning to check for cycles, buses or transport devices. Less risk and a faster commute may encourage the use of public transport, transport devices and cycling over private vehicles.

Figure C.

Under the proposed change, the cars pictured (labelled C and D) would need to give way to the cyclists travelling through the intersection (labelled A and B) before turning into the side road.
Proposal 6D). Give priority to footpath, shared path and cycle path users over turning traffic where the necessary traffic control devices are installed

Our proposed change will mean:

- People on the path will have priority over turning traffic when they're crossing a side road, anywhere that minimum markings are installed.
- People on the path are treated consistently with other users going straight through, anywhere the appropriate traffic control devices are installed.

We propose that minimum markings be two white lines across the side road, as pictured below in Figure D. Our proposed change is expected to reduce delays for path users and make active modes more attractive.

Giving priority to footpath, shared path and cycle path users over turning traffic is expected to increase their safety and priority at intersections.

*Figure D.*

*The pedestrians in the picture above (labelled A and B) are crossing the side road with white lines. We propose that these pedestrians would have right of way over turning traffic and other path users.*

*The cyclist (labelled as C) about to cross the side road, would also have right of way over turning traffic but would need to give way to the pedestrians also crossing the road.*

*The cars on the road (labelled D and E) will need to give way to the pedestrians and the cyclist crossing the road.*
Proposal 7:

Mandate a minimum overtaking gap for motor vehicles overtaking cycles, transport devices, horses, pedestrians, and people using mobility devices on the road.

Our proposed change will ensure drivers of motor vehicles pass at a safe distance when overtaking cyclists, horses, pedestrians and people using transport devices and mobility devices on the road.

The minimum overtaking gap will be:

- 1 metre when the posted speed limit is 60km/h or less
- 1.5 metres when the posted speed limit is over 60km/h.

A mandatory minimum overtaking gap will:

- set a clear expectation about what a safe minimum passing distance is
- legitimise what’s currently a guideline
- raise awareness of this practice.

The proposed change is expected to decrease the number of incidents involving overtaking vehicles and vulnerable road users.
Proposal 8:
Clarify how road controlling authorities can restrict parking on berms

Currently, to restrict parking on berms, local councils can introduce a bylaw:

- prohibiting parking in certain locations, and
- signposting the prohibition in those locations.

Different councils disagree on whether they need signage.

Our proposed change will remove the need for signage and clarify what’s needed for road controlling authorities to restrict parking on berms.

Road controlling authorities will be able to restrict parking on a berm or an area of berms by:

- passing a resolution, and
- registering the restriction with the NZ Transport Agency.

This means that if a road controlling authority believes that berm parking on a collection of streets is a safety issue, they’ll have the power to restrict berm parking in those spaces without using a sign.
Proposal 9:

Give buses priority when exiting bus stops

Under our proposed change, road users must give way when an urban bus on a scheduled public transport service:

- is leaving a signed bus stop, and
- has indicated for three seconds.

Our proposed change will apply on roads with a posted speed limit of 60km/h or less.

This will signal that public transport has priority in urban areas, as buses usually carry more people than cars.
We want to hear what you think

The next phase of the Rules development process is to consider your views, and the impact that the proposed changes would have on you.

You can find further information about these proposals in the Accessible Streets Overview (available at [www.nzta.govt.nz/accessible-streets-consultation](http://www.nzta.govt.nz/accessible-streets-consultation)), which also includes a series of questions about the proposals. These questions are also provided in the online submission form, available at the above web address or by calling or writing to us.

Your submission is public information

We will use your submission to help us make the changes to the rules.

Please note that Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (the Transport Agency) will publish a summary of submissions. If you do not want your name or any identifying information to be included in anything we publish (including because you believe your comments are commercially sensitive) please indicate this clearly in your submission.

Please note that your submission is also subject to the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA). This means that other people will be able to obtain copies of submissions by making a request under the OIA. If you think there are grounds for your information to be withheld under the OIA, please note this in your submission. We will take your reasons into account and may consult with you when responding to requests under the OIA.
You can make a submission in the following ways:

1. Fill in the online survey: [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/MXTDZBC](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/MXTDZBC)  
(Please note that the online survey is based on questions in the full overview).

2. Fill in the submission form, which contains the range of questions. The submission form is available online at [www.nzta.govt.nz/accessible-streets-consultation](http://www.nzta.govt.nz/accessible-streets-consultation) and you can request a copy by emailing us (accessible.streets@nzta.govt.nz) or phoning our contact centre 0800 699 000

Please include the following information in your submission:
- the title – Accessible Streets Regulatory Package 2020
- your name
- your job title and organisation’s name if applicable
- your address or email address.

a) **Send your submission to us by email**

   Email us a letter, video response or survey to accessible.streets@nzta.govt.nz

b) **You can post us your submission** to:

   Accessible Streets Regulatory Package 2020  
   Transport System Policy Team  
   Free Post 65090  
   Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency  
   National Office  
   Private Bag 6995  
   Wellington 6141

Please note the deadline for submissions is 5pm on Wednesday 22nd April 2020.
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To enable the Albert-Eden Roskill Ward Councillors to verbally update the Local Board.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
The ward councillors provide a verbal update.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

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

File No.: CP2020/03302

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide the Chairperson, Harry Doig, with an opportunity to update local board members on the activities he has been involved with since the last meeting.

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

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
 a) receive Chair Harry Doig's report for February 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
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<td>125</td>
</tr>
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</table>
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<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketāpapa</th>
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<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
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Business meeting 19 March 2020

Harry Doig Board Member Report
Period from 11 Feb to 04 March 2020

Roles assigned by the local board
- Local Board Chair
- Primary Contact – Community

Council meetings / events attended
12 February  Local Board Plan Engagement - 580 Hillsborough Rd
12 Feb    Chair/ Deputy Chair / Srn Advisor/Advisor  catch up
13 Feb    Puketāpapa Local Board (PLB) Workshop
13 Feb    Community Forum at Wesley
14 Feb    Local Board Plan Engagement – Wesley Intermediate with member Shen
17 Feb    PLB Agenda run through
19 Feb    Planning Committee workshop – City Centre Masterplan refresh
19 Feb    Chair/ Deputy Chair catch up
19 Feb    Meet with Fletcher Living representatives about Three Kings Quarry development
19 Feb    Chair/ Deputy Chair / RM/ Srn Advisor  catch up
19 Feb    PLB mins meeting with Chair/Deputy Chair/SLA/LA/DA
20 Feb    Puketāpapa Local Board Business Meeting
20 Feb    Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop
21 Feb    Kura Kāwana induction - Being a good governor
21 Feb    Monthly Comms meeting with Deputy Chair
21 Feb    Healthy Puketapapa - Process Evaluation Interview
24 Feb    Kura Kāwana - Standing orders with members Turner and Lai
24 Feb    Cr Casey/PLB & A-E Chairs’ Monthly Meeting
26 Feb    Local Board Plan Engagement – Ranfurly Village with member Shen
26 Feb    Local Board Plan Engagement – Selwyn Village with members Kumar and Turner
27 Feb    Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop
28 Feb    Puketāpapa LB catch-up with community Constable
28 Feb    Local Board Plan Engagement – Wise Women’s Group with member Kumar
01 March  Local Board Plan Engagement – Music in the Parks with members Turner, Shen, Kumar and Lai
02 Mar    PA/ Chair catchup
04 Mar    Puketapapa Local Board Strategic Relationship Grant 2020-2021 with member Lai
04 Mar    Chair/ Deputy Chair / RM/ Srn Advisor  catch up
04 Mar    Local Board Plan Engagement – Hillsborough, Lynfield and Mt Roskill Rotary Club
          with member Shen and Lai
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Other relevant meetings attended
29 February  Attend Community service projects with members of The Church of Jesus Christ of
           Latter-day Saints and member Shen
03 Mar  Meeting with New Auckland Deaf Society Inc re alcohol licence application

Issues

Disclosures
As recorded in Council's declaration of interest register

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

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

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
a) receive the member reports for February – March 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
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<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Jonathan Turner's report, 11 February - 05 March 2020</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<th>Author</th>
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<tr>
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Julie Fairey - Board Member Report
Covering period 10 Feb to 5 Mar 2020

I was away on holiday overseas from 21 February to 1 March.

Roles assigned by the local board
- Deputy Chair
- Primary contact for Parks
- Primary contact for Transport
- Member of the Integrated Area Plan working group
- Delegated land owner approvals for film and event permitting in parks

General / assigned roles update
- **Deputy Chair**
  - **Participated on behalf of the Chair as follows:**
    - None during the reporting period

**As regular part of Deputy Chair role:**
  - 10 Feb – Attended Chairs’ Forum from 12.24pm as observer, with Chair Doig
  - 17 Feb – Attended Agenda Run-Through meeting
  - 19 Feb - Regular catch-up with Chair
  - 19 Feb – Regular catch-up with local board advisors, with Chair
  - 19 Feb – Attended Minutes meeting with Chair
  - 21 Feb – Attended monthly communications meeting with Chair
  - 2 Mar – Brief catch-up with Senior Local Board Advisor
  - 2 Mar – Brief catch-up with Chair
  - 4 Mar – Regular catch-up with local board advisors, with Chair
  - 5 Mar – Attended work programme preparation meeting with Chair

- **Primary contact for Parks & Environment**
  - 17 Feb – Met with Member Turner to discuss Manukau Harbour Forum
  - 4 Mar - Attended Keith Hay Park Users Group

- **Primary contact for Transport**
  - 10 Feb – Monthly meeting with AT Relationship Manager on small local issues, with Member Turner
  - 18 Feb – Dropped in to Wesley Community Centre to discuss Sandringham Rd Extension pedestrian crossing impacted by Central Interceptor works with staff
  - 21 Feb – Interview with researcher from AUT looking at walkability
  - 5 Mar – Facilitated board member discussion on Capital Transport Fund priorities

- **Member of the Integrated Area Plan working group**
  - None during the reporting period
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- **Land owner approvals**
  
  Member Kumar, as alternate for this delegation, dealt with these while I was away 21 Feb to 1 Mar.
  - Access to Stamford Park Rd accessway (to regional cycleway) for stormwater connection works for adjacent private property, sent in mid February – gave feedback that it looked fine
  - Filming for Monte Cecilia Park for reality TV scene on 11th or 12 March – agreed to delegate to officers

**Meetings / events attended in addition to above**

- 10 Feb – Meeting with PA Liaison about diary management
- 13 Feb - Attended most of regular board workshop with Members Doig, Lai, Shen, Turner, and Kumar, by Skype due to illness. I was absent from 12.30pm to 2.30pm.
- 14 Feb – Attended Kura Kawana training session “Point of Order” on standing orders and meeting procedure.
- 17 Feb – Attended St Therese School engagement session on the Local Board Plan with Member Turner
- 20 Feb – Attended regular Local Board business meeting
- 20 Feb – Attended regular local board workshop with Chair Doig, Members Shen, Lai and Turner
- 2 Mar – Attended Mt Roskill Grammar School assembly with Member Kumar, to encourage participation in the Local Board Plan
- 5 Mar – Attended regular Local Board workshop with Chair Doig, Members Lai, Shen and Turner, Member Kumar from 9.40am
- 5 Mar – Attended regular community forum with Chair Doig, Members Kumar, Lai, Shen and Turner

**Conferences / member development**

- None in the reporting period other than provided by Council as listed above

**Disclosures**

I am an individual member of the Auckland branch of the National Council of Women. During the reporting period I attended the regular branch meeting on 10 Feb 2020. www.ncwnz.org.nz

I am a trustee, and board secretary, for The Aunties, a charity established to expand and make sustainable work done to meet the needs of families dealing with domestic violence. During the reporting period I did not attend any meetings in this role www.aunties.co.nz

I am also a trustee on the HE Fairey Family Trust, which gives grants to people with disabilities through CCS/Disability Action, and am now one of the two “active” trustees from
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August 2019, which means myself and another family member assess the applications against the criteria and decide if they meet them.

During the reporting period I flew AKL to WLG on 12 February, return flight the next morning, paid for by Parliamentary Services, to join my husband who was working in Wellington.

For clarity, my holiday in Australia from 21 February to 1 March was self-funded.

**Recommendation**
That this report be received.
Roles assigned by the local board
1) Delegations in the fourth term (2019-2022)
   • Landowner consents AND filming AND events
     ○ Julie Fairey Lead and Ella Kumar Alternate
   • Liquor licenses AND notification of resource consents AND board views on notified consents
     ○ Harry Doig Lead and member Ella Kumar Alternate

2) Appointments in the fourth term (2019-2022)
   • Aircraft Noise Community Consultative Group – Ella Kumar Lead and Bobby Shen Alternate
   • Pah Homestead Joint Liaison Body – Chair Lead and Ella Kumar Alternate
   • Manukau Harbour Forum - Jon Turner Lead and Ella Kumar Alternate
   • Integrated Area Plan PWP – all members, but a quorum of three

3) Board key contact people for the fourth term (2019-2022)
   • Parks and Environment: Primary contact Julie, Secondary contact Ella
   • Community: Primary contact Harry, Secondary contact Fiona
   • Transport: Primary contact Julie, Secondary contact Jon
   • Planning: Primary contact Ella, Secondary contact Bobby

Delegations in the fourth term (2019-2022)
   • Landowner consents AND filming AND events
     ○ Julie Fairey Lead and Ella Kumar Alternate
   • Liquor licenses AND notification of resource consents AND board views on notified consents
     ○ Harry Doig Lead and member Ella Kumar Alternate

2) Appointments in the fourth term (2019-2022)
   • Aircraft Noise Community Consultative Group – Ella Kumar Lead and Bobby Shen Alternate
   • Pah Homestead Joint Liaison Body – Chair Lead and Ella Kumar Alternate
   • Manukau Harbour Forum - Jon Turner Lead and Ella Kumar Alternate
   • Integrated Area Plan PWP – all members, but a quorum of three

3) Board key contact people for the fourth term (2019-2022)
   • Parks and Environment: Primary contact Julie, Secondary contact Ella
   • Community: Primary contact Harry, Secondary contact Fiona
   • Transport: Primary contact Julie, Secondary contact Jon
   • Planning: Primary contact Ella, Secondary contact Bobby
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Meetings / events attended

4th Feb Local Board meeting

5th Feb Local Board Workshop

Urban Development Bill

1. Southern Initiative Update on FY20 and potential FY21
2. PLB Q2 report
3. Finance Introduction and overview
4. Regional Facilities Auckland Introduction and overview
5. LBP engagement
6. Health Puketapapa results of community prioritisation initial findings from process evaluation
7. Walmsley Park temporary park service provision plan

Integrated Area Plan meeting

13th Feb Local Board Workshop

1. Community forum
2. Community feedback
3. Scattering Ashes, LB Feedback on burial and cremation
4. Parks Sports and Rec Monthly update
5. Parks Sport and Rec Christchurch remembrance space at Walmsley
6. Proposal to develop inter-regional marine pest pathway management, LB feedback
7. Freeland Reserve employment project update
8. Kainga Ora development (former HLC)
9. At monthly Update

Puketapapa Local Board draft plan Have your Say forum Wesley Community Centre

26th Feb HYS Selwyn Heights

27th Feb Local Board Workshop

1. Te Auanga Community Advisory Group
2. AT Capital Fund
3. Local Board Plan feedback
4. Healthy Puketapapa Strategic Structure discussions
5. Wesley and Roskill Youth zone Q3 update
6. Community Place, Wesley markets/RYZ business Plan
7. Arts Culture events update

28th Feb HYS Wise Women Group
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I was away Feb 14th to 25th Feb

Disclosures

Contractor for YMCA as an aerobics instructor to deliver fitness classes. (Cameron Pools Leisure Centre and Lynfield Leisure and Recreation Centre is situated in PLB area who own the buildings).

Roskill Together Committee Member

I volunteered for many years before being on the local board and will continue with community as requested in my personal capacity in various ways like events, support, fitness or as required at many organisations where the board may have funded or will fund in the future and will declare these situations as they arise and applications come to the local board and when local board engages and fund groups.

Recommendation
That this report be received.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Ella Kumar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Roles assigned by the local board

I have been assigned by Chair Doig to be the secondary contact person in the Community area.

Auckland Council workshops, meetings and briefings

5 Feb  Attended regular local board workshop with Chair, Deputy Chair, Members Kumar, Shen and Turner from 9.25am

5 Feb  Attended Integrated Area Plan meeting with Chair, Deputy Chair, Members Kumar, Shen and Turner from 3pm

13 Feb  Attended regular local board workshop with Chair, Deputy Chair, Members Kumar, Shen and Turner

20 Feb  Attended Local Board Business Meeting with Chair, Deputy Chair, Members Shen and Turner from 10am

20 Feb  Attended regular local board workshop with Chair, Deputy Chair, Members Shen and Turner from 1.30pm

27 Feb  Attended regular local board workshop with Chair, Members Kumar, Shen and Turner

Other meetings, events

1 Feb  Attended Raise Up Youth Event at Three Kings Reserve with Members Kumar, Shen and Turner

3 Feb  Attended Kura Kāwana induction- Being a Good Governor at Albert Street, City with Deputy Chair, Members Shen and Turner

13 Feb  Attended first Community Forum at Wesley Community Centre at Wesley with Chair, Members Kumar, Shen and Turner

22 Feb  Attended Out and About Mud Kitchen at Underwood Park

24 Feb  Attended Kura Kāwana induction- Standing Orders at Council Chambers, Takapuna with Chair and Member Turner

25 Feb  Attended Mt Roskill Community Patrol- Vehicle Donation at Police Station, Dominion Road, Mt Roskill with Member Kumar and Shen

29 Feb  Attended Friends of Wairaki Stream at Lynfield Cove with Member Turner
Other issues/challenges

Below are the issues that I have come across from constituents or personal observation:

- Ellis Ave and Graham Bell Ave intersection safety
- Footpaths maintenance
- Visibility of raised table on Beagle Ave
- 27 Feb- Member of the community raised dogs aggression incident on McCullough Ave, Three Kings
- Lynfield area of water pipes bursting on streets
Recommendation/s

That this report to be received.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Fiona Lai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Jonathan Turner Board Member Report
11th February – 5th March 2020

Roles assigned by the local board
- Transport portfolio secondary.
- Appointed to the Manukau Harbour Forum.

General / assigned roles update
- Attended the second Manukau Harbour Forum workshop on the 13th February. Topics discussed included future structure of the Forum, a stocktake of activities around the harbour and a variety of other issues. The business meeting was deferred till the next month.
- Logged a variety of issues with council including:
  - Potholes on Richardson Rd.
  - Possible pollution in Wairaki Stream
  - Growth of marine weeds in the Manukau Harbour
  - Issues around logging problems via AT website
- Communicated with residents about a number of concerns:
  - Carlton Street upgrade concerns – residents worried that the bus route will not be put in place.
  - Commodore/Hillsborough/Margaret Griffin intersection – issues around parking and sightlines.
  - Safety of cycleways – witnessed an accident on the turnoff from the SW cycleway.
  - Weeds in a number of walkways.

Meetings / events attended
- 13th February – Local Board Workshop
- 13th February – Community Forum at Wesley Community Centre. Focused on the Local Board Plan pre-draft engagement.
- 14th February – Manukau Harbour Forum workshop
- 17th February – Local Board engagement at St Therese School. Gathered over 50 responses from tamariki about their favourite parts of Puketāpapa.
- 17th February – Agenda run-through before the business meeting.
- 20th February – Puketāpapa Local Board business meeting
- 20th February – Local Board Workshop
- 24th February – Kura Kāwāna workshop
- 26th February – Local Board plan engagement at Selwyn Heights Village
- 27th February – Local Board workshop
- 27th February – met with constituent on Carlton Street to discuss history and future of the road.
- 29th February – Friends of Wairaki Stream beach cleanup at Lynfield Cove. Very well attended and organised event.
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- 1st March – Local Board stall at the Music in Parks event in Walmsley Park.
- 5th March – Local Board Workshop
- 5th March - Community Forum focused on all of the engagements currently taking place.

Conferences / member development
- 24th February – attended the Kura Kāwana Elected Member training on Standing Orders. This session focused on the ‘rules’ of a business meeting and how these can be used for effect.

Disclosures
- I am a member of Owairaka Athletics and supporter of Friends of Wairaki stream.

Recommendation
That this report be received.

Note: if other recommendations are proposed they may be subject to a Notice of Motion (refer to Standing Orders or Appendix 1 pg. 5-6 in the guidance document).
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To present the Puketāpapa Local Board with its updated governance forward work programme calendar (the calendar).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The calendar for the Puketāpapa Local Board is in Attachment A. The calendar is updated monthly reported to business meetings and distributed to council staff.

3. The calendar was introduced in 2016 as part of Auckland Council’s quality advice programme and aims to support local boards’ governance role by:
   • ensuring advice on meeting agendas is driven by local board priorities
   • clarifying what advice is expected and when
   • clarifying the rationale for reports.

4. The calendar also aims to provide guidance for staff supporting local boards and greater transparency for the public.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
 a) receive the governance forward work programme calendar for March 2020.

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 Programme Calendar, March</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketāpapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachment A**

**Item 26**
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide a summary of Puketāpapa Local Board (the Board) workshop notes.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The attached summary of workshop notes provides a record of the Board’s workshops held in February and March 2020.
3. These sessions are held to give informal opportunity for board members and officers to discuss issues and projects and note that no binding decisions are made or voted on at workshop sessions.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) receive the Puketāpapa Local Board workshop notes for: 05 February, 13 February, 20 February, 27 February, 05 March.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record, 05 February 2020</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record, 13 February 2020</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record, 20 February 2020</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record, 27 February 2020</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record, 05 March 2020</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketāpapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketapapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Wednesday, 05 February 2020 commencing at 9.30 am.

### PRESENT

**Chairperson:** Harry Doig  
**Members:**  
Julie Fairey  
Elia Kumar arrived 1.20 pm  
Fiona Lai  
Bobby Shen  
Jon Turner  

**Apologies:** Elia Kumar morning part

**Also present:** Nina Siers, Mary Hay, Ben Moimoi and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Item Southern Initiative Update on FY20 and potential ideas for FY21</td>
<td><strong>Oversight and monitoring</strong></td>
<td>The local board was updated on allocated funds from financial years 18/19 and 19/20 and discussed projects for 20/21. Next steps a further workshop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dhaya Haran | Specialist Advisor - Youth Employment  
Southern Initiative |  
Dion Westrupp | Tupu Toa Intern  
Community & Social Policy |  
| 2.0 Item PLB Q2 Report | **Oversight and monitoring** | The local board was updated on quarter 2 performance. Next steps a report to be included in the Puketapapa Local Board Business meeting agenda for February 2020. |
| Mary Hay | Senior Local Board Advisor  
Local Board Services |  
David Rose | Lead Financial Advisor  
Financial Strategy and Planning |  
<p>| 3.0 Item Finance introduction and overview | <strong>Oversight and monitoring</strong> | The officer gave the board an overview of financial planning a high level process the following topics were covered: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4.0** Item Regional Facilities Auckland – introduction and overview  
Judy Lawley  
Manager Local Board Engagement  
Stakeholder Engagement |
| **Oversight and monitoring**  
The officer presented to the local board on Regional Facilities Auckland and their involvement with local boards. |

| **5.0** Local Board Plan (engagement)  
Litia Brighouse-Fuavoa  
Local Board Engagement Advisor |
| **Oversight and monitoring**  
The officer went through the board calendars confirming board members availability. |

| **6.0** Item Healthy Puketāpapa results of community prioritisation initial findings from process evaluation  
Ailsa Wilson  
Project Manager  
Arts Community and Events  
Ronelle Baker  
Practice Manager - Operations  
Arts Community and Events |
| **Local initiatives/specific decisions**  
The board considered the consultation feedback from the prioritisation results.  
The officer provided the results for:  
- Healthy Housing objectives  
- Community cohesion work  
- Working with healthy homes  
- Encourage movement objective  
- Healthy Kai objective  
Next steps a further workshop in February 2020. |

| **7.0** Walsmley Park Temporary Park Services provision plan  
Devin Grant-Miles  
Land Use Advisor Community Facilities  
Carol Moffat  
from Ghella Abergeldie  
Lesley Hopkins  
from Ghella Abergeldie |
| **Local initiatives/specific decision**  
The board considered the draft plan prior to the business meeting.  
The officers spoke on the Walsmley site that will be used for the Central Inceptor Project.  
This site work will start on 31 March 2020. The Haycock site will start on 26 March 2020 the Frederick St is looking to start February 2021 |

The workshop concluded at 2.35 pm.
**Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record**

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketāpapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Thursday, 13 February 2020 commencing at 9.25 am.

**PRESENT**

Chairperson: Harry Doig  
Members: Julie Fairey via SKYPE  
Ella Kumar from 9.34 am  
Fiona Lai  
Bobby Shen  
Jon Turner

**Apologies:** Mary Hay  
**Also present:** Nina Siers, Ben Moimoi and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Declarations of Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **1.0 Item Community Forum briefing** | Oversight and monitoring | The officer gave the board a briefing on the Community Forum event happening this evening.  
Litia Brighouse-Fuavao  
Engagement Advisor | |

**MEMORANDUM**

Title: Activity and Expenditure Review  
Date: 19th February 2020  
Agenda Item: 27  
Recommendation: To adopt the minutes of the Puketāpapa Local Board meeting held on 13th February 2020.  
Meeting date: 19th March 2020  
Meeting time: 9.25 am  
Meeting location: Puketāpapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings  
Minutes taken by: [Signature]

**ACTION ITEMS**

- Update on the implementation of the action plan for the Community Forum event happening this evening.
- Review of the current financial year’s budget and activity report for Puketāpapa Local Board.

**ANNEXES**

- Activity and Expenditure Review Report  
- Community Forum Event Planning Document
## 1.1 Item Community Feedback

**Litia Brighouse-Fuavao**  
Engagement Advisor  
Local Board Services

- **Oversight and monitoring**  
  Community feedback was shared between the local board and officers.

## 2.0 Item Scattering of ashes: LB Feedback on burial and Cremation Act Review

**Ben Molmoi**  
Local Board Advisor  
Local Board Services

- **Local initiatives/specific decisions**  
  The officer presented to the local board the draft feedback on the Ministry of Health’s review of the Burial and Cremation Act and related legislation. The members provided feedback.

  Next steps a report will be on the Puketāpapa Local Board Business Meeting Agenda – 19 February 2020.

## 3.0 Item PSR Monthly update

**Pippa Sommerville**  
PSR Portfolio Managers  
Parks Sports and Recreation

**Huw-Hill-Male**  
Community Park Ranger  
Parks Sports and Recreation

**Netty Richards**  
Parks & Places Specialist  
Parks Sports and Recreation

- **Oversight and monitoring**  
  The officers provided a monthly update on the parks, sport and recreation work programme to the local board.

## 4.0 Item PSR Christchurch remembrance space at Walmsley Park

**Pippa Sommerville**  
PSR Portfolio Managers  
Parks Sports and Recreation

**Netty Richards**  
Parks & Places Specialist

**Ivy Soulia**  
Landscape Architect  
Community Facilities

**Rodney Klaassen**  
Stakeholder Advisor  
Community Facilities

**Jody Morley**  
Manager Project Delivery  
Community Facilities

**Katrina Morgan**  
Work Programme Lead  
Community Facilities

- **Oversight and monitoring**  
  The officers provided the board with an update on a potential remembrance space at Walmsley Park.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>Item Proposal to develop inter-regional marine pest pathway management. Local board opportunity to provide feedback.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     | Samantha Happy  
Snr Regional Advisor Marine Biosecurity Environmental Services – Infra & Env Bio  
Design, Advisory & Planning |
|     | Sietse Bouma  
Team Leader – NES Auckland Plan Strategy and Research, Natural Environment Strategy |
|     | • Local initiatives/specific decisions  
The officers presented to the local board on the proposal to develop inter-regional marine and pest management.  
The board provided feedback to the officers.  
Next steps a report will be on the Puketāpapa Local Board February Business Meeting agenda where members will have further opportunity to provide their feedback that will then be included in the Auckland Council’s submission. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.0</th>
<th>Item: Freeland Reserve – employment project update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     | Nick FitzHerbert  
Relationship Advisor, Relationship Management Unit. Relationship Advisor |
|     | • Oversight and monitoring  
The officer provided the local board with an update on the increasing local employment opportunities through the Freeland Reserve Stream restoration project. The officer advised that there had been some delays with the project. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.0</th>
<th>Item: Kainga ora developments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     | Nick FitzHerbert  
Relationship Advisor, Relationship Management Unit. Relationship Advisor |
|     | Yu-Ning Liu  
Development Programmes Lead Development Programme Office |
|     | Alina Wimmer  
Manager Development Strategy Development Programme Office |
|     | Celia Davison  
Manager Planning - Central/South Plans & Places |
|     | Andrew Duncan  
Manager Financial Policy Financial Strategy and Planning |
|     | David Rose  
Lead Financial Advisor Financial Strategy and Planning |
|     | Lucy Smith  
Kainga Ora |
|     | • Oversight and monitoring  
The local board were updated on the Kainga Ora development taking place in the area. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.0</th>
<th>Item: AT monthly Update including discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Local initiatives/specific decisions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Thomas</td>
<td>Elected Member Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer provided the local board with an update. He spoke on items that were coming forward to the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting agenda on 20 February 2020. Next steps a workshop in March.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.0</th>
<th>Review of elections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Local initiatives/specific decisions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Molmoi</td>
<td>Local Board Advisor Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer provided an overview on the report going forward to the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting agenda on 20 February 2020. The members discussed and provided draft feedback. Next steps a report will be on the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting agenda for 20 February 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 3.00pm
Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketāpapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Thursday, 20 February 2020 commencing at 1.30 pm.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Harry Doig
Members: Julie Fairey
Fiona Lai
Bobby Shen
Jon Turner

Apologies: Mary Hay, Ella Kumar

Also present: Nina Siets, Ben Moimoi and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Item Community Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Klaassen</td>
<td>Stakeholder Advisor Community Facilities</td>
<td>Introduction from the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Item Community Leasing Michelle Knudsen</td>
<td>Community Lease Specialist Community Facilities</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The officer spoke on the following renewal of leases for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Waiaata Epsom Tennis Club Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Fairholme Tennis Club Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Next steps a report will be on the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting agenda for March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Item Growth programme update Work Programme Lead Growth: Jonathan Hope</td>
<td>Work Programme Lead Community Facilities</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Martin</td>
<td>Manager Programme Development</td>
<td>The officers gave an overview of the growth programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Next steps a report on the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting agenda for June 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td><strong>Item Fearon Park Car park</strong>&lt;br&gt;Phil Goulter Project Manager Community Facilities</td>
<td>- Oversight and monitoring&lt;br&gt;The officer provided an update on the project.&lt;br&gt;Next steps a further workshop in March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td><strong>Item Operational Maintenance update</strong>&lt;br&gt;Justin Cash Senior Maintenance Delivery Coordinator Community Facilities</td>
<td>- Oversight and monitoring&lt;br&gt;The officer updated the local board on the following:&lt;br&gt;- Walmsley Park pathways maintenance&lt;br&gt;- Waikowhai Playground&lt;br&gt;- Waikowhai board walk&lt;br&gt;- Drinking fountain at Walmsley Underwood area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td><strong>Item CEU</strong>&lt;br&gt;Juanita De Senna&lt;br&gt;Strategic Broker Arts Community and Events Community Empowerment&lt;br&gt;Mary Dawson&lt;br&gt;Manager Strategic Brokers Arts Community and Events&lt;br&gt;Sunita Kashyap&lt;br&gt;Specialist Advisor Arts Community and Events Community Empowerment&lt;br&gt;Rachel Cho&lt;br&gt;Graduate - ACE Arts Community and Events Community Empowerment&lt;br&gt;Na Va'aaelua&lt;br&gt;Daylyn Braganza&lt;br&gt;Advisor Arts Community and Events Community Empowerment</td>
<td>- Oversight and monitoring&lt;br&gt;The officer introduced the team to the local board. The officers provided an update on the following:&lt;br&gt;Build capacity – Support Roskill Community Network&lt;br&gt;Community led placemaking: Support Neighbours Day Campaign&lt;br&gt;Increase diverse participation: Seniors participation&lt;br&gt;Capacity Build with Bike Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylyn Braganza</td>
<td>Local Strategic relationships through contestable grant funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>Build capacity: Increase children’s participation in council decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Community and Events</td>
<td>Youth and Children's Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Empowerment</td>
<td>Youth Development Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social innovation and enterprise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa Va’aelua</td>
<td>Increase diverse community participation: Responsive programming for identified communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>Apply empowered communities approach – connecting communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Community and Events</td>
<td>Maori responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunita Kashyap</td>
<td>Social cohesion in new housing development area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Advisor</td>
<td>Apply the empowered communities’ approach – connecting communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Community and Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Cho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita de Senna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Brokers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Community &amp; Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The workshop concluded at 3.55 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketāpapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Thursday, 27 February 2020 commencing at 9.25 am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Harry Doig
Members: Fiona Lai
          Ella Kumar from 9.37 am
          Bobby Shen
          Jon Turner

Apologies: Julie Fairey, Mary Hay from 12.30 noon

Also present: Nina Siers, Mary Hay until 12.30, Ben Moimoi and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.0 Item Te Auaunga Community Advisory Group</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oversight and monitoring</strong></td>
<td>The officer provided an update on the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita De Senna</td>
<td>Strategic Broker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts Community and Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Dawson</td>
<td>Manager Strategic Brokers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts Community and Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.0 Item AT Capital Fund Long List</strong></td>
<td><strong>Local initiatives/specific decisions</strong></td>
<td>The officer was unable to provide a detailed update on the AT Capital Fund Long List however did provide an update on the Greenways project. Next steps a further workshop in March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Thomas</td>
<td>Elected Member Relationship Manager, Auckland Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Cuthers</td>
<td>AT Principal Project Manager, Auckland Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.0 Item Local Board Plan – feedback

**Litia Brighouse-Fuavao**  
Engagement Advisor

- **Oversight and monitoring**  
The local board was updated on the feedback received to date. Next steps a further workshop.

### 4.0 Item Healthy Puketāpapa strategic structure discussion

**Alisa Wilson**  
Project Manager  
Arts Community and Events  
Community Empowerment

**Ronelle Baker**  
Practice Manager – Operations  
Arts Community and Events  
Community Empowerment

- **Local initiatives/specific decisions**  
The officer updated the local board on the project to date. Next steps a further workshop.

### 5.0 Item Wesley Roskill Youth Zone Q3 Update

**Michael Matheson**  
Place Manager (Puketāpapa Albert-Eden)  
Arts and Community and Events

The officer provided the local board with an update of the programmes that are currently on at the centre. Next steps a further workshop June 2020.

### 6.0 Item Community Places Wesley Market/RYZ Bus Plan

**Kat Tilmey**  
Senior Project Lead  
Arts Community and Events

**Michael Matheson**  
Place Manager (Puketāpapa Albert-Eden)  
Arts and Community and Events

**Echo Jannman**  
Manager Services Improvements  
Arts and Community and Events

- **Local initiatives/specific decisions**  
The officers discussed with the local board the Community Places Wesley Market/RYZ Bus Plan.

### 7.0 Item: ACE Events

**Kim Modin – Manager**  
Event Production  
Arts Community and Events

**Angela Radosits**  
Event Organiser  
Arts Community and Events

- **Oversight and monitoring**  
The Events Team presented on the Carols at the King event held Saturday, 7 December 2020. The local board were also updated on the events being held in the area over the next few months

The workshop concluded at 3.11 pm
Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketāpapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Thursday, 05 March 2020 commencing at 9.25 am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Harry Doig
Members: Julie Fairey
         Ella Kumar
         Fiona Lai
         Bobby Shen
         Jon Turner

Apologies:

Also present: Nina Sierrs, Mary Hay, Ben Moimoi and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarations for Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Member Shen – Item 2.0 Local Board Work Programme FY2020/2021 for Grants he is a leader in the Chinese Group. Member Kumar – Item 2.0 Local Board Work Programme FY2020-2021 noted her involvement with Roskill Together and YMCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Work Programme Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td>The officer provided the board with an overview of the work programme lines for FY2020/2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Moimoi Local Board Advisor Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Local Board Work Programme 2020-2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>The officers presented to the local board on their department work programme lines for FY2020-2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Moimoi Project Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hay Senior Local Board Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhaya Haran Specialist Advisor - Youth Employment Southern Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Norman via SKYPE Strategic Planning Manager LED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marc Dendale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans and Places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Richard Hughes via</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKYPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Strategy &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debbie Ashton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pippa Somerville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSR Portfolio Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Sports and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nick FitzHerbert</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infra &amp; Env</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mary Stewart</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infra &amp; Env</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ellice Protheroe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infra &amp; Env</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juanita de Senna</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Broker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Community and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rodney Klaassen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Katrina Morgan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Programme Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jody Morley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Delivery Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.0 Item PSR Work Programme**

| **Pippa Somerville** | Christchurch Memorial Update |
| PSR Portfolio Manager | The officers provided the local board with a further update on a potential remembrance space at Walmsley Park. |
| Parks Sports and     |                          |
| Recreation           |                          |
| **Netty Richards**   |                          |
| Parks & Places Specialist |                      |
| Parks Sports & Recreation | Ivy Soulisa  
Landscape Architect  
Community Facilities |
|--------------------------|------------------|
| 4.0 Alcohol Licensing    | • Oversight and monitoring  
The officer provided the local board with an overview of the alcohol licensing operation within council. Members discussed and provided feedback. |
| Bruce Law  
Team Leader Alcohol Licensing, North, West Licensing & Regulatory Compliance |
| 5.0 Item Panuku Introduction | • Oversight and monitoring  
The officer gave the local board an overview of the Panuku operation. Panuku is a CCO it is combination of joining Auckland Property Development Limited and Waterfront Auckland.  |
| Lisa Gooding  
Senior Engagement Advisor, Corporate Affairs, Panuku Development Auckland |
| 6.0 Item Panuku 119A May Road | • Local initiatives/specific decisions  
The officer gave the members an update on the site 119A May Road.  
A report will be coming to the Puketapapa Local Board Business meeting agenda in April 2020.  |
| Anthony Lewis  
Senior Advisor Portfolio Review  
Portfolio Review  
Assets & Delivery, Panuku Development Auckland |

The workshop concluded at 3.55 pm
Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Puketāpapa Local Board

a) exclude the public from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

C1 Open space provision at Monte Cecilia Park, Hillsborough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7. | s7(2)(g) - The withholding of the information is necessary to maintain legal professional privilege.  
In particular, the report identifies land which the council seeks to acquire for open space purposes.  
s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.  
In particular, the report identifies land which the council seeks to acquire for open space purposes.  
s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).  
In particular, the report identifies land which the council seeks to acquire for open space purposes. | s48(1)(a)  
The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7. |
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Raiseup

Puketāpapa Local Board update

2019 Highlights
Item 8.1

- Drop In Space
- Youth Gym Night
- New Found Sound
- First Aid Workshop
- Raise Up Graduation
- Raise Up Camp
- Leadership Training
- Youth Fest Planning
- Jump Scare
- Teachers vs Students Multi sport
- Hygiene Packages

This Year!
What to expect in 2020

Upcoming Events
- Lynfield College Mural
- YMCA Youth Hub
- Art Festival
- Jump Scare
- Movie Night
- Youth Fest
- Camp
- Graduation

Upcoming Workshops
- Garden workshop
- Cupcake decorating workshop
- First Aid Workshop

- Crew recruitment
- Facilitate a new drop in/weekly activity (Youth Boxing)
- Crew volunteering
- Raise Up Youth Service Endorsements
- Collaborate with other Community Youth Practitioners

Lynfield Crews 2020 Goals
- Become Raise Up Crew of the Year
- Reach more young people in our community
- To create Lynfield YMCA in a active youth hub.
- Produce quality events and workshops.
- To support the development of the young people in Lynfield