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Note: The reports contained within this agenda are for consideration and should not be construed as Council policy unless and until adopted. Should Members require further information relating to any reports, please contact the relevant manager, Chairperson or Deputy Chairperson.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TABLE OF CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Declaration of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Leave of Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Petitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Deputations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Public Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Extraordinary Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>New road name in the Millbrook Investment Limited subdivision at 58 Millbrook Road, Henderson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>New road name in the Treasure Plus Limited subdivision at 170, 172 &amp; 174 Te Atatu Road, Te Atatu South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>New road name in the Two Open Doors Limited subdivision at 5 and 7 Kereru Street, Henderson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Auckland Transport’s update for April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ratification of Henderson-Massey Local Board feedback on the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ratification of Henderson-Massey Local Board feedback on proposed amendments to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Local board feedback for inclusion in Auckland Council submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Confirmation of Workshop Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Consideration of Extraordinary Items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1  Welcome

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

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

4  Confirmation of Minutes
That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:
(a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 17 March 2020, as a 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
In response to Covid-19 measures there will be no deputations. However, as required under the COVID-19 Response (Urgent Management Measures) Act 2020, either a recording of the meeting or a written summary will be published on the Auckland Council website.

9  Public Forum
In response to Covid-19 measures there will be no public forum. However, as required under the COVID-19 Response (Urgent Management Measures) Act 2020, either a recording of the meeting or a written summary will be published on the Auckland Council website.

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."
New road name in the Millbrook Investment Limited subdivision at 58 Millbrook Road, Henderson.

File No.: CP2020/04011

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Henderson-Massey Local Board for a name for a new private road created by way of the subdivision at 58 Millbrook Road, Henderson.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Auckland Council has road naming guidelines that set out the requirements and criteria of the Council for proposed road names. These requirements and criteria have been applied in this situation to ensure consistency of road naming across the Auckland Region.
3. The applicant, Millbrook Investment Limited, has submitted the following names for the new commonly owned access lot:
   - Korokio Lane (applicants preferred name)
   - Mokimoki Lane (alternative)
   - Whakataka Lane (alternative)

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) approve the name ‘Korokio Lane’ for the new private road constructed within the subdivision being undertaken by Millbrook Investment Limited at 58 Millbrook Road, Henderson in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974.

Horopaki Context
4. Resource consent has been obtained for a 39 lot residential subdivision for 58 Millbrook Road, Henderson and the council references are BUN60319000 and SUB60019002.
5. A site plan of the road and development can be found in Attachment A.
6. A location map of the proposed development can be found in Attachment B.
7. In accordance with the national addressing standard the private road requires a name as it serves more than 5 lots.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
8. Auckland Council’s road naming criteria typically require that road names reflect:
   - A historical or ancestral linkage to an area
   - A particular landscape, environment or biodiversity theme or feature; or
   - An existing (or introduced) thematic identity in the area.
The use of Maori names is actively encouraged.

The applicant has proposed the names set out in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed New Road Name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Road Naming Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korokio Lane (applicants preferred name)</td>
<td>This is an endemic bush also known as New Zealand wire-netting bush and can be found throughout the site.</td>
<td>Meets criteria – local significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mokimoki Lane (alternative name)</td>
<td>This is a native fern also referred to as ‘Fragrant Fern’ and can be found throughout the site.</td>
<td>Meets criteria – local significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakataka Lane (alternative name)</td>
<td>An alternative name for the Korokio (as above).</td>
<td>Meets criteria – local significance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) has confirmed the proposed and alternative names are acceptable and no duplicates exist within the Auckland region.

All iwi in the Auckland area were written to and invited to comment:
- Ngāti Whātau o Kaipara and Ngāti Whātau Ōrākei deferred comment to Te Kawerau a Maki.
- Te Kawerau a Maki and Ngāti Te Ata supported the proposed names.

No other replies were received from iwi.

The proposed names are deemed to meet the council’s road naming guidelines and the officer’s recommendation is to approve the applicant’s choice.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

Climate impact statement

The naming of roads has no effect on climate change. Relevant environmental issues have been considered under the provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the associated approved resource consent for the development.

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

Council group impacts and views

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

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

Local impacts and local board views

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

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
17. The applicant has responsibility for ensuring that appropriate signage will be installed accordingly once approval is obtained for the new road name.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
18. There are no significant risks to council as road naming is a routine part of the subdivision development process with consultation being a key part of the process.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
19. Approved road names are notified to Land Information New Zealand which records them on its New Zealand wide land information database which includes street addresses issued by councils.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>58 Millbrook Road Site Plan</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>58 Millbrook Road Location Map</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

Authors  Dale Rewa - Subdivision Advisor

Authorisers
Trevor Cullen - Team Leader Subdivision
Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau
New road name in the Millbrook Investment Limited subdivision at 58 Millbrook Road, Henderson.
New road name in the Millbrook Investment Limited subdivision at 58 Millbrook Road, Henderson.
New road name in the Treasure Plus Limited subdivision at 170, 172 & 174 Te Atatu Road, Te Atatu South.

File No.: CP2020/04559

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Henderson-Massey Local Board for a name for a new private road created by way of the subdivision at 170, 172 and 174 Te Atatu Road, Te Atatu South.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Auckland Council has road naming guidelines that set out the requirements and criteria of the Council for proposed road names. These requirements and criteria have been applied in this situation to ensure consistency of road naming across the Auckland Region.
3. The applicant, Treasure Plus Limited, has submitted the following names for the new commonly owned access lot:
   - Treasure Lane (applicants preferred name)
   - Lucky Avenue (alternative)

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:
a) approve the name 'Treasure Lane' for the new private road constructed within the subdivision being undertaken by Treasure Plus Limited at 170, 172 and 174 Te Atatu Road, Te Atatu South in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974.

Horopaki
Context
4. Resource consent has been obtained for a 11 lot residential subdivision for 170, 172 and 174 Te Atatu Road, Te Atatu South and the council references are BUN60067705 and SUB60039327/SUB60039327-A.
5. A site plan of the road and development can be found in Attachment A.
6. A location map of the proposed development can be found in Attachment B.
7. In accordance with the national addressing standard the private road requires a name as it serves more than 5 lots.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
8. Auckland Council's road naming criteria typically require that road names reflect:
   - A historical or ancestral linkage to an area
- A particular landscape, environment or biodiversity theme or feature or
- An existing (or introduced) thematic identity in the area
- The use of Maori names is actively encouraged.

9. The developer is of Chinese origin, the chosen names reflect ancient Chinese traditions and superstitions and also originates from the developer’s company name, Treasure Plus.

10. The applicant has proposed the names set out in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed New Road Name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Road Naming Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Lane (applicants preferred name)</td>
<td>The names reflects ancient Chinese superstition around treasuring life and ancestors, and their connection to the land. It is the hope that future residents treasure the land</td>
<td>Meets criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucky Avenue (alternative name)</td>
<td>This name relates to ancient Chinese traditions.</td>
<td>Meets criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) has confirmed the proposed and alternative names are acceptable and no duplicates exist within the Auckland region.

12. All iwi in the Auckland area were written to and invited to comment:
   - Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara and Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei deferred comment to Te Kawerau a Maki
   - Te Kawerau a Maki had no objections.

13. The proposed names are deemed to meet the council’s road naming guidelines and the officer’s recommendation is to approve the applicant’s choice.

Tāuākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

14. The naming of roads has no effect on climate change. Relevant environmental issues have been considered under the provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the associated approved resource consent for the development.

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

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

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

16. The decision sought for this report does not trigger any significant policy and is not considered to have any immediate impact on the community.

Tāuākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

17. The applicant has corresponded with local iwi and no objections were received.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea  
Financial implications

18. The applicant has responsibility for ensuring that appropriate signage will be installed accordingly once approval is obtained for the new road name.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga  
Risks and mitigations

19. There are no significant risks to council as road naming is a routine part of the subdivision development process with consultation being a key part of the process.

Ngā koringa ā-muri  
Next steps

20. Approved road names are notified to Land Information New Zealand which records them on its New Zealand wide land information database which includes street addresses issued by councils.

Ngā tāpirihanga  
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>170, 172 and 174 Te Atatu Road Site Plan</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>170, 172 and 174 Te Atatu Road Location Map</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina  
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Dale Rewa - Subdivision Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Trevor Cullen - Team Leader Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New road name in the Treasure Plus Limited subdivision at 170, 172 & 174 Te Atatu Road, Te Atatu South.
New road name in the Treasure Plus Limited subdivision at 170, 172 & 174 Te Atatu Road, Te Atatu South.
New road name in the Two Open Doors Limited subdivision at 5 and 7 Kereru Street, Henderson.

File No.: CP2020/04566

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Henderson-Massey Local Board for a name for a new private road created by way of the subdivision at 5 and 7 Kereru Street, Henderson.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Auckland Council has road naming guidelines that set out the requirements and criteria of the Council for proposed road names. These requirements and criteria have been applied in this situation to ensure consistency of road naming across the Auckland region.

3. The applicant, Two Open Doors Limited, has submitted the following names for the new commonly owned access lot:
   - Pānga Place (applicants preferred name)
   - Korowhio Place (alternative name).

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) approve the name ‘Pānga Place’ for the new private road constructed within the subdivision being undertaken by Two Open Doors at 5 and 7 Kereru Street, Henderson in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974.

Horopaki
Context
4. Resource consent has been obtained for a 16 lot residential subdivision at 5 and 7 Kereru Street, Henderson and the council references are BUN60336047 and SUB60336049.

5. A site plan of the road and development can be found in Attachment A.

6. A location map of the proposed development can be found in Attachment B.

7. In accordance with the national addressing standard the private road requires a name as it serves more than 5 lots.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
8. Auckland Council’s road naming criteria typically require that road names reflect:
   - A historical or ancestral linkage to an area
   - A particular landscape, environment or biodiversity theme or feature or
   - An existing (or introduced) thematic identity in the area
- The use of Maori names is actively encouraged.

9. The applicant has proposed the names set out in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed New Road Name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Road Naming Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pānga Place</td>
<td>Meaning connections with, related to and in association with the land.</td>
<td>Suggested by iwi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korowhio Place</td>
<td>Blue-grey duck with a pale pink bill found along fast flowing mountain streams and rivers in native forest &amp; tussock grassland. Named after the call of the male bird.</td>
<td>Meets criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) has confirmed that both names are acceptable and no duplicates exist within the Auckland region.

11. All iwi in the Auckland area were written to and invited to comment. Te Kawerau a Maki suggested the name ‘Pānga’, which the applicant has chosen as their preferred option. No other replies were received from iwi.

12. As an alternative the applicant has also suggested the name 'Korowhio', in keeping with the 'bird' theme of Kereru Street.

13. The proposed names are deemed to meet the council’s road naming guidelines and the officer’s recommendation is to approve the applicant’s choice.

**Tauākī whakaawewe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

14. The naming of roads has no effect on climate change. Relevant environmental issues have been considered under the provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the associated approved resource consent for the development.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

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

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

16. The decision sought for this report does not trigger any significant policy and is not considered to have any immediate impact on the community.

**Tauākī whakaawewe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

17. The applicant has corresponded with local iwi and no objections were received.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

18. The applicant has responsibility for ensuring that appropriate signage will be installed accordingly once approval is obtained for the new road name.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
19. There are no significant risks to council as road naming is a routine part of the subdivision development process with consultation being a key part of the process.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
20. Approved road names are notified to Land Information New Zealand which records them on its New Zealand wide land information database which includes street addresses issued by councils.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5 and 7 Kereru Street Site Plan</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5 and 7 Kereru Street Location Map</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Dale Rewa - Subdivision Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Trevor Cullen - Team Leader Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New road name in the Two Open Doors Limited subdivision at 5 and 7 Kereru Street, Henderson.

Attachment A

Item 13
New road name in the Two Open Doors Limited subdivision at 5 and 7 Kereru Street, Henderson.
Auckland Transport's update for April 2020

File No.: CP2020/04461

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To provide an update to the Henderson-Massey Local Board (the Board) on Auckland Transport (AT) matters in its area and an update on its local board transport capital fund (LBTCF).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. Provide an Update on COVID-19 situation

3. Progress on the Board’s LBTCF funded projects is noted.

4. Included is a list of the public consultations sent to the Board in December 2019, January and February 2020 for comment and the decisions of the Traffic Control Committee of AT for November 2019 to February 2020, as they affect the Board’s area.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) receive Auckland Transport’s update for April 2020.

Horopaki
Context

5. Auckland Transport is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. We report on a monthly basis to local boards, as set out in our Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important engagement role local boards play within the governance of Auckland on behalf of their local communities.

6. 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

AT’s COVID19 response

7. This is an unprecedented time for Aucklanders. AT is taking its role to support the Government’s response to COVID-19 extremely seriously and is committed to ensuring it plays its part to support the region, its staff, essential workers and the services it operates.
8. AT’s Chief Executive, Shane Ellison, is very proud of the work the organisation is doing alongside its fellow CCOs and Auckland Council to prepare for, and respond to, the significant situation the region is facing. AT staff will continue to provide essential services during the Level Four Alert period and longer if needed. Many of the changes made to respond to the Government’s direction have, quite literally, been made in a number of days. This includes significant timetable changes, setting up contact centres to work entirely remotely, and major changes to the AT Mobile app.

9. AT’s number one priority is to support the public health response, as well as supporting its staff through this challenging time. Beyond that, AT is beginning to consider what a new normal may look like as it supports Auckland Council and its communities, noting the critical role it plays in the region.

10. **Changes to public transport**: AT has made changes to public transport services to support this, which will continue until further notice. Aucklanders are strongly advised to stay home. Public transport services will only be available for those working in essential services, getting to and from the supermarket, for medical reasons, and to move essential goods.

11. Stickers and decals are being added to services to advise people where to sit, ensuring they are maintaining at least a two-metre distance from other passengers.

12. **Bus Services**: Bus services will largely operate according to weekend timetables. Some services will be removed (such as school buses and Skybus) while services to key medical centres will retain regular or more frequent services. This is also to ensure medical staff can change shifts.

13. Cash is no longer being collected on buses. The $10 fee for AT Hop cards has been waived and customers are required to get on and off buses via the rear door. These initiatives and the extra hygiene measures help ensure everyone is kept as safe as possible by minimising the physical contact between customers and bus drivers.

14. **Train services**: During COVID-19 Alert 4, AT train services will be running to the Sunday timetable. Some additional early morning train services have been added to ensure essential workers can get where they need to be. Early data shows the additional early morning train services have been well received.

15. **AT Mobile app**: To support people travelling for essential purposes on the bus and train network, AT has introduced a major upgrade to the AT Mobile app. The new feature shows how many people are on a bus or train at any given time. This allows people to see if the recommended physical distancing between other passengers of 2 metres will be achievable before they get on board.

16. **AT Mobile users** can now look under the Live Departures area of the app to see one of four “live occupancy statuses”: Likely empty, Likely space available, Likely near the limit of safe distancing, and Likely not accepting passengers. The categories will be shown as four icons in the shape of people that will fill in as the number of people on a given bus or train increases.

17. This real-time information is based on live data from AT HOP on and off tags, which is why it is important for anyone using public transport to continue to use their AT HOP card even though trips are free while we are at Alert Level 4.

18. Once a bus is at its safe-distance capacity, the app will show passengers are no longer being accepted and the driver will only do drop-offs until it is safe to accept passengers again.

19. **Customer service centres**: AT has taken the decision to close a number of its customer service centres at Transport Hubs as a precautionary measure. This is primarily because some of these smaller centres are not able to offer the appropriate 2 metre social distancing space between customers and staff (e.g. no glass protection/separation), and in some cases between staff and their own colleagues.
20. These sites are at:
   - Botany
   - AUT (which is closed and where the vast majority of customers were students anyway)
   - Papakura
   - Newmarket
   - The Manukau train platform.

21. **Customer Service Centres will remain open in the major hubs** for the time being. These are:
   - Britomart
   - New Lynn
   - Panure
   - Manukau Bus Station
   - Smales Farm.

22. **All customers** are still able to call AT’s free 0800 number (24/7), use the AT Mobile app or visit the website if they have journey planning or travel needs.

23. **Network management:** AT’s focus will be on ensuring free flowing access for emergency and other essential traffic. Traffic volumes are expected to be relatively light due to the number of businesses closing and people staying indoors. Therefore, traffic signalling will be managed to give priority access to hospitals and other essential services. AT is also supporting the Ministry of Health and healthcare providers should traffic management be required around testing centres.

24. **Construction programme:** AT’s construction sites have been made safe and are now closed. These sites will be regularly monitored for health and safety. Only work related to maintaining essential services and critical infrastructure and to address immediate and short-term safety issues (e.g. emergency maintenance work) will be undertaken by AT until the alert level is reduced by the Government.

25. **Parking.** AT has made the following changes to parking around the region:
   - On street parking will be free and time limits (P30, P60, P120 etc.) will not be enforced
   - AT parking buildings and pay and display carparks are also free for casual users
   - There is to be no parking on special vehicle lanes (Bus, T2 and T3 lanes) at all times. This is to ensure that public transport and emergency vehicles will be able to move freely.

26. **Parking and transport compliance staff** are playing their part to make sure things are safe. Their role is considered an essential service under the Government’s current restrictions. AT staff will be ensuring that there is access to parking around hospitals for health workers, especially when many of them are working long hours. They will also be present on the public transport network ensuring the safety and security of essential workers and frontline transport staff.

27. **Harbourmaster:** The Harbourmaster is urging Aucklanders to refrain from recreational boating during the lockdown period, as activities that put people at risk are unacceptable at this time. All non-essential boating must stop, and all anchored boats must remain where they are as long as it is safe to do so. Boaties who are presently living on a boat should follow the same lockdown rules as those living ashore.

28. **Helping the economy and protecting jobs.** AT is acutely aware that the investment it makes on behalf of Auckland Council, local boards and central government is key to the economy and protecting jobs. Conservatively, over 7,000 jobs flow from investment in professional services, construction and delivery of roads, facilities maintenance, and public transport services. As a result, AT is working hard with its funders, all its delivery partners and supply chains to collaboratively find a pathway forward. The New Zealand Transport
Agency and the Ministry of Transport have been very supportive to date and AT will continue to work with them as the complexities of this situation unfold.

29. **AT staff**: AT appreciates the understanding, support, patience and care for the organisation that Aucklanders have shown during this challenging time. Its people, aside from those providing essential services on the transport network, are adjusting to working from home during self-isolation. It is a priority for AT’s Board of Directors, executive team and Chief Executive that its people and their families are well-supported through this time and continue to be able to contribute to AT’s objectives on behalf of Auckland Council. Managers are keeping in touch with their teams daily and AT’s Business Technology team is supporting AT staff with IT requirements remotely.

**Funds allocated in the last term to projects and carried forward into the 2019-2023 term for project completion**

30. The current COVID-19 situation will impact on the timeline for scoping, costing and allocating funds to, potential Local Board Transport Fund projects. While work is continuing on scoping and costing potential projects, some require site visits and as these are not currently possible, there will be delays on finalising scope and costing for these. However, Auckland Transport will do its best to ensure that work on these projects is progressed as soon as possible and that they are brought back to Local.

**Boards for prioritisation and the allocation of funds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Project Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>Unlock Henderson Projects</td>
<td>$1,494,540</td>
<td>No Update as Panuku is leading this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662</td>
<td>Henderson North Home and School Zone</td>
<td>$1,606,579</td>
<td>Consultation closed on Sunday, 7 March. Auckland Transport will report back to the Local Board on the outcome of the consultation at a workshop in May.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$3,101,119

Funds available to be allocated in the new term 2019-2023

| Total Funds Available in current political term | $7,774,108 |
| Amount committed to date on projects approved for design and/or construction | $3,101,119 |
| Remaining Budget | $4,672,989 |

**Community Safety Fund**

31. The Community Safety Fund (CSF) was established in the 2018 Regional Land Transport Plan and it allocated $20 million for local initiatives in road safety: $5 million in the financial year 2019/2020 and $15 million in financial year 2020/2021. It is apportioned to local board areas by a formula focused on numbers of Deaths and Serious Injuries (DSI).

32. The fund has been named the Community Safety Fund (CSF) and Henderson-Massey Local Board was allocated $800,168 over two years. The Board developed a list of safety projects which were prioritised after assessment and a rough order costs established.

33. Currently projects are being further assessed and design work is in progress. It is expected that most projects will be delivered in year two of the programme.

34. AT expect to report back on the progress of these projects in the first quarter of 2020.
### Henderson-Massey Local Board Community Safety Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Update on Progress</th>
<th>Approved by Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Universal Drive/Rathgar Road  | Over the last 5 years (2014 – 2018), there has been 14 reported crashes (1 serious, 4 minor and 9 non injury) at this intersection.                     | The draft scheme plan design for a signalised intersection has commenced. Traffic counts, concept design and traffic modelling has been completed. One of the key features that will considered is the inclusion of a separate left turn lane on the Rathgar Rd approach to the intersection. This will form part of the design that includes the following:  
• Signalisation of all approaches;  
• Signalised pedestrian crossings;  
• Cycle facilities;  
• Minor road widening;  
• Auxiliary stormwater work;  
• New footpath; and  
• New road marking and signage. | July 2019                                                                                                                                           |
| Signalisation                 | The main crash type at this intersection is ‘crossing / turning’, in particular with vehicles turning right out of Rathgar Road and colliding with vehicles travelling on Universal Drive. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                         |
|                               | Further, there are no formal crossing facilities provided at this intersection.                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                         |
|                               | A separate document has been submitted for the signalisation of this intersection. Signalisation of the intersection reduces the number of potential crossing / turning type conflicts at this intersection, however |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                         |
| Universal Drive / Rathgar Road| Over the last 5 years (2014 – 2018), there has been 14 reported crashes (1 serious, 4 minor and 9 non injury) at this intersection.                     | In conjunction to the draft scheme plan detailed above, a raised intersection is also being designed. The cost for this will determine if this is constructed at the same time as the above project. Notwithstanding this the final design will not preclude its installation at a later date.                                                                 | July 2019                                                                                                                                           |
| Raised Intersection            | The main crash type at this intersection is ‘crossing / turning’, in particular with vehicles turning right out of Rathgar Road and colliding with vehicles travelling on Universal Drive. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                         |
|                               | Further, there are no formal crossing facilities provided at this intersection.                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                         |
|                               | A separate document has been submitted for the signalisation of this intersection. Signalisation of the intersection reduces the number of potential crossing / turning type conflicts at this intersection, however |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                         |
**Item 14**

- It does not manage the speed and energy of vehicle should a driver make a mistake (i.e. red light running).
  
  In line with the safe system philosophy and with AT's commitment to vision zero, further mitigation measures should be considered to reduce the speed / energy at this intersection such that if a crash was to occur, it does not result in any people being killed or seriously injured.

---

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

35. 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.

36. 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.

37. To this end, Auckland Transport's Statement of Intent contains three performance measures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2021/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of buses in the Auckland bus fleet classified as low emission</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in CO2e (emissions) generated annually by Auckland Transport corporate operations (from 2017/18 baseline)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Auckland Transport streetlights that are energy efficient LED</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

**Council group impacts and views**

38. The impact of 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**

**Request for Pedestrian Crossing on Border Road, Henderson**

39. A request was received from Local Board member Loader on behalf of a constituent requesting a pedestrian crossing near the intersection of Henderson Valley Road and Forest Hill Road. Auckland Transport (AT) have investigated and we are not proposing any additional measures for to the following reasons:
• An Auckland Transport engineer visited the location and observed pedestrian movements. They noted that pedestrian numbers were relatively low near the roundabout, and that many pedestrians were using the pedestrian refuge island at 18 Border Road.

• Our crash records show that there have been 13 crashes at this intersection in the last five years with 10 non-injury crashes and three crashes resulting in a minor injury.

• The minor injury crashes at this intersection are attributed to two drivers losing control while turning at the intersection, one in heavy rain.

• The final minor injury crash involved a distracted driver.

• The remaining non-injury crashes did not involve pedestrians.

40. Also, the crash record suggests that this intersection may require minor safety improvements to help with some of the operational issues. As such, while AT will not be making any changes at this time, AT will add this to the list of projects for future investigation.

Road Surfacing Waimanu Bay Drive and Side Roads, Te Atatu Peninsula

41. Auckland Transport has received a request through the Chairperson from a constituent requesting some advice on road surfacing on Waimanu Bay Road and sides roads in the Te Atatu Peninsula.

42. Auckland Transport’s (AT) road resurfacing guidelines require that chip seal surfacing is used for resealing low volume local roads, due to the high cost of the alternative asphaltic concrete (AC) surfacing. AC is normally only used on roads where the traffic volume exceeds 10,000 vehicles per day or in high stress areas such as cul-de-sac heads or busy intersections. This approach is consistent with best practice throughout New Zealand and is endorsed by the NZ Transport Agency who also provide funding for resurfacing of roads. AC surfacing costs approximately four times the cost of chip seal and a substantial increase in our resurfacing budget would be required if AC was more widely used throughout the city. We would not qualify for NZTA funding for AC surfacing as it is not the most cost effective option.

43. In subdivision roads AT normally asked that developer to install an AC surface when the road is constructed, as this provides a good wearing surface for the subsequent construction traffic when the houses are built. The AC surface is then resurfaced in 15–20 year time to extend its life and unless it is a high volume road, it is likely to be re-surfaced with chip seal.

Request for pedestrian safety at the corner of Alderman Drive and Great North Road

44. Auckland Transport (AT) has received a request from Local Board member Matt Grey from a constituent requesting AT to investigate the safety issues at the corner of Alderman Drive and Great North Road.

45. At the outset, Auckland Transport would like to reassure the Local Board that pedestrian safety is of the utmost importance to Auckland Transport.

Investigation findings

46. For pedestrians crossing from the medical centre towards the signals, visibility can be obstructed due to the proximity of the building to Great North Road

• A number of pedestrians were observed stepping into the road without using caution.

• Crash records show that there have been no incidents at this intersection involving pedestrians.

47. Based on the above, it appears that the intersection is operating relatively safely for pedestrians, and as such AT are not proposing any immediate changes.

Minor Improvements Programme

48. This site has been added to our minor improvements programme for further investigation. Please note, that this programme involves the collation of all proposed projects before ranking the sites based on their safety and operational issues.
49. There are a number of projects already awaiting prioritisation as part of this programme.

50. Once funding has been provided each financial year, AT progress the projects we are able to within the available resources and funding. Therefore, due to this process, AT are unfortunately unable to provide a timeframe for any changes.

Local Board Workshops
51. AT attended workshop in March 2020. The purpose of these workshops was to update and seek feedback from the Local Board on these topics:
- Initial Work Up of Potential LBTCF Projects.

Auckland Transport’s Traffic Control Committee (TCC) report
52. Decisions of the TCC during the month of March 2020 affecting the Henderson/Massey Local Board area are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Street (Suburb)</th>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>Nature of Restriction</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Mar-20</td>
<td>Ratanui Street / Alderman Drive / Waitakere Lane, Henderson</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes</td>
<td>No Stopping At All Times / Bus Stop / Bus Shelter / Loading Zone / Angle Parking / P90 Parking / Authorised Vehicle Parking-Police / No Passing / Edge Line / Lanes / Lane Arrow Marking / Flush Median / Keep Clear / Traffic Island / Give-Way Control / Roundabout</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
53. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no impacts or opportunities for Māori. Any engagement with Māori, or consideration of impacts and opportunities, will be carried out on an individual project basis.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
54. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no financial implications.

55. The table below gives the LBTCF financial summary for the Henderson-Massey Local Board.

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

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
56. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no financial implications.
Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
57. Auckland Transport will provide another update report to the Board in May 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Owena Schuster – Elected Member Relationship Manager (Henderson-Massey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon – Elected Member Relationship Team Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ratification of Henderson-Massey Local Board feedback on the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review

File No.: CP2020/04354

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To enable the local board to formalise by resolution the feedback provided to inform the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review

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. At the 17 March Henderson-Massey Local Board business meeting, it was delegated to Members B Loader and Brady to provide feedback on the Council-Controlled Organisations Review to the Independent Panel [HM/2020/1]
7. This report seeks to formalise the feedback provided, by resolution of the Henderson-Massey Local Board.
8. Henderson-Massey Local Board’s feedback is attached.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) ratify Attachment A as the local boards feedback provided 2 April 2020 for inclusion in the independent Council-Controlled Organisations review
Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey Local Board feedback to the independent Council</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controlled Organisations review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Wendy Kjestrup - Local Board Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCO Review Feedback – Henderson-Massey Local Board
Dated 31 March 2020

Development of the feedback was formally delegated at the 17 March 2020 business meeting to members Brady and Loader

1. The Henderson Massey Local Board serves a diverse population of 120,000 with areas of need across much of our board area and a young age demographic, with 36% of the population being born overseas and 16% of our people being of Maori descent so it is important to have a Council structure that best serves the needs of our local community.

2. In general, with regard to reviewing CCO performance at a local board governance level and being responsive to local communities, it is the Henderson-Massey Local Board’s perspective that the CCOs operating through Auckland Council provide a mixed result of effectiveness and efficiency in its model for delivering services to the Council and Aucklanders.

3. Our community is best served with an efficient model of delivering Council services, so it is necessary to review CCO performance to ensure that the community’s needs are met. When people experience poor communication and results from within the wider council group, it is attributed to ‘the council not listening’. This in turn breeds distrust and is likely a factor in reduced participation in democracy and voting in Auckland, so it is important to get the relationship right.

4. In response to the CCO Review, the Henderson Massey Local Board:
   b. Endorse in part the Council Controlled Organisations model for delivering council services, but would seek that the CCO’s:
      i. Demonstrate improved accountability to ratepayers and an improved understanding and respect for the co-governance role of local boards
      ii. Be required to undertake meaningful, proactive and genuine engagement with local boards and community in reasonable timeframes
      iii. Demonstrate an understanding that Auckland Council is much more expansive than just the central areas of the city and deliver services accordingly
      iv. Must actively improve the internal culture of their organisations and recognise the role of CCO’s is to serve the needs of the people of Auckland and to operate as an integrated part of the wider Auckland Council

5. It must be acknowledged that the CCO Review has been undertaken in part during the Covid-19 situation so community contributions of feedback to this review may be limited.

Watercare Services

6. Watercare Services (Watercare) are seen to be a CCO that is performing well and an entity that delivers a consistently high-quality service for Auckland across the potable water supply and wastewater management systems.
7. The Henderson-Massey Local Board has experienced an effective relationship management process as governors. Watercare consistently demonstrate early decision input support to operational staff particularly in activities affecting the areas local open spaces. The local board are also aware Watercare's efforts to connect with residents and resolve, or at the least explain and communicate, on any local complaint led issues that arise.

8. Watercare manage their own communication directly with customers through an informative direct billing process that seeks to educate around water conservation demonstrating their overall objectives as being public service driven rather than consumption or expansion led.

9. There appears to be a strong complimentary relationship between Watercare and Auckland Councils Healthy Waters team that has worked well over the past 9 years.

10. Watercare's operations appear to be owned and fronted up by Watercare's Board and senior management when there are matters of mixed public and local political views. This is vital for resident and elected member confidence in the organisation knowing it is robust and considered in its approaches within the framework of its core business.

Summary:

Watercare Services is to be acknowledged for its successful governance relationships and operational delivery.

Henderson-Massey Local Board Recommendations:

a. Watercare Services should be retained as a Council Controlled Organisation
b. Watercare Services should improve their consultation and decision-making relationship with Healthy Waters, as the three waters (potable, wastewater and stormwater) must be recognised as interdependent in order to achieve sustainable outcomes
c. Watercare should continue to engage with the Henderson-Massey Local Board, Council, and community organisations to inform its planning for local projects.

Auckland Transport

11. The need for the establishment of Auckland Transport (AT) as a CCO is understood from a regional and network perspective and some significant advances have occurred across urban city centric public transport network taking forward and delivering in a timely manner aspects of; increased dual tracking, bus and train and integrated station upgrades, electrification of the rail network, zone simplification, and integrated ticketing.

12. Through AT benefits have been realised in the relationship with central government and NZTA. Examples include major road corridor upgrades, cycling infrastructure, increased safety investment in active modes along with intersections and road shapes. Through AT, NZTA has identified that local boards have a stakeholder role with regards to State Highway development. Kiwirail has also started to think about localised rail corridor improvements beyond just that which affects rolling stock. In the Henderson-Massey Local Board area NZTA SH16 mitigation funding for acquisition of areas of open space and associated local impacts have been made directly available to the local board for support of projects across the area's open space network.
13. However, at the more local scale of roading, footpaths and town centres there are more mixed views about AT’s success. AT’s assets are pervasive across every neighbourhood and used almost daily by residents, hence there is a very high awareness of localised assets and opportunity for concern to be expressed when they don’t meet expectations. From an engagement perspective matters which affect people directly are much more likely to lift people to action and this is often received as a complaint. Matters which come to elected members from the public have typically arisen out of receiving either; a standard holding response from AT that feels to the customer as such and feels like it is slow in being answered, or not picking up the nuisance of the matter that is being expressed. Sometimes it is an ongoing matter that AT has looked to answer, but the member of the public is not happy with the reply. Getting beyond these matters to a governance level can be difficult for elected members as it can introduce doubt and question in the AT localised responsive system.

14. To assist local board members in their governance role a number of relationship management roles have been in place since early in the inception of AT. However what is more often being felt, since AT internal changes a few years ago, is that everything is being managed through a nominated role. The accountable staff in more advanced roles and technical staff are not connecting with the local boards directly.

15. To facilitate the governance role of local boards the opportunity to resource the provision of quality local transport advice needs to be developed, particularly from a place development perspective (a core role of local boards). This includes the local boards role in enhanced walking and cycling connections to destinations of attraction including; employment, education and leisure.

16. Limited insight is given from a transport strategy and planning perspective toward the triennial AT Local Board Capital fund or Local Board Plans (which are legislatively required to be refreshed after local government elections). The local board has been informed that there is a small transport advisory team in the Chief Planning Office (which it has not had contact with) perhaps this could be grown, or more ideally AT staff at a appropriate senior level are better enabled to provide advice and be resourced to connect with local governors in local boards.

17. Auckland Transport will always be a target of debate in the community for doing too much or too little, either too fast or too slow. At a local level greater governance decision making could be facilitated through planning direction being supported to local boards, in turn these elected members will need to stand behind decisions made bringing increased public accountability.

18. Communication between Auckland Transport and Local Boards can be enhanced to enable better input on transport matters, particularly local safety projects, walking/ cycling connections and integration with wider local board planning. The current system of communication by using a Relationship Manager as a conduit for filtering decisions that AT have already made, or advising the Local Board of low scale consultation late in the process, does not give Local Boards the degree of input into decision-making that should be required. Auckland Transport must take a more proactive response in informing the Local Board about plans in the Local Board area as they are the organization that is tasked with this responsibility, rather than relying on the Local Board to provide information requests or constituency advocacy communications.
19. A large proportion of constituency complaints received by the Henderson-Massey Local Board relate to issues that constituents have in communicating with Auckland Transport. It is important that Auckland Transport recognizes their role and responsibilities in this area and advise their staff of protocols for effectively replying to ratepayer queries. There have been multiple instances of communication issues within the Henderson-Massey Local Board area, including:
   a. Auckland Transport advising a local BID that they could not put up 5kg Christmas wreaths on the street light poles as the poles are too old and then suggesting the BID or the Henderson-Massey Local Board should fund the replacement of the AT street light poles in the Te Atatu Peninsula business centre;
   b. Suggesting to a ratepayer in Massey that they ask the Henderson-Massey Local Board to fund a new bus stop and bus shelter in Massey when the resident asked for improvements that AT would not fund on a route that AT was reviewing.

20. Auckland Transport needs to fund safety projects and other initiatives more transparently. The Henderson-Massey Local Board has experienced frustration at AT for the funding of road safety projects and other initiatives. For example:
   a. Over the last 6 years Henderson-Massey Local Board has recognised the importance of improving safety in and around Rathgar Road, Henderson as there are several schools and early childhood centres in the area. These improvements cannot be fully funded by Henderson-Massey Local Board AT CAPEX. Auckland Transport appears to be ‘waiting’ for our board to commit our next round of Henderson-Massey Local Board AT CAPEX to fund traffic signals and a raised crossing area at the intersection of Rathgar and Universal Drive (Universal is a Collector road and over last 10 years many accidents have been reported at this intersection). AT’s reticence in not committing their own safety budget to this work is frustrating as we have already used much of the past three years allocation on this area.

Summary:

Regionally, Auckland Transport has taken forward substantive infrastructure improvements and systems integration that have benefitted hundreds of thousands of people. At a local level enhanced governance quality advice and support for decision making beyond stakeholder management is required.

Henderson-Massey Local Board Recommendations:

   a. Auckland Transport to remain a CCO, provided there are much strengthened requirements to provide meaningful consultation and accountability to the Auckland Council Governing body and Auckland Council Local Boards and in turn to the ratepayers of Auckland. These requirements include:
      i. recognition within the Auckland Transport organization that they are a Council Controlled Organisation and not a stand-alone business,
      ii. that the Council Governing body holds decision-making authority for Auckland Transport and all CCO’s, in regard to the office accommodation needs of the CCO’s, and regarding bonus and supplementary payments to directors and staff of Auckland Transport and other CCO’s,
      iii. the inclusion of an improved performance standard for Auckland Transport to align with the wider local planning and Auckland regional planning and vision documents including The Auckland Plan, Auckland’s Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy etc. and Local Board Plans for local projects of significance,
iv. A requirement for Auckland Transport to provide wider consultation and communication channels for Local Boards rather than only filtering e-mail communications through the relationship manager,
b. Auckland Transport to fund safety projects and other initiatives more transparently.
c. Auckland Transport to provide the governing body and local boards with information on their decision-making criteria and weighting system for projects to proceed so that AT are more accountable to local needs and boards can question the AT prioritisation decisions of certain projects.
d. Auckland Transport to improve their response to ratepayer queries.

Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED)

21. ATEED appears to have had success in developing Auckland as a destination with its significant events lifting the vitality of the wider Auckland experience for visitors and residents. The establishment of Accommodation Provider Targeted Rates as a partial funding contribution has further lifted the value of the CCO in its role working across the multiple tourism sector groups a greater accountability of delivery focus.

22. With regards to Economic Development it is hard to recall what ATEED has achieved in itself beyond support out west through its Screen Auckland entity and a number of regionally managed courses being held for local businesses. At a local board level it has been difficult to recall any contact, beyond a periodic email and a general update, or any local (or multi-board) advisory support from Auckland Council’s Chief Economist Unit.

23. During the 2014 CCO review the Henderson-Massey Local Board expressed its concerns with regards to Local Economic Development being removed from Auckland Council and being taken up by ATEED with the sense of a potential loss of the “local” aspect.

24. Whilst there has been active support from the staff who transitioned from AC to ATEED it is hard to identify any gains made. Beyond an operational level programme management there has been limited opportunity for active advice and support for the governance role of strategic analysis and direction setting. This is reflected in that the current three-year plan will likely not include a stand-alone local economic development outcome, rather a few initiatives will be included as contributors to other outcomes around youth, Māori and diverse community development.

25. The 2018/21 ATEED Statement of Intent identifies a cross cutting priority which includes having an ‘Enhance spatial focus’ across the west. At a local board governance and support level there is no awareness that ATEED is acting innovatively and with a step-change towards improving household prosperity across the west.

26. There is significant growth occurring in the north-west growth area through Redhills, Kumeu and Helensville – identified in the Auckland Unitary Plan to take 30% of Auckland’s growth over the next 5 - 30 years. Who does the planning and the on-the-ground work to kick start and get innovative industries in on the ground developing west based multi-nodal employment opportunities that our future low carbon community’s need?

27. Over the past two terms there has been support toward establishing a new Business Improvement District in the local board area (Henderson / Lincoln/ Central Park Drive) from staff in the CCO/External Partnerships team in Auckland Council’s governance
division. This is practical on the ground support that assists the local board taking forward its governance direction around local economic development. There is a gap around town centre and business strategy and facilitation that could be taken forward through reinvesting staff and a portion of the budget allocated to ATEED back to a dedicated Local Economic Development team within council.

28. At a local board level there is limited understanding of local operational directions and even less involvement in informed decision making. Consideration should be made to increase accountability through an ATEED model that provides support to governors around strategic directions locally, or staff resource and associated support funding being re-established in Council - noting that previously this area was also under-resourced within Council.

29. ATEED in recent years has not effectively engaged with the Henderson-Massey Local Board on a regular basis on local issues of employment and business development.

30. ATEED have a regional focus, but provide limited services in the Henderson-Massey Local Board area. ATEED can be more effective by increasing discussion and action on tourism, local employment initiatives and business networking and knowledge-sharing opportunities.

Summary:

ATEED appears to be of benefit to the city overall however economic development support appears to be city centric rather than focussing on local suburb-scale developments.

Henderson-Massey Local Board Recommendations:

a. ATEED functionality to be returned to the Auckland Council group, with the governing body sharing decision-making powers with local boards to enable town centre and suburb scale economic development alongside BID support.

Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku)

31. The Henderson-Massey Local Board acknowledges the positive relationship with Panuku with aligning development towards local priorities in the Local Board Area.

32. When the same function of sale and development of Council property was undertaken by Auckland Council Properties Limited, the Henderson-Massey Local Board did not have the same degree of input into the sale of and development of Council assets.

Summary:

Panuku as a CCO has proved to be a positive addition to the CCO model that has driven results in Henderson-Massey.

Henderson-Massey Local Board Recommendations:

a) Panuku should be retained as a Council Controlled Organisation for property and urban development.

b) Responsibility for service properties and other properties not planned for development, to be returned to the Auckland Council group.

c) The Henderson-Massey Local Board acknowledges our positive relationship with Panuku that has enabled development within the Henderson-Massey Local Board area, particularly with the Unlock Henderson Project and development of the new
social housing for older adults at Opanuku Village in Henderson Valley Road (previously Wilsher Village).  
d) That the Henderson-Massey Local Board signals unease about the equitable distribution of income from Panuku’s role regarding the sale of land and assets within each Local Board area, and the criteria for investment, as reflected in the sale of 2-6 Henderson Valley Road site

Conclusion

33. The Henderson-Massey Local Board recognises the importance of CCO’s within the Council model and acknowledges the achievements that have been made through developing positive relationships between Local Boards, within Council and with CCO’s.

34. Our local board budget is small when compared with the CCO’s and with the wider Council balance sheet. We always make the best decisions for the future of our community, and much of our funding is based on partnership and community development, but we recognise the need to partner with CCO’s to fully realise the potential within our Local Board area.
Ratification of Henderson-Massey Local Board feedback on proposed amendments to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework

File No.: CP2020/04462

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To enable the local board to formalise by resolution the feedback provided on proposed amendments to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework

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. Local board engagement and insights were sought throughout development of the framework, including meetings and cluster workshops.

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

6. In February 2020, a memorandum was circulated to share key findings from the public consultation and proposed amendments to the draft ACAF to address the feedback received through the consultation.

7. A report on the 17 March business meeting agenda sought formal feedback from the local board on the amendments.

8. At the 17 March Henderson-Massey Local Board business meeting, it was delegated to the Chair to provide feedback on the proposed amendments [HM/2020/1]

9. This report seeks to formalise the feedback provided, by resolution of the Henderson-Massey Local Board.

10. Henderson-Massey Local Board’s feedback is attached.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

11. ratify Attachment A as the local boards feedback provided on proposed amendments to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework.
Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey Local Board feedback on amendments to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Wendy Kjestrup - Local Board Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memo

To: Carol Stewart, Senior Policy Advisor, Local Board Services
cc: Glenn Boyd, Relationship Manager, West Local Boards
From: Chris Carter, Chair, Henderson-Massey Local Board

Subject
Henderson-Massey Local Board feedback on the changes to the draft Te Taruke-a-Tawhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework (ACAF).

Background
• In February 2018, the Environment and Community Committee committed Council to leading the development of an integrated climate change action plan, addressing both the rising emissions in the region and the impacts of our changing climate.
• Local board insights were sought through a series of cluster workshops held in October 2018 to inform the development of an integrated climate action plan.
• Evidence building and engagement with a wide range of stakeholders has taken place in the development of the draft Te Tāruke-a-Tawhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Plan. There was strong support from communities in the Henderson-Massey Local Board area for this plan.
• 11 key moves and accompanying actions were developed. These have since been refined into 8 priorities and the feedback is being sought from local boards on the changes. The 8 proposed priorities are:
  o Natural environment
  o Built environment
  o Transport
  o Economy
  o Community and coast
  o Te puawaitanga o te tangata
  o Energy and Industry
  o Food.
• The Henderson-Massey Local Board resolved at its 17 March business meeting to delegate feedback to the Chair of the board.

Feedback
The Henderson-Massey Local Board provides feedback on the changes to the draft Te Taruke-a-Tawhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework as follows:
  i) support the name change to Te Tāruke-a-Tawhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan.
  ii) support the establishment of the three core drivers for action: “A Tāmaki response”, “Reducing our emissions”, and “Preparing for climate change” to provide greater clarity on the goals of the framework.
  iii) support simplifying the framework by moving from eleven key moves to eight priorities.
  iv) support the inclusion of learning from and interweaving Māori principles and practice in the first pillar, “A Tāmaki response”.

Attachment A

Item 16
v) support greater focus on equity of resources and tools to aid low income communities in building resilience to be able to respond to climate change impact.

vi) note the identified need for a significant shift in transport to be delivered at pace and scale, particularly regarding public transport infrastructure in the fast-growing North-West area. For Henderson-Massey this will mean increased focus on developing the network of shared paths and building safe dedicated cycleways on local streets and addressing the affordability of and improving public transport for our lower income communities.

vii) note the potential regional and local cost implications of addressing climate change and its impacts, as well as the work being carried out on developing a climate finance work package. The board believes that any measures to address local cost implications must include a review of current local board funding levels to allow boards to effectively respond to this issue.
Local board feedback for inclusion in Auckland Council submissions

File No.: CP2020/04231

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To recommend that the Henderson-Massey Local Board delegate authority to the local board Chair to submit the local board’s formal views for inclusion in Auckland Council submissions to Central Government and other councils, where this feedback is due before a local board meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. Central Government (and other councils) seek feedback through public consultation on bills, inquiries and other key matters. The consultation timeframes vary between four and eight weeks.

3. The Governing Body is responsible for making official submissions to Central Government on most matters except for submissions to government on legislation where it specifically relates to local board area. Where the Governing Body decides to make an official submission on a Central Government matter, staff work to develop a draft submission for consideration by the Governing Body and will call for local board input so it can be incorporated. The Auckland Council submission needs to be approved within the consultation timeframes set by Central Government.

4. Local board input is required to be approved by the local board. Where local boards are unable to make these decisions at a local board meeting due to the constrained timeframes, another mechanism is required. In situations where local boards prefer not to use the urgent decision process, local boards sometimes provide informal feedback that is endorsed at the next business meeting. This is not considered best practice because the local board input can be challenged or changed at ratification or approval stage, which leads to reputational risk for the council.

5. In situations where timeframes don't allow reporting to formal business meetings, staff recommend that the local board either uses the urgent decision process or delegates authority to the chair to approve and submit the local board’s input into Auckland Council submissions. Both options provide an efficient way to ensure that local board formal input is provided when external parties set submission deadlines that don't allow formal input to be obtained from a local board business meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) delegate authority to the Chair to approve and submit the local board’s input into Auckland Council submissions on formal consultation from government departments, parliament, select committees and other councils.

b) note that the local board can continue to use its urgent decision process to approve and submit the local board’s input into Auckland Council submissions on formal consultation from government departments, parliament, select committees and other councils, if the Chair chooses not to exercise the delegation sought in recommendation (a).
c) note that this delegation will only be exercised where the timeframes do not allow for local board input to be considered and approved at a local board meeting.

d) note all local input approved and submitted for inclusion in an Auckland Council submission is to be included on the next local board meeting agenda for the public record.

Horopaki Context

6. Government departments, parliament, select committees and other councils seek feedback on issues using both formal and informal consultation opportunities. Auckland Council has an ongoing opportunity to provide advocacy on public policy matters and this is often done by making a public submission. Submissions can be provided on other council’s plans, on policy and legislative reviews or on an agency’s proposed strategy.

7. Council submissions are the formal responses to the public consultation opportunities that are open to everyone, including all Aucklanders.

8. Under the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 the Governing Body must consider any views and preferences expressed by a local board, where a Governing Body decision affects or may affect the responsibilities or operation of the local board or the well-being of communities within its local board area.

9. Under the current allocation of decision-making responsibility, the Governing Body is allocated decision-making responsibility for “submissions to government on legislation including official submissions of Auckland Council incorporating local board views”. Local boards are allocated decision-making for “submissions to government on legislation where it specifically relates to that local board area only”.

10. Central Government agencies set the deadlines for submissions which are generally between four to eight weeks. These timeframes do not usually allow for formal reporting to local boards to input into the council submission. In situations where local boards prefer not to use the urgent decision process, local boards can sometimes provide informal feedback that is endorsed at the next business meeting. This is not considered best practice because the local board input can be challenged or changed at ratification or approval stage, which leads to reputational risk for council.

11. Providing a delegation for Central Government submissions provides local boards with another option to give formal local views within prescribed timeframes.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

12. There are five options available to local boards to approve their formal views and input on submissions to Central Government. Where this input is sought within a time constrained process and is due before a meeting of the local board, only four of these options will be available.

Table 1: Options for mechanisms through which the local boards can approve their formal views on Auckland Council submissions to Central Government and other councils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Local board input         | • Decision is made and adopted in a public meeting (transparency of decision making).  
                              | • All local board members have the opportunity to make the formal decision.       | • Local board meeting schedules and agenda deadlines often don’t align with external agency deadlines. |
| approved at a business meeting |                                                                      |                                                                      |
| 2. Local board input         | • Provides a mechanism for local                                       | • Extraordinary meeting needs to                                     |
### Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>approved at an extraordinary meeting of the local board</td>
<td>boards to provide their formal views where submission deadlines do not align with local board meeting schedules.</td>
<td>be called by a resolution (requires anticipation by the local board) or requisition in writing delivered to the Chief Executive. The process usually requires a minimum of three clear working days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decision is made and adopted in a public meeting (transparency of decision making).</td>
<td>• There are additional costs incurred to run an unscheduled meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All local board members have the opportunity to make the formal decision.</td>
<td>• It may be difficult to schedule a time when enough local board members can attend to achieve a quorum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Local board input approved using urgent decision mechanism (staff recommend this option)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• It provides a mechanism for local boards to provide their formal views where submission deadlines do not align with local board meeting schedules.</td>
<td>• The decision is not made in a public meeting. It may be perceived as non-transparent decision-making because it is not made by the full local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local board input can be submitted once the Chair, Deputy Chair and Relationship Manager have received the report providing the local board views and input.</td>
<td>• Chair and deputy may not have time to properly consult and ascertain view of the full local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The urgent decision needs the sign-off from two local board members (ie the Chair and Deputy Chair), rather than just one.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Local board input approved by the chair who has been delegated authority from the local board (staff recommend this option where local boards choose not to use the urgent decision process)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• It provides a mechanism for local boards to provide their formal views where submission deadlines do not align with local board meeting schedules and local boards don’t want to use the urgent decision process.</td>
<td>• Decision is not made in a public meeting. It may be perceived as non-transparent decision-making because it is not made by the full local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local board input can be submitted as soon as possible after the local board views and input have been collated and discussed by the local board members.</td>
<td>• The chair who has the delegated authority may not have time to properly consult and ascertain views of the full local board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Local board input submitted and ratified at a later date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Local board informal input can be submitted as soon as possible after the local board views and input have been collated and discussed by the local board members.</td>
<td>• Local board input submitted is considered to be the informal views of the local board until they are approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local board input can be challenged or changed at ratification or approval stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decision to ratify informal views, even if made in a public meeting, is unable to be changed in the council submission (can be perceived as non-transparent decision-making).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inclusion of informal views in the Auckland Council submission will be at the discretion of the Governing Body. These may be included with caveats noting the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Pros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Options one, two and three are already available to local boards and can be utilised as required and appropriate. Option one should always be used where timeframes allow reporting. Option four requires a delegation in order for a local board to utilise this mechanism and should be used only when timeframes don’t allow reporting to a business meeting.

14. Local boards who wish to utilise option four are requested to delegate to the chair as this fits within the leadership role of the chair and they are more likely to be available because the chair is a full-time role. The role of this delegated member will be to attest that the approved and submitted input constitutes the views of the local board. The input should then be published with the agenda of the next formal business meeting of the local board to provide transparency. The delegate may choose not to exercise their delegation if the matter is of a sensitive nature and is something that the full board should consider at a business meeting.

15. Each local board will be in charge of its own process for considering and developing their local board input that will be approved by the delegated member. This can include discussions at workshops, developing ideas in a small working group or allocating it to an individual member to draft.

16. Where local boards do not wish to delegate the views to the chair, the recommended option is to use the urgent decision mechanism (where deadlines don’t align with local board reporting timeframes). The mechanism requires a staff report and the decision to be executed by three people (the Chair, Deputy Chair and the Relationship Manager). Local board input can be submitted within one to two days after the local board views and input have been collated and discussed by the local board members.

17. Option five is not considered best practice and local boards are strongly discouraged from using this.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

18. This decision is procedural in nature and any climate impacts will be negligible. The decision is unlikely to result in any identifiable changes to greenhouse gas emissions.

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

19. This report proposes a delegation to ensure that staff can undertake the preparation of submissions in a timely manner, while receiving formal local board input on matters that are of local board importance.

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

20. This report seeks to establish a specific delegation for the local board chair.

21. Any local board member who is delegated responsibilities should ensure that they represent the wider local board views and preferences on each matter before them.
Māori impact statement
22. A decision of this procedural nature is not considered to have a positive or negative impact for Māori.

Financial implications
23. A decision of this procedural nature is not considered to have financial implications on Auckland Council.

Risks and mitigations
24. If local boards choose to delegate to provide their formal views on Auckland Council submissions, there is a risk that this mechanism is perceived as non-transparent decision-making because it is not made by the full local board. This can be mitigated by publishing the submitted local board input on the next agenda.

25. There is also a risk that the chair who has the delegated authority may not have time to properly consult and ascertain views of the full local board. This can be mitigated by encouraging the local board to collectively discuss and agree their input before it is submitted by the member who has been delegated authority.

Next steps
26. On those occasions where it is required, the delegation will be used to approve and submit the local board’s input into Auckland Council submissions on formal consultation from government departments, parliament, select committees and other councils.

Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Authorisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carol Stewart - Senior Policy Advisor</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To present the Henderson-Massey Local Board with a Governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The Governance forward work calendar (the calendar) for the Henderson-Massey Local Board is in Attachment A. The calendar is updated monthly, reported to business meetings and distributed to council staff.
3. The calendar aims to support local boards’ governance role by:
   • ensuring advice on meeting agendas is driven by local board priorities
   • clarifying what advice is 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 Henderson-Massey Local Board:
a) receive the Governance forward work calendar for April 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Governance forward work calendar - April 2020</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Brenda Railey - Democracy Advisor - Henderson-Massey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Governance Forward Work Programme – April 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month (2020)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April/May</td>
<td>Changes to local board meetings as a result of COVID19 legislation and options for public input</td>
<td>Accountability to the public</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Waters Strategy</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April/June</td>
<td>Auckland Waters Strategy</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 May 2020</td>
<td>Annual planning (LBA) agree feedback and advocacy</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific</td>
<td>Formal adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Adopt draft Local Board Plans and SCP content</td>
<td>decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Annual planning (LBA) adopt local board agreements and fees and charges schedule</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Annual planning (LBWP) approve work programmes</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Auckland Waters Strategy</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Open Space Management Framework (2020 tbc)</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Define opportunities / potential approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Signage Bylaw 2015</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Water supply and wastewater bylaw review</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Confirmation of Workshop Records

File No.: CP2020/04588

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To present records of workshops held by the Henderson-Massey Local Board.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Briefings/presentations provided at the workshop held are as follows:
   3 March 2020
   1. Snow in the Park
   2. 2020/2021 Local board work programme development (Annual Planning WS3)
   3. Henderson-Massey Community Facilities Work Programme 2020-2023
   4. Local Board Plans update
      – potential LBTCF Projects
   5. Te Atatu Waka Ama Boat Launch – concept plan
   6. Initial Work Up of potential LBTCF Projects
   
   10 March 2020
   - Presentations – 3 shortlisted for ex-Massey Library space
   1. ATEED’s Local Board Engagement Plan and Screen Auckland Update
   2. Progressing Potential LB Transport Capex Fund (LBTCF) Projects
   3. Work Programme: Community Arts Broker
   4. Local board plans: population wellbeing and injury prevention
      – Briefings
      – Update from Chair’s Forum
   
   24 March 2020 Workshops cancelled due to Covid-19 measures.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) note the workshop records for 3 and 10 March 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Workshop records 3 and 10 March 2020</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Brenda Railey - Democracy Advisor - Henderson-Massey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Henderson-Massey Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Henderson-Massey Local Board held in the Henderson Civic Chambers L2, 6 Henderson Valley Rd, Henderson, on 3 March 2020, commencing at 9.30am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Chris Carter
Members: Will Flavell (Deputy Chair)
Brenda Brady
Peter Chan
Brooke Loader
Vanessa Neeson
Ingrid Papau

Apologies: Matt Grey
Also present: Glenn Boyd, Glenn Boyd, Wendy Kjestrup, Tracey Wisnewski, Sharlene Riley and Brenda Railey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Snow in the Park</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>A discussion with board members to highlight proposed changes to the format and activities for the event and suggested date for the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter: Kaiya</td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine (9.34am-10.00am)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Core element retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Royal Reserve venue has a lovely slope. Parking is an issue. 5,000 visitors last year. Numbers of locals uncertain. People do attend the event from outside local board area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Explore other partners e.g. movies in parks regional advertising. Cautious about changing venue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Date Sun 14 June (option to hold event on Saturday) starting 2pm approx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Board support for holding event in current location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Next steps:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Look next year for a new location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To receive new proposal in April 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Engagement with local schools for their input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. To investigate other park options to hold 2020 event (Kaiya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td>2. 2020/2021 Local board work programme development (Annual Planning WS3)</td>
<td>Local decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presenter:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation to board members on the draft work programmes for discussion and feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10.00am-1.00pm)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Action:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Kjestrup</td>
<td>1. Workshop required for Marieke Numan to provide more information (10 Mar confirmed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In support: Tracey Wisnewski and David Rose</td>
<td>Libraries: Megan Grimshaw-Jones and Margo Arthy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other attendees: Betty MacLaren, Megan Grimshaw-Jones, Linda Smith, Tracey Williams, Susan Quinn, Helen Biffin, Michelle Knudsen, Nick FitzHerbert, Jo Hart, Claire Siddens and Mary Dawson</td>
<td>- Items discussed line by line;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To note board’s new focus on Pacific community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Parks, Sport &amp; Recreation:</strong> Linda Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Redhills growth area local park service provisional plan – contract this work out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Board support for progressing provisional plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The Western Initiative:</strong> Dhaya Haran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A board concern was duplication of services provided by other organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discussion around not increasing funding and impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Board decision pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>I&amp;ES:</strong> Nick FitzHerbert, Tracey Parsons, Gabi Ezeta and Chris Ferkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Items discussed line by line and changes were noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Plans &amp; Places:</strong> John Moffat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1963 – will support next year. To come back to us.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CF Opex:</strong> Helen Biffin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 13 - to discuss direction from board with business association.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 65 - Board strongly supports this item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LUNCH**
### 3. Henderson-Massey Community Facilities Work Programme 2020-2023

**Helen Biffin**  
(1.00pm-2.00pm)

| Local decision making | Presentation to board members on Community Facilities work programme 2020-2023. Request for board member feedback on priorities for facility development. The work programme was discussed line by line. **Next steps:**  
- Work programme revised based on feedback  
- Growth and Coastal programmes to Environment & Community Committee  
- Workshop in May to give feedback on revised work programme  
- Work programmes approved in June business meeting. **Actions:**  
1. To workshop (tbc) revised work programme in May for board feedback (Brenda) |

### 4. Local Board Plans update

**Presenter: Wendy Kjestrup**  
(1.45pm-1.59pm)

| Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions | Board members updated on the local board plan progress.  
- Gap in large spaces for people to gather e.g. community spaces.  
- Lack of suitable large community spaces. |

**Administration (weekly) – Sharlene Riley**

| Time allowed for discussion of potential LBTCF Projects **Presenter: Wendy Kjestrup**  
(2.10pm-2.35pm) | Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions | Board member briefing on potential LBTCF Projects.  
Reiterate criteria of fund. **Next steps:**  
- Finalise list of LBTCF projects.  
- Request Auckland Transport for rough order of costs for projects.  
- Report from AT re bulk fund completion of HM/Whau cycleway? |
5. Te Atatu Waka Ama Boat Launch – concept plan  
Presenter: Kimberley Graham (2.38pm–

| Oversight and monitoring | Presentation to board members for feedback on 5 concept options.  
| Option on council land. Decision making sits with local board.  
| Temp structures on reserve land  
| Lengthy review of alternative sites. Preferred site close to water.  
| Concern temporary solution becoming permanent.  

Next Steps:  
- Memo to board with updated information.  
- April Report recommending options

6. Initial Work Up of potential LBTCF Projects  
Presenters: Owena Schuster and Tracey Wisnewski (3.30pm–4.00pm)

| Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions | Discussion of potential list of prioritised LBTCF projects for AT to provide rough order of costs.  
| Examples given of projects that would clarify under fund criteria. Transport related projects e.g. walkway, bridge, etc  
| Deadline: 31 March 2020  

Suggestions:  
1. Henderson Creek cycle way.  
2.Waitemata Drive bridge  
3. Te Whau pathway.

Actions:  
1. To progress list of prioritised projects next week (Tracey Wisnewski)

The workshop concluded at 4.00pm.
**Henderson-Massey Local Board Workshop Advisor Notes**

Workshop record of the Henderson-Massey Local Board held in the Civic Council Chambers, 6 Henderson Valley Road, Henderson, on 10 March 2020, commencing at 9.15am.

**PRESENT**
- **Chairperson:** Chris Carter
- **Members:**
  - Will Flavell
  - Brenda Brady
  - Peter Chan
  - Ingrid Papau
- **Apologies:** Brooke Loader and Vanessa Neeson
- **Also present:** Glenn Boyd, Glenn Boyd, Wendy Kjestrup, Tracey Wisnewski, Sharlene Riley and Brenda Railey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Presentations – 3 shortlisted for ex-Massey Library space YMCA Sport Waitakere Niutao Community Trust | Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions | To present to board members on how these organisations would use the space at 545 Don Buck Rd, Massey (ex Massey Library space).
Board members will consider all three presentations and identify a preferred supplier.
Discussion on agreed criteria:
- collaboration with other community groups and
- how the groups intend to utilise the space
General discussion regarding the various options.
Note: Board support for enlivening imbuing space with life.
**Actions:**
1. To investigate if three groups can share space (Michelle Knudsen)
2. Board members to meet at 545 Don Buck Rd at 9.30am on Friday to tour building. (Tracey Wisnewski) |
| 1. ATEED's Local Board Engagement Plan and Screen Auckland Update | Keeping informed | Presentation updating board members on ATEED’s revised local board engagement plan, and Screen Auckland.

Board members have visibility of the engagement and film permitting activity undertaken by ATEED.

Notes:
- Engagement Plan - monthly updates available.
- Screen Auckland permitting film in public space.
- Board keen to encourage film crews using local businesses.
- Whaka studio competing with Kumeu studios

Actions:
1. Request further information on future of Whaka studios and impact of new Kumeu studios (Ellie Beard) |

| 2. Progressing Potential LB Transport Capex Fund (LBTCF) Projects | Keeping informed | Further discussion to progress prioritising LBTCF list of projects and that board members agree LBTCF list of priority projects.

Notes:
- Board support for AT potential project:
  - Lighting project for the walkway between Central Park Drive and the north west cycleway

New projects discussed:
- Funding Te Whau Pathway
- Waitemata Drive Cycle & Footbridge
- Options for AT Henderson’s Future cycleway
- Henderson Creek cycleway renewals
- Support advocacy from Whau for Te Whau Pathway.

Actions:
1. What is AT doing regarding options for Henderson’s future and Henderson Creek cycleway renewals? (Tracey Wisnewski) |
### 3. Work Programme: Community Arts Broker
**Presenter:** Marieke Numan  
(11.25am-)

| Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions | Discussion of work programme Item 645 Community Arts Broker budget increase. | Notes:  
- Outlined arts broker role and how budget would be applied.  
- Requested increased budget to cover programming and broker cost.  
- Board indicated support for 20/21 increase. |

| Wendy lead a discussion with board members on work programme queries raised at last week’s workshop to confirm final budget figures. |

### 4. Local board plans: population wellbeing and injury prevention
**Presenter:** Wayne Levick (Strategic Advisor - Safety Collective CE) and Alisa Wilson (Senior Health Advisor)  
(12.30pm-1.02pm)  
In support: Duncan McLaggan (Service and Integration Manager CE)  
Heather Robertson (Data Analyst – Safety Collective CE)

| Keeping informed | Presentation to board members to explore findings from population wellbeing and injury profiles.  
Options and opportunities for local boards to plan and/or collaborate to address population wellbeing and injury prevention. | Notes:  
- Impact of wellbeing and injury prevention  
- Results from Wellbeing and Injury Prevention profile provided  
- 1.4 drinking fountains in Henderson-Massey ward area per 1,000 - below Auckland average  
- Options for development e.g. themes, practicalities etc.  
- Collection of alcohol related harm data improving. |

| Keeping informed | Briefings:  
- Chinese community engagement as part of Annual Budget consultation last Saturday. Translation to mandarin would be useful.  
- Request for Peter Chan to meet them regularly  
- Chinese community would like information on board in mandarin. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keeping informed</th>
<th>Update from Chair’s Forum:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCO’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Richard Northey, Waitemata Local Board presented on CCO’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Covid 19 – precaution (no hand shaking or hugging)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Disposal of funeral ashes. Request from board chairs for a policy. Mana whenua consultation requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions:</strong></td>
<td>To send Richard Northey’s presentation to other board members (Chris)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Community Facilities monthly update</th>
<th>Keeping informed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moire Park – concept development:</td>
<td>To present a revised Moire Park upgrade concept design Community consultation has been undertaken and an initial concept has been presented to the local board and North West Mana Whenua forum with feedback incorporated into the revised concept design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter: Greer Clark and Riyasp Bhandari</td>
<td>Board member feedback and support on the revised concept design to move this project to the detailed design phase to enable physical works to proceed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In support: Amy Gautier and John Cranfield</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.26pm–2.05pm)</td>
<td>- Renewal funding allocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Update on Moire Park concept plan development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Feedback from mana whenua collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postponed:</strong></td>
<td>- Support for incorporation of Maori stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAP—Asbestos Programme update (Ben Meadows, Jaqelma Madeiro)</td>
<td>- Support installation of 2 water fountains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priority list:**

1. Shade structure
2. Low wall artwork at park entrance
3. Asphalt basketball court
   - No to flying fox (over budget)

**Next steps:**

- Community consultation
- Come back to board to present final Concept Design Plan.

**Actions:**

1. Talk with Healthy Families re water fountain outside rugby club (Wendy to send to Greer)

Administration (weekly) – Sharlene Riley
### Reports on 17 March business meeting Agenda
Glenn Boyd (2.05pm-2.20pm)

| Keeping informed | Annual Budget - Short presentation from Glenn. Use public forum time for submissions.  
- Board to endorse regional grant for Waitemata rugby club.  
- To provide feedback on CCO Review report by 3 April 2020.  
- Further considerations from local boards on Climate Change. |

| 6. Work Programme queries arising out of last week’s workshop | Keeping informed | Carry on with discussion with work programme queries. |

Wendy Kjestrup

**Member update and informal board member discussion**

The workshop concluded at 4.00pm.