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1 Welcome
   A board member will lead the meeting in prayer.

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 Papakura Local Board:
   a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting held on Wednesday 26 February 2020, as true and correct.

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

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

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

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

8.1 Deputation - Kuraconnect

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Melissa Tipene, from the Papakura Athletic and Harrier Club, will provide an update on the Kuraconnect activities.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
   a) thank Melissa Tipene from the Papakura Athletic and Harrier Club for her Kuraconnect presentation.
8.2 Deputation - The Rising Foundation Trust

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Alex Tarrant, General Manager of the Rising Foundation Trust, will introduce what the charity does within the Papakura community and the benefits and outcomes the programme has on the youth and wider whanau members.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) thank Alex Tarrant from the Rising Foundation Trust for their presentation.

8.3 Deputation - Mana Whenua Engagement Paoa Whanake Strategic Partnership

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Genesis Moana, from Manawhenua Ngati Paoa Social Development, will speak to the activities of Manawhenua Ngati Paoa Social Development.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) thank Genesis Moana, from Manawhenua Ngati Paoa Social Development for her presentation.

8.4 Deputation - Papakura Business Association

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Tracy Shackleton from the Papakura Business Association, will introduce the new Town Centre Safety Coordinator Vanessa Newman.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) thank Tracy Shackleton from the Papakura Business Association, for her presentation.
8.5 Deputation - Papakura Museum - Kay Thomas

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. Kay Thomas from the Papakura Museum, will speak to funding for an exhibition.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) thank Kay Thomas from the Papakura Museum, for speaking to exhibition funding.

9 Public Forum

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

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

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.”
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To provide an opportunity for the Manurewa Papakura ward councillors to update the board on Governing Body issues they have been involved with since the previous meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. Standing Orders 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 provides for Governing Body members to update their local board counterparts on regional matters of interest to the board.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) receive Councillor Angela Dalton and Councillor Daniel Newman’s updates.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
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<th>Author</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To provide an opportunity for the Papakura Local Board Chairperson to update the local board on issues he has been involved in over the past month.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) receive the verbal report from the Papakura Local Board Chairperson.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attendance at local board meetings during the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice period

File No.: CP2020/04563

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To recommend an amendment to the local board’s standing orders in order to provide for attendance of non-members at local board meetings via audio or audio-visual link.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report updates the local board on the temporary arrangements for local board meetings enabled by the COVID-19 Response (Urgent Management Measures) Act 2020 and provides options for implementing similar arrangements for non-members.

3. The COVID-19 Response (Urgent Management Measures) Act 2020 temporarily amends the existing legislative restrictions for local government on remote attendance for elected members and minimum quorum at local board meetings. This now enables meetings to proceed by audio-visual link, changes how meetings can be open to the public and how members of the public receive the agenda and minutes.

4. The current local board standing orders do not provide for non-members, specifically members of the public and Māori, to give input via audio or audio-visual link.

5. The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) requires that a person other than a member of the local board may participate by means of audio link or audio-visual link if the standing orders of the local authority permit this and if the chair is satisfied that all conditions and requirements in the standing orders are met. (Clause 25A(2), Schedule 7, LGA). Local board standing orders do not currently allow for this.

6. Auckland Council will be using Skype for Business for local board meetings. Attendance by members and non-members (if approved) will be facilitated by phone (audio only) or Skype video (audio-visual) via Skype for Business app.

7. An amendment to Standing Orders to enable electronic attendance can either be reversed at a future date or maintained to support that attendance in the future, where it is available.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) note the temporary amendments pursuant to the COVID-19 Response (Urgent Management Measures) Act 2020 which allows members to attend meetings by audio-visual link, as of right and despite anything to the contrary in standing orders and to be counted for the purposes of quorum.

b) amend its standing orders by including a new Standing Order 3.3.10 that reads as follows:

Attendance of non-members by electronic link

A person other than a member of the local board may participate in a meeting of the local board by means of audio link or audio-visual link if the person is otherwise approved to participate in accordance with Standing Orders Sections 6 and 7.

c) amend its Standing Order 7.8.5 to provide discretion to the chair of the meeting to decline Public Forum requests via audio or audio-visual link.

Horopaki
Context

COVID-19 Response (Urgent Management Measures) Act 2020


9. The amendments to the LGA and LGOIMA enable local authorities to have meetings by audio-visual link (given the restrictions regarding physical distancing and Alert Level 4) and support the effective operation of those meetings by removing conditions associated with the right to attend meetings by audio or audio-visual link.

10. These amendments only apply while the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice 2020 is in force and will be repealed when that notice expires or is revoked.

Amendments to LGA

11. The amendments to the LGA modify Clause 25A, Schedule 7 so that a member of a local authority has the right to attend any meeting by audio or audio-visual link, regardless of what is provided for in the local authority’s standing orders. It also modifies clause 25A so that a member attending by audio link or audio-visual link is counted for the purposes of quorum.

Amendments to LGOIMA

12. The amendments to LGOIMA include modifying s 47 so that the requirement for meetings of local authorities to be ‘open to the public’ may be met during Alert Level 4 and other restrictions on physical distancing. The amendment redefines ‘open to the public’ to mean that the local authority:

a) if it is reasonably practicable, enables access to the meeting by broadcasting live the audio or video of the meeting (for example, by broadcasting it on an Internet site); and

b) does 1 or both of the following as soon as practicable after the meeting ends:

i. makes an audio or a video recording of the meeting available on its Internet site

ii. makes a written summary of the business of the meeting available on its Internet site.
13. This amendment does not anticipate public involvement as part of the meeting itself but ensures the public can access or view meeting proceedings online (either live or after the meeting) or through reviewing the summary.

14. Other amendments to LGOIMA include:
   - Modifying s 46A so that agendas and reports for the meetings may be made available on the local authority’s internet site instead of at offices and other physical locations.
   - Modifying s 51 so that minutes of meetings may be made available on the local authority’s internet site instead of at offices and other physical locations.
   - The changes made by the COVID-19 Response (Urgent Management Measures) Act 2020 now supersede some of the provisions in the local board standing orders and the restrictions on physical distancing and from Alert Level 4 now limit the opportunity for public input.

Local Board Standing Orders
15. The LGA requires local authorities to adopt a set of standing orders for the conduct of its meetings and those of its committees (Clause 27, Sch 7). Each local board has adopted its standing orders which have been developed from a template.

16. As a result of the statutory amendments listed in this report, the following standing orders have been temporarily superseded:
   - 3.3.2 Member’s status – quorum and vote
   - 3.3.3 Conditions for attending by electronic link
   - 3.3.4 Request to attend by electronic link
   - 7.3.1 Information to be available to the public
   - 7.3.2 Availability of agendas and reports
   - 8.2.1 Inspection of minute books

17. There are additional provisions in standing orders that may require further consideration if the local board wishes to enable these to continue during the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice period. These relate to input and participation by Māori and the public.

18. Clause 25A(2), Schedule 7 of the LGA requires that a person other than a member of the local authority may participate by audio link or audio-visual link if the standing orders of the local authority permit this and if the chair is satisfied that all conditions and requirements in the standing orders are met.

19. The current standing orders do not currently provide for non-members, if required and approved to do so, to give input by means of audio link or audio-visual link.

20. Other participants at local board meetings include Governing Body members and staff. The LGA and the recent amendment provide the right for any member of a local authority or committee to attend any meeting of a local authority by audio-visual link (unless lawfully excluded). This can be interpreted broadly to extend to meetings where the elected member may not be a decision-maker or be participating in the decision at all. As such, Governing Body members participation may be by audio or audio-visual link and the process for providing them with speaking rights remains under standing orders.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
21. In performing their role, local boards are required to act in accordance with the principles contained in s 14(1) of the LGA including the requirement for the council to conduct its business in an open, transparent and democratically accountable manner and make itself aware of and have regard to the views of all of its communities.
22. While the LGA does not specifically require public input to be provided for at local board meetings, the standing orders approved by the local board reflects the principles in s 14 LGA by providing for public attendance and enabling public input at meetings.

23. In order to continue to provide this opportunity as well as facilitate input by Māori and the public, the standing orders require amending.

Standing Orders Section 6 Māori Input

24. Speaking rights for Māori organisations or their nominees are granted under standing orders for the purpose of enabling Māori input, if any, to any item on the agenda of a meeting.

25. To ensure this right can be exercised during the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice period, provision needs to be made enabling any input to be given by audio or audio-visual link.

Standing Orders 7.7 Deputations and 7.8 Public Forum

26. The provisions for public input in standing orders are one of the ways that local boards give effect to the requirements of the LGA (s 78 and s 79).

27. The LGA provides that in the course of its decision-making, a local authority must consider the views and preferences of persons likely to be affected by or have an interest in the matter. The LGA does not specify how those views are to be obtained or what form that consideration should take. It does not require a public forum at meetings.

28. However, the LGA gives local authorities discretion as to how to comply with s 78 and what to consider. Through their standing orders, local boards and the Governing Body have chosen to enable public input through deputations and public forum at their meetings as one way to obtain community views, among other things.

29. To ensure this opportunity can continue to be made available during the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice period, provision must be made in standing orders to receive this by audio or audio-visual link.

Proposed amendment

30. This report recommends that input from non-members continue to be enabled during the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice period. This requires an amendment to the standing orders.

31. An amendment to standing orders requires a 75% majority vote.

32. A similar amendment has been made by the Governing Body to their standing orders. It is desirable to ensure consistency across the governance arms of Auckland Council. The Governing Body resolutions are as follows:

Resolution GB/2020/33 (n) That the Governing Body amend standing orders by inserting a new Standing Order 3.3.10 as follows:

Attendance of non-members by electronic link A person other than a member of the Governing Body, or the relevant committee, may participate in a meeting of the Governing Body or committee by means of audio link or audio-visual link in emergencies if the person is otherwise approved to participate under these standing orders (such as under Standing Order 6.2 “Local board input” or 7.7 “Public input”).

Resolution GB/2020/33 (p) That the Governing Body agree to change Auckland Council’s Standing Orders to provide full discretion to the chair of the Emergency Committee to decline public input requests

33. The local board’s standing orders currently gives discretion to the chair to decline deputations but not public forum requests. Giving discretion to the chair to manage requests
for public forum during this time can ensure the requirements of the LGA regarding the provision of the technology requirements, can be supported.

**Technology options available**

34. Where attendance by audio or audio-visual link is permitted, the LGA requires that the chair of the meeting ensures:
   - that the technology for the audio link or audio-visual link is available and of suitable quality
   - that the procedure for use of the technology will ensure that participants can hear and be heard by each other.

35. The chair’s discretion will need to be exercised where the technology and quality cannot be guaranteed.

36. The audio and audio-visual link options available for non-member input are provided by Auckland Council through Skype for Business:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audio link only</td>
<td>• No ability to see presentations being shared or to see and be seen by local board members attending the meeting&lt;br&gt;• Only technical equipment required is a landline or mobile telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Skype for Business meeting via phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual link</td>
<td>• Allows non-member to see both presentations being shared and to see and be seen by the local board members attending&lt;br&gt;• Requires a mobile phone or a computer device with an internet connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video and audio attend Skype for Business meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. If enabled under standing orders, non-members who wish to give input would need to contact the local board with a request to attend. If approved by the chair, information on how to join the meeting using audio and audio-visual link options above will be sent out to the attendee by staff.

**Summary of meeting**

38. Where it is not reasonably practicable for the public to attend the meeting through a broadcast and/or peruse a recording after it has happened, a summary of the meeting will need to be provided by staff.

39. A summary in this context would be different from the content of agendas, reports and minutes which are all separately required to be publicly available. It should contain the thrust or key points of the discussion or debate at the meeting keeping in mind that its purpose is to provide an alternative to an audio or video recording of the meeting, in a situation where the public is not able to attend and hear this discussion themselves.

40. The ordinary definition of a summary is a brief statement or account of the main points of something. While the appropriate level of detail is likely to vary depending on what is being discussed at meetings, a summary is not expected to include verbatim notes.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

41. 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
42. Staff attendance at meetings, while not specifically provided for, is a necessary part of local board meetings and as such is expected to take place using audio-visual link.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
43. This report seeks to amend the local boards standing orders to enable public input and Māori input at meetings.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
44. This report seeks a decision that will ensure Māori input can continue to be given during the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice period.
45. This will ensure Māori are not prevented from giving input at a meeting on any matter that may be of interest to them.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
46. The decision to amend standing orders is of a procedural nature and is not considered to have financial implications on Auckland Council.
47. The scaling up of technology to ensure compliance with COVID-19 Response (Urgent Management Measures) Act 2020 is being done at a cost to the council. The costs are not known at this stage and will be factored into operational budgets.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
48. The objective of the recent legislative changes is to reduce public health risks and ensure compliance with social distancing measures and other restrictions in New Zealand’s COVID-19 alert levels response plan.
49. While this is not specifically required by legislation, permitting public input by audio or audio-visual link, if practicable, can ensure the local board can receive and consider views of its constituents on decisions that they are making.
50. There is a risk that the audio-visual option would only be taken up by a small number of constituents as this would only be available to those who have the technical devices and internet access. The software that will be used for meetings is Skype for Business which is free to download and use. However, the internet access costs or availability of technology/devices can be a limiting factor for some constituents. Constituents who do not have internet access can participate, if approved, by phone.
51. The report is seeking discretion for the local board chair to decline public forum requests. This delegation should be exercised with caution so as to not undermine the intention of standing orders (which currently provided some limited grounds to decline public input). There will be instances where it is reasonable to decline (noting these examples are not intended to be exhaustive), such as:
   • where the technology cannot be provided or quality cannot be assured
   • a need to manage time allocations for the agenda
   • the matter is neither urgent nor the subject of a decision to be made at the meeting
   • the request is offensive, repetitious or vexatious.
Next steps

52. If approved, the amendments to standing orders can, if the local board chooses, continue beyond the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice period. Enabling these changes gives maximum flexibility for attendance of non-members at future meetings, including those with underlying health issues or compromised immune systems that may need to take extra precaution even after the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice period has ended.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.
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Authorisers
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Auckland Transport April 2020 report to the Papakura Local Board

File No.: CP2020/04258

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To receive the Auckland Transport April 2020 update report to the Papakura Local Board.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Each month, Auckland Transport provides an update to the Papakura Local Board on transport-related matters, relevant consultations in its area, Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBCTF) projects and decisions of Auckland Transport’s Traffic Control Committee.
3. The Auckland Transport April 2020 update report is attached to this report along with the Speed limit changes in the Papakura Local Board area from 30 June 2020 memo, and the Allocating Local Board Transport Capital Funds report.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) receive the Auckland Transport April 2020 monthly update report as provided in Attachment A to this report.

b) allocate 50% of its remaining LBCTF of $2,332,263 being $1,166,131, to the Pescara Point walkway (Greenways Plans Projects 12 & 13) to bring the board’s total contribution to this project to $2,446,131, as provided in Attachment C to this report.

c) request Auckland Transport to progress a business case to NZTA to fund the remaining amount of $1,621,787 to complete the Pescara Point Walkway project.
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April 2020: Auckland Transport monthly update to the Papakura Local Board

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. An update for the Papakura Local Board about transport related matters in its area, including the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. A decision is required this month on the following:
   - Projects the board selects to request rough order of costs (RoCs) for from Auckland Transport (AT), to allow the Board to make decisions on the allocation of its local board transport capital fund (LBTCF), as per the separate decision report.
3. The report also contains information about the following:
   - Information about the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF).
   - Information about Auckland Transport local and regional projects and activities.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
   a) receive the Auckland Transport April 2020 monthly update report.

Horopaki
Context
4. This report addresses transport-related matters in the board’s area and includes information on the status of the Local Board Transport Capital Fund and the fund’s projects.
5. 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.
6. Any LBTCF projects selected must be safe, must not impede network efficiency, and must be located in the road corridor or on land controlled by Auckland Transport (though projects running through parks can be considered if there is a transport outcome).
7. AT is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. AT reports on a monthly basis to local boards, as set out in the Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important engagement role local boards play within and on behalf of their local communities.
Attachment A

Item 14

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

8. This section of the report contains information about local projects, issues and initiative. It provides summaries of the detailed advice and analysis provided to the local board during workshops and briefings.

Local Board Transport Capital Fund

9. In this 2019-2022 electoral term, the local board has approximately $2.32 million of LBTCF to allocate to projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previously unallocated funds</th>
<th>Allocation for term</th>
<th>Total $ available to new Board</th>
<th>Minimum $ that should be allocated by 30 June 2020 to ensure projects can be constructed during the electoral term, the board should allocate 50% of their allocation in June 2020.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>366,879</td>
<td>1,965,384</td>
<td>$2,332,263</td>
<td>1,066,307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. AT encourages all local boards to maximise the use of their allocated funding and has established a timeline for the board to use for identification, investigation and delivery of projects.

11. The timeline is listed below:

- On the 5th February 2020, Auckland Transport workshoped an initial list of potential projects with the local board providing an opportunity to identify possible projects.
- On the 4th March 2020, Auckland Transport further workshoped this initial list of projects with the local board, providing an opportunity for the board to provide feedback.
- On the 18th of March 2020, AT workshoped the projects identified by the local board again and confirmed the list of projects that the board wished to put forward for rough order of costing (ROC).
- The local board will formally request by resolution, advice and rough order of costing (ROC) for the projects identified at the March workshop at its April 2020 business meeting.
- During May and June 2020 AT will provide costs and advice on the projects. This information can be used by the local board to prioritise its projects and to allocate funds based on quality advice. Workshops will be scheduled to discuss this information to support the local board’s decision-making.
- In June 2020 it is planned that the local board will able to:
  - Approve detailed design for complex projects with a cost of over $300,000.
  - Approve smaller projects (less than $300,000) for design and construction.

12. AT will endeavour to meet the timelines above. However, there may be some delays in preparing RoGs, if site visits are required due to the lockdown period of the Covid-19
emergency situation. This may then impact on the Board’s ability to give allocations to projects by resolution.

13. Notwithstanding the above, the aim is that during the first six months of the term the local board can identify worthwhile transport projects and start work on utilising its transport capital fund. This will allow projects to be progressed or delivered inside of the board’s current political term.

14. Auckland Transports’ aim is to move through this process and synchronise it with development of the board’s Local Board Plan. This process ensures transport projects support the board’s goals. It maximises efficiency and minimises the risk that transport funds are used to fund unplanned or poorly evaluated projects. Further, it helps to ensure that projects are completed in this electoral term. In the second year of the local board’s electoral term, this cycle will be repeated if the board does not allocate all its funds in the first year.

15. The projects identified that resolutions are sought for are listed in the separate decision report.

Responses to Resolutions

16. The most recent resolutions of the Papakura Local Board are recorded below in **bold** font, with Auckland Transport contained below each resolution.

Resolution number PPK/2020/11

i) expresses its disappointment that Auckland Transport will not consider an alternative location for the bus layover until the bus interchange work commences and a permanent solution found (noting that this may be indefinite as the bus interchange is not currently funded), despite previous undertakings by Auckland Transport staff that feasibility work has commenced at the site at the corner of Settlement Road and Great South Road, and requests information on the outcome of any feasibility work conducted to date.

Due to the Covid-19 imposed isolation, information to address this resolution is still not available at the time this report was written, and the response will be further deferred until the May 2020 AT report.

Local Updates

Speed limit changes in the Papakura Local Board area from 30 June 2020

17. As part of its Safe Speeds management programme, AT consulted with Aucklanders in 2019 on the Speed Limits Bylaw 2019, to set safe speed limits on the top 10% of high-risk roads in the region. AT received a total of 11,722 consultation feedback submissions of which 13 were from local boards, 11,658 were from individuals and 51 were stakeholder submissions. The consultation process followed an extensive review of Auckland’s roads by AT.

18. After considering all the public submissions, hearings and reviewing technical reports, AT’s Board approved the Bylaw on 22 October 2019. Due to the scale of the change with new road signage and traffic calming measures being installed, the Bylaw will be implemented in a phased approach.

19. The first phase, when new speed limits are legally enforceable by NZ Police, starts 30 June 2020. The main areas affected by the new speed limit changes are in the Waitakere, Rodney and Franklin local board areas.

20. An additional 75 roads scattered across the region, including 26 roads in the Papakura Local Board area will have new speed limits from 30 June 2020. Phases 2 and 3 are scheduled for 30 November 2020 and 30 June 2021 implementation (respectively).
21. AT is preparing a comprehensive region-wide media, communications, public relations and marketing plan to inform Aucklanders of the changes to speed limits. An interactive map is also under development where people can search for any road in Auckland to check if it will have new speed limits or not.

22. The new speed limit signs will be installed prior to 30 June 2020 and the old signs will be removed.

23. A list of all roads with speed limit changes from 30 June 2020 in the Papakura Local Board area is included as an attachment to this report.

Pedestrian Safety Improvements – Walters Road

24. Auckland Transport is improving pedestrian safety on Walters Road, Takanini. We are installing a new crossing with traffic lights on Walters Road, Takanini outside Kauri Flats School. This is in response to requests from the school to improve the safety of students crossing the road. These changes aim to provide a safe path for students and other pedestrians to cross Walters Road, connecting them to the main school entrance. These works are scheduled for June 2020 but may of course now face some delay.

Footpath on Great South Road near Drury School

25. There is currently a missing footpath link connecting the western side of Great South Road near Drury school. This issue involves more than just a missing footpath as Slippery Creek Bridge is located in the middle of this road section. There is no pedestrian facility on the western side of the bridge and no space to provide a footpath within the current bridge structure.

26. AT is currently investigating the feasibility of building a clip-on footbridge at the Slippery Creek Bridge. This project also involves footpath connections to the existing footpaths upstream and downstream. If a footbridge is deemed unfeasible for any reasons, AT will look at providing a refuge island north of the bridge to assist pedestrians to cross the road before they reach the bridge.

27. The construction of either the footbridge or the alternative refuge island is in the 2020/21 financial year. We expect to consult with the local board over the next few months on this project.

Walters Road / Kauri Flats School, Takanini

28. A new mid-block signalised pedestrian crossing is now proposed within the school frontage near the main school entrance on Walters Road. A shared path will also be provided to complete the pedestrian connections.

29. Construction is scheduled for June this year. Consultation letter will be sent out later this week or early next week to Local Board and other Key stakeholders including the school. School is up to date with the proposal and we will continue to do so.

30. Footpath connections to Bruce Pullman Park have been completed via Castlepoint Avenue. Students will be able to walk through Bruce Pullman Park onto Castlepoint Ave and get to the new mid-block crossing.

No Parking Signage – 78 Great South Road, Papakura

31. AT have received a request from a local resident raising concerns about vehicles parked on the grass berm outside and around 78 Great South Road, Papakura.
32. AT’s Traffic Bylaw 2012 includes a prohibition on parking a vehicle on a cultivated area in the urban traffic area. Under the bylaw a person must not park on a cultivated part of the road such as a grass berm but may park on an area that has been designed and constructed to accommodate a parked vehicle or if AT has given written permission. The current bylaw prohibition applies to the entire urban traffic area which was designated by the legacy area councils prior to Auckland Transport being established.

33. In accordance with legal advice received, AT needs to pass a resolution and install signs ‘prohibiting parking off the roadway’ on the affected street before any enforcement can be undertaken. The resolution report will be sent for approval to AT’s Traffic Control Committee.

34. In the coming weeks, AT will install signs at regular intervals outside and around 78 Great South Road, Papakura, prohibiting the parking off the roadway in this area.


35. At the time of report writing, non-essential work has ceased due to the government-imposed isolation rules (effects on AT are outlined below). This has impacted on a number of local projects being carried out in the Papakura Local Board area. An update on projects will be provided at the next business meeting.

Regional Transport Updates

COVID-19: Auckland Transport update
Update on public transport in Auckland under Alert Level 4

36. New Zealand moved to Alert Level 4 at 11.59pm on Wednesday, 25 March 2020.

37. This means:

- In alignment with new national policy while at Alert Level 4, all public transport (bus, trains and ferries) contracted by AT became free from the morning of Thursday, 26 March.

- From 11.59pm on Wednesday, 25 March 2020 public transport services are only be available for those working in essential services, for medical reasons, to access essential services including get to the supermarket, and to move essential goods. For details on what is considered an essential service visit [https://covid19.govt.nz/government-actions/covid-19-alert-level/](https://covid19.govt.nz/government-actions/covid-19-alert-level/)

- While travel will be free people should continue to tag on and off using their AT HOP card. This will allow Auckland Transport to monitor passenger numbers and make fast adjustments to services if required due to changes in demand.

- Essential workers may be asked, while travelling, to show who they work for. Where practical people should carry some form of identification showing who they are, who they work for, and their job (e.g. a business card, letter from their employer, or other work ID).

- People must continue to use the rear door to get on and off the bus. This is to ensure everyone is kept as safe as possible by minimising the physical contact between customers and the bus drivers.

- Trains, buses and ferries contracted by AT are running to a reduced timetable, similar to the usual weekend service timetable. These timetables are available on [https://at.govt.nz/COVID-19](https://at.govt.nz/COVID-19). Note: some key ferry services such as those to Waiheke and Devonport are not contracted or managed by AT and different arrangements may apply.

- All AT construction sites have been made safe and secure by our contractors and were closed from 11.59pm on Wednesday, 25 March 2020. 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 Auckland Transport until the alert level is reduced by the Government.

- 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’s upcoming public Board meeting, due to be held on Thursday (March 26), has been postponed to a later date and Directors are continuing to closely monitor the emerging issues and impacts of COVID-19.

- This is a challenging time for us all. We ask that people be understanding and patient of everyone else who is in the same situation until this global issue can be brought under control.

- Remember that the best place to find the latest information about the COVID-19 situation in New Zealand is on the Government’s special COVID-19 website: [https://covid19.govt.nz/](https://covid19.govt.nz/)


### Manurewa made safer with largest speed-calming project in Auckland

38. The largest area-wide speed calming project in Auckland is now live in Manurewa. Auckland Transport (AT) has finished road safety improvements on residential streets in Manurewa to provide a safer environment for all road users.

39. The residential speed management project – covering Browns Road, Roscommon Road, Russell Road and Weymouth Road – was partly funded by the Regional Fuel Tax, along with the Manurewa Local Board.

40. The $4 million project aims to reduce vehicle speeds with a combination of speed-calming measures - including 21 raised zebra crossings, 116 speed humps and 23 red-coloured entry treatments.

### Safer roads for Māngere Bridge schools are on their way

41. Walking to school in Māngere Bridge will now be safer for children, thanks to Auckland Transport’s Safer Communities programme.

42. The Māngere- Ōtāhuhu Local Board area has a high rate of road death and serious injury. 80 per cent of all road deaths and serious injuries occur on 50km/h roads like in Māngere Bridge. Nearly half of those deaths and serious injuries involve elderly or children walking or scooting to school.

43. Māngere Bridge is the second community to benefit under the programme after Mt Roskill.

44. Safety improvements will see wider footpaths - with clearer boundaries between them and surrounding properties. There will also be raised pedestrian crossings and raised speed tables to encourage safer speeds.

45. The first phase of construction has begun in Māngere and is due to be completed by June. See more at [https://at.govt.nz/about-us/news-events/safer-roads-for-mangere-bridge-schools-are-on-their-way/](https://at.govt.nz/about-us/news-events/safer-roads-for-mangere-bridge-schools-are-on-their-way/)

### Hingaia Road improvements - stage one completed

46. Stage one of work in southern Auckland’s Hingaia Peninsula is now complete.Auckland Transport (AT) is upgrading Hingaia Road in Karaka to support housing and employment growth in the area.

47. The Hingaia Peninsula is an area that is experiencing a phenomenal amount of growth. This growth needs to be supported by new arterial roads, bus routes, pedestrian facilities and cycling facilities. Work on the south side of Hingaia Road is now complete – including a footpath upgrade, a new drainage pipe and rain gardens.
48. See more about the work at https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/hingala-road-improvements/

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

*Climate impact statement*

49. 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.

50. 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.

51. 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 CO2 (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* The impact of information (or decisions) in this report are confined to AT and do not impact on other parts of the council group.

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

*Local impacts and local board views* The local board have been consulted on the following project(s) over the reporting period:

a) installation of a new crossing with traffic lights on Walters Road, Takanini outside Kauri Flats School.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

*Māori impact statement*

53. There are no specific impacts on Māori for this reporting period. Auckland Transport is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi—the Treaty of Waitangi and its broader legal obligations in being more responsible or effective to Māori.

54. Our Māori Responsiveness Plan outlines the commitment to with 19 mana whenua tribes in delivering effective and well-designed transport policy and solutions for Auckland. We also recognise mataawaka and their representative bodies and our desire to foster a relationship with them.

This plan in full is available on the Auckland Transport Website - https://at.govt.nz/about-us/transport-plans-strategies/maori-responsiveness-plan/#about
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

55. The LBTCF is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papakura 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>

56. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no financial implications for the local board.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

57. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no risks. AT has risk management strategies in place for the transport projects undertaken in the Papakura Local Board area.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

58. AT will provide another update report to the board at the next meeting in May 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

59. A list of roads in Papakura affected by the speed limit by-law changes on 30th June 2020 is attached.
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Context and background

1. In 2018, 54 people died and 595 others were seriously injured on Auckland’s roads.

2. To reduce rising levels of deaths and serious injuries (DSI) on Auckland’s roads, AT is delivering a $700 million road safety infrastructure programme, including Safe Speed management.

3. Setting safe speeds is one the quickest and cost-effective ways to reduce DSI on our roads. AT’s Safe Speed management programme supports its Vision Zero goal of zero DSI by 2050.


5. It follows the Auckland Council Planning Committee’s September 2018 resolution to “request Auckland Transport to accelerate the road safety and speed management programmes and seek input from partners to make Auckland a Vision Zero region” - Resolution number PLA/2019/83.

6. AT’s road safety programme is partly enabled by the Regional Fuel Tax, which contributes $210 million of the total $700 million capital expenditure.

7. The programme is estimated to reduce DSI by up to 60% by 2028.

8. The Speed Limits Bylaw is the legal process for changing speed limits following Section 27.1 of the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017.

9. As part of its Safe Speeds management programme, AT consulted with Aucklanders in 2019 on the Speed Limits Bylaw 2019, to set safe speed limits on the top 10% of high-risk roads in the region.

10. AT received a total of 11,722 consultation feedback submissions of which 13 were from local boards, 11,658 were from individuals and 51 were stakeholder submissions.

11. The consultation process followed an extensive review of Auckland’s roads by AT.

12. The Papakura Local Board feedback was that it broadly supports the range of speed reductions within Papakura.

13. After considering all the public submissions, hearings and reviewing technical reports, AT’s Board approved the Bylaw on 22 October 2019.

14. Due to the scale of the change with new road signage and traffic calming measures being installed, the Bylaw will be implemented in a phased approach.

15. The first phase, when new speed limits are legally enforceable by NZ Police, starts 30 June 2020.

16. The main areas affected by the new speed limit changes are in the Waitematā, Rodney and Franklin local board areas.

17. An additional 75 roads scattered across the region, including 26 roads in the PLB area will have new speed limits from 30 June 2020.

18. Phases 2 and 3 are scheduled for 30 November 2020 and 30 June 2021 implementation (respectively).

19. AT is preparing a comprehensive region-wide media, communications, public relations and marketing plan to inform Aucklanders of the changes to speed limits.

20. An interactive map is also under development where people can search for any road in Auckland to check if it will have new speed limits or not.
21. The new speed limit signs will be installed prior to 30 June 2020 and the old signs will be removed.

### Speed limit changes in the Papakura Local Board area from 30 June 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Section descriptions</th>
<th>Speed limit before 30 June 2020 (km/h)</th>
<th>Speed limit after 30 June 2020 (km/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airfield Road</td>
<td>between 100m east of Porchester Road and Mill Road</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Road</td>
<td>between Lipton Grove and Hunua Road</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Drive</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominion Road</td>
<td>between 300m south of Settlement Road and Hunua Road</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumas Place</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Avenue</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erceg Way</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatland Road</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin Drive</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy Moth Place</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Place</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter Street</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia Avenue</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marybeth Place</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Rise</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Estate Rd</td>
<td>between Great South Road and eastern abutment of motorway bridge</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Hill Road</td>
<td>between 600m east of Gibbs Crescent and Settlement Road</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Section descriptions</td>
<td>Speed limit before 30 June 2020 (km/h)</td>
<td>Speed limit after 30 June 2020 (km/h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosehill Drive</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Arch Place</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royston Street</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnypark Ave</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tairere Crescent</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanah Merah Drive</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taonui Street</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatariki Street</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastney Road</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Allocating Local Board Transport Capital Funds

**Te take mō te pūrongo**

**Purpose of the report**

1. To allow the Papakura Local Board to request rough order of costs (RoCs) from Auckland Transport (AT) in order for the Board to make decisions on the allocation of its local board transport capital fund (LBTCF).

**Whakarāpopototanga matua**

**Executive summary**

2. The next steps in this year’s LBTCF round are noted below along with staff recommendations for projects that the Board has been considering taking forward to rough order of costing.

3. The Board has $2,332,263 in its transport capital fund in this political term.

4. The RoCs will be reported back to the Board. Decisions on the selection and allocation of funding to projects is expected to take place in June 2020.

5. The Board have not provided AT with any projects that require RoCs.

**Ngā tūtohunga**

**Recommendation/s**

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) receive the Auckland Transport April 2020 decision report.

b) advise the board to allocate 50% of their LBCTF to the Pescara Point walkway (Greenways Plans Projects 12 & 13).

**Horopaki**

**Context**

6. AT is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. It reports on a monthly basis to local boards, as set out in its Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important engagement role of local boards within and on behalf of their local communities.

7. 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
Allocating Papakura LBTCF in the new political term

8. In the new political term, the Board’s LBTCF budget stands at $2,332,283.

9. During the 2016-19 political term, most of the LBTCF was allocated by boards in 2019. This has meant that the delivery of many of these projects is still in progress. By considering and making decisions early in the political term, the Board will increase its ability to make positive impacts in its area before the next election.

10. The Board may choose to allocate all the budget in this year’s LBTCF round, or part of it only. However, in order to get projects constructed in this political term, the Board should aim to allocate at least half of its fund in 2020 and the other half in 2021.

11. During February and March 2020, the Board has been compiling and prioritising a list of LBTCF projects. These have been discussed at local board workshops.

12. At the April 2020 business meeting, the Board is requested to identify which projects it wishes to proceed onto the next stage of prioritisation - rough order of costing.

13. AT will provide the Board with the rough order of costing for the selected projects and any other relevant advice by the end of May 2020. After it has considered this information, the Board will be requested to choose which projects it wishes to allocate funding toward. It is anticipated that at least half the fund will be allocated by the end of June 2020.

14. The board have advised that the project that they wish to pursue with the LBCTF is two sections of the Papakura Greenway Plan, being the Elliot to Freelance – Section 12 & Freelance to Pescara Point – Section 13.

Elliot to Freelance – Section 12 & Freelance to Pescara Point – Section 13

15. This is an existing Community Facility project that would see the construction of shared paths around the Pahurehure Inlet, connecting Elliot Street to the new motorway over bridge at Pescara Point. This project is eligible for LBTCF usage, as it serves a transport function.

16. There are two stages to this project with Section 12 being the Elliot Street to Freelance Terrace path, and Section 13 connection Freelance Terrace to Pescara Point. From a transport perspective, this project presents the benefit of creating a transport link between the Karaka Harbourside Community and the Papakura Town Centre – which includes access to buses and trains.

17. This project is not funded. The latest cost estimate for this project (as of March 2020) totals $4,067,918. In October 2017, previous board allocated $1,280,000 of funding towards this project, leaving a shortfall of approximately $2,788,000.

18. It is recommended that the board allocate 50% of their LBCTF, meaning a further contribution of $1,066,307. This would bring the funding shortfall of this project to approximately $1,720,000.

19. The civil engineering drawings for the viable design of this project have been provided to the board, along with the breakdown of the estimated costings.

20. NZTA have indicated that they are willing to receive a business case for a contribution towards funding this project, and a further allocation from the board towards this project would increase the likelihood of a business case being successfully received by NZTA.
Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi

Climate impact statement

21. 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.

22. One of AT’s core roles is 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.

23. 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

24. The impact of information in this report is mainly confined to Auckland Transport. Where LBTCF projects are being progressed by Auckland Council’s Community Facilities group, engagement will take place. Any further engagement required 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

25. AT attended local board workshops in February and March 2020 to develop these project options. The workshop on 5th February 2020 refreshed the Board on the new process for the allocation of the LBTCF.

26. At the 18th March 2020 workshop, AT provided advice on the project lists and provided staff recommendations on which projects to take forward to rough order of costing. As above, no other projects were put forward for RoC costing.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

27. 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

28. There are no financial implications for the Board in requesting rough order of costs from Auckland Transport. Costs associated with providing the rough order of cost plus more detailed high-level advice is borne by Auckland Transport.

29. The recommended action would see 50% of the boards current LBCTF allocated. This amount would be $1,068,307.

30. The table below gives the LBCTF financial summary for the Papakura Local Board which includes the budget available in the new political term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papakura 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget left</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

31. The proposed decision of receiving the report and requesting rough order of costs for potential LBCTF projects has no risks for the Board.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

32. AT expects to report back May 2020 with the prepared RoCs. Due to current Covid-19 lockdown, RoCs that require site visits may take longer to prepare than the May 2020 deadline.

33. The Board will be requested to allocate funds to its selected projects by the end of June 2020, or as soon as practical after RoCs are provided.

34. In this case, as no RoCs are sought, should the board elect to follow this reports recommendation, a business case will be prepared and taken to NZTA for additional funding of the Greenways Projects 12 & 13.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

35. There are no attachments to this report.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>James Ralph, Elected Member Relationship Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon, Manager, Elected Member Relationship Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approval for a new road name at 42 Beach Road, Papakura
File No.: CP2020/03122

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Papakura Local Board to name a new private road, being a commonly owned access lot, created by way of a subdivision development at 42 Beach Road, Papakura.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Auckland Council’s road naming guidelines set out the requirements and criteria for proposed road names. These requirements and criteria have been applied in this situation to ensure consistency of road naming across Auckland.
3. On behalf of the developer and applicant, Nanak Homes Limited, agent EMACS Group Ltd has proposed the names presented below for consideration by the local board.
4. Any of the three proposed road name options would be acceptable for the local board to approve for use in this location, having been assessed to ensure that they meet Auckland Council’s Road Naming Guidelines and the National Addressing Standards for road naming. All technical standards are met and the names are not duplicated anywhere else in the region. Mana whenua were also consulted. It is up to the local board to decide upon the thematic suitability of the names within the local context.
5. The proposed names for the new private road at 42 Beach Road, Papakura:
   - Vanni Lane (applicant preferred)
   - Akoma Lane (alternative 1)
   - Ruruku Lane (alternative 2)

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
a) approve the name (local board to insert chosen name and road type) for the new private road created by way of subdivision at 42 Beach Road, Papakura in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974 (resource consent reference BUN60311366 & SUB60311368).

Horopaki
Context
6. Resource consent BUN60311366 & SUB60311368 was issued 18 June 2018 for the construction of eight residential lots and one commonly owned access lot (COAL).
7. In accordance with the National Addressing Standards for road naming (the AS/NZS 4819-2011 standard), the COAL requires a road name because it serves more than 5 lots.
8. Site and location plans of the development is provided in Attachments A and B respectively to this report.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

9. The Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines allow that where a new road needs to be named as a result of a subdivision or development, the subdivider/developer shall be given the opportunity of suggesting their preferred new road name/s for the local board’s approval.

10. Auckland Council’s road naming criteria typically require that road names reflect one of the following local themes, with the use of Māori names being actively encouraged:
- a historical or ancestral linkage to an area;
- a particular landscape, environmental or biodiversity theme or feature; or
- an existing (or introduced) thematic identity in the area.

11. The three proposed road names are each from a different language to reference the diverse cultures that are proposed to live in the new subdivision. The meanings reference the connection and love that the residents will have towards the land and towards each other.

12. The applicant’s proposed names and meanings are set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Names &amp; Preferences</th>
<th>Meaning (as described by applicant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vanni Lane (applicant preferred)</td>
<td>Italian word meaning: <em>God is gracious</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akoma Lane (alternative 1)</td>
<td>Ghana origins meaning: <em>The heart</em> Symbolises love, unity, patience, tolerance, goodwill, and faithfulness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruruku Lane (alternative 2)</td>
<td>Māori word meaning: <em>(noun) band, bond, commitment.</em> In reference to the time and dedication the developer has put into creating this subdivision, as well as the bond that the future residents will have towards each other and their new homes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The names proposed by the applicant have been assessed to ensure that they meet Auckland Council’s Road Naming Guidelines and the National Addressing Standards for road naming. All technical standards are met and the names are not duplicated anywhere else in the region - therefore it is up to the local board to decide upon the suitability of the names within the local context.

14. Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) has confirmed that all of the proposed names are acceptable and not duplicated elsewhere in the region.

15. ‘Lane’ is an acceptable road type for the new private road, suiting the form and layout of the road, as per the Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines.

16. All relevant local iwi were written to (via email) and invited to comment. No iwi provided responses or comments. It is therefore implied that no iwi were opposed to the use of any of the proposed names in this location for this small private road.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

17. 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
18. The decision sought for this report has no identified impacts on other parts of the council group. The views of council controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of the report’s advice.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
19. This report seeks a decision from the Papakura Local Board and the decision is not considered to have any immediate local impact beyond those outlined in this report.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
20. The decision sought from the Papakura Local Board on this report is linked to the Auckland Plan Outcome “A Māori identity that is Auckland’s point of difference in the world”. The use of Māori names for roads, buildings and other public places is an opportunity to support Auckland’s Māori identity. One Māori road name option has been proposed.

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

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
22. 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
23. Approved road names are notified to Land Information New Zealand and recorded 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>A1</td>
<td>Location Plan of 42 Beach Road, Papakura</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Site Plan of 42 Beach Road, Papakura</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
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<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Salter</td>
<td>David Snowdon - Team Leader Subdivision</td>
</tr>
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<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
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Location plan for 42 Beach Road, Papakura
Attachment A

Item 15

Location plan for 42 Beach Road, Papakura
New road name in the subdivision at 72 Hinau Road, Karaka by Parkland Properties Limited

File No.: CP2020/04597

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Papakura Local Board to extend one existing road name and name thirteen new roads created by way of subdivision at 72 Hinau Road, Karaka by Parkland Properties Limited (BUN60077812, SUB60221444).

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 developer, Parkland Properties Limited, have submitted the following road name options for the ‘Equidae Estate at 72 Hinau Road, Karaka. (Note: Road 1 is the existing road, and there is no ‘Road 13’):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Proposed Road Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To be extended</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Road 2**                  |
| **Preferred**               |
| Maukitua                    |
| Avenue                      |
| **First Alternative**       |
| Lipizzaner                  |
| Avenue                      |
| **Second Alternative**      |
| Ardennes                    |
| Avenue                      |

| **Road 3**                  |
| **Preferred**               |
| Mangapikopiko               |
| Parade                      |
| **First Alternative**       |
| Bardigiano                  |
| Parade                      |
| **Second Alternative**      |
| Mangalarga                  |
| Parade                      |

| **Road 4**                  |
| **Preferred**               |
| Awa Paheke                  |
| Avenue                      |
| **First Alternative**       |
| Maremmano                   |
| Avenue                      |
| **Second Alternative**      |
| Boulonnais                  |
| Avenue                      |

| **Road 5**                  |
| **Preferred**               |
| **First Alternative**       |
| **Second Alternative**      |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Road Name</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### New road name in the subdivision at 72 Hinau Road, Karaka by Parkland Properties Limited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 6</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Wharekawa</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Holsteiner</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Camargue</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 7</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Pukepuke</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Galiceno</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Camarillo</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 8</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Te Aua</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Westphalian</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Hanoverian</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 9</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Waikowhai</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Eriskay</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Criollo</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 10</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Huarere</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Morab</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Orlov</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 11</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Taheke</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Noriker</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Hirza</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 12</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
New road name in the subdivision at 72 Hinau Road, Karaka by Parkland Properties Limited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 14</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Name</td>
<td>Maungatahi</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Konik</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Azteca</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Approval is also sought to use a previously approved name, Hinau Road, for the extension of that same road (Road 1).

5. The preferred road names were suggested by Ngāti Tamaoho following discussion between them and the developer, Parkland Properties Limited. The discussion followed objection by Ngāti Tamaoho (supported by Te Ahiwaru Waiohua) to the names suggested by the developer which were based around the theme of horse breed names chosen in recognition of the New Zealand Bloodstock in Karaka. These names are now proposed as the first and second alternative road names.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) approve the use of the existing name of Hinau Road for the extension of that road, and approve thirteen names from the abovementioned list of options created by way of subdivision at 72 Hinau Road, Karaka (Council references BUN60077812, SUB60221444), in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974.

Horopaki
Context

6. The road name application involves a three-stage subdivision consent in the Hingaia Special Housing Area at 72 Hinau Road, Karaka and the council reference is BUN60077812.

7. The roads are required to be named in accordance with the national addressing standards as they each serve more than 5 lots.

8. The extension of the existing name ‘Hinau Road’ will avoid any confusion of addressing along the continuous roadway.

9. The developer has carried out extensive consultation with Ngāti Tamaoho and as a result all preferred names are those suggested by Ngāti Tamaoho, whilst the first and second alternative names are those suggested by the developer, Parkland Properties Limited.
10. Site and location plans of the development can be found in Attachments A and B respectively.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

11. The Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines allow that where a new road needs to be named as the result of a subdivision or development, the subdivider/developer shall be given the opportunity of suggesting their preferred new road name for the Local Board’s approval.

12. 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.

13. The Applicant has proposed the following names for consideration summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 1</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be extended</td>
<td>Hinau</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 2</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Maukitua</td>
<td>Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Lipizzaner</td>
<td>Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Ardennes</td>
<td>Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 3</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Mangapikopiko</td>
<td>Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Bardigiano</td>
<td>Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Mangalarga</td>
<td>Parade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 4</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Awa Paheke</td>
<td>Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Maremmano</td>
<td>Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Boulonnais</td>
<td>Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 5</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Wharekawa</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Holsteiner</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Camargue</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 6</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Pukepuke</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road 7</td>
<td>Road Name</td>
<td>Road Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Paretaua</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Campolina</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Halfinger</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 8</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Te Aua</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Westphalian</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Hanoverian</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 9</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Name</td>
<td>Waikowhai</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Eriskay</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Criollo</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 10</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Name</td>
<td>Huarere</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Morab</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Orlov</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 11</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Name</td>
<td>Taheke</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Noriker</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Hirza</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 12</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Name</td>
<td>Kueke</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Trakehner</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Dartmoor</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 14</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Name</td>
<td>Maungatahi</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Konik</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New road name in the subdivision at 72 Hinau Road, Karaka by Parkland Properties Limited

### Second Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 15</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Name</td>
<td>Whakarau</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alternative</td>
<td>Sorraia</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Alternative</td>
<td>Skyros</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Parkland Properties Limited initially proposed names for its ‘Equidae Estate’ following the theme first introduced for street names in 2013 when it successfully proposed horse breeds for street names in its Karaka Estate subdivision along Hingaia Road.

15. The horse breed theme was chosen in recognition of the New Zealand Bloodstock in Karaka which remains a central and symbolic cornerstone to the Karaka area.

The developer advises that the Equidae Estate subdivision is contiguous with the NZ Bloodstock and pays homage to this internationally famous enterprise.

The horse breed themed names were circulated amongst the local iwi groups and two non-supportive responses were received. As a result, the developer Parkland Properties Limited consulted further with Ngāti Tamaoho and have incorporated the iwi suggested names as the preferred names with an agreement reached with Ngāti Tamaoho for the horse breed themed road names put forward as the first and second alternative road names.

16. Land Information New Zealand has confirmed that all the above names are acceptable to use.

17. The proposed names are all deemed to meet the road naming guidelines.

18. **The road suffixes**: All suffixes listed in the tables above are acceptable.

---

**Tauākī whakaaweawē āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

19. 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 whakaaweawē me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera**

**Council group impacts and views**

20. The decision sought for this report has no identified impacts on other parts of the council group. The views of council-controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of this report’s advice.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

21. 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 whakaaweawē Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

22. Eight local iwi were consulted over the proposed road names via Council’s facilitation service and responses were received from two iwi being Ngāti Tamaoho and Te Ahiwaru Waiohua.
23. The response received from Ngāti Tamaoho was not in support of the proposed road names and this stance was supported by Te Ahiwaru Waiohua. There were no other responses and no alternative names were suggested.

24. Following this response the developer, Parkland Properties Limited, contacted Ngāti Tamaoho to discuss iwi road naming suggestions. As a result of this consultation all preferred road names are those suggested by Ngāti Tamaoho, and it was agreed that the first and second alternatives would be those horse breed themed names suggested by the developer, Parkland Properties Limited.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

25. 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**

26. 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 korinaga ā-muri**

**Next steps**

27. Approved road names are notified to Land Information New Zealand who records them on their 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>72 Hinau Road - Site Locality Map</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>72 Hinau Road - Scheme Plan - Road Numbering</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Lesley Wood – Subdivision Advisor – South, Resource Consents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>David Snowden, Team Leader, Subdivision, Resource Consents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment A:

Site locality plan of 72 Hinau Road, Karaka in the Hengaia Special Housing Area.

The existing portion of Hinau Road can be seen heading south and leading into the subdivision at 72 Hinau Road.
Attachment B:

Scheme Plan of Stages 1 – 3 of the Subdivision at 72 Hinau Road, Karaka.
Addition to the Papakura Local Board meeting schedule

File No.: CP2020/04562

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval for a meeting date to be added to the 2019-2022 Papakura Local Board meeting schedule in order to accommodate a change to the timeframes for the Annual Budget 2020/2021.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The timeframes for the Annual Budget 2020/2021 process have now been modified due to delays in receiving the processed submissions caused by the Covid-19 lockdown,
3. The Papakura Local Board scheduled an additional meeting for 6 May 2020 [resolution PPK/2019/219] to decide on their feedback and advocacy for the Annual Budget 2020/2021, based on submissions from their local board area.
4. The 6 May 2020 meeting will need to be cancelled due to the new timeframe, and a new additional meeting approved to meet the modified Annual Budget 2020/2021 timeframes.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) cancel the additional meeting scheduled on 6 May 2020 at 4.30pm, to decide on their feedback and advocacy for the Annual Budget 2020/2021.

b) approve a new additional meeting date of 13 May 2020 at 5pm to the 2019-2022 Papakura Local Board meeting schedule, to accommodate the Annual Budget 2020/2021 timeframes.

Horopaki
Context
5. The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) and the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA) have requirements regarding local board meeting schedules.
6. In summary, adopting a meeting schedule helps meet the requirements of:
   • clause 19, Schedule 7 of the LGA on general provisions for meetings, which requires the chief executive to give notice in writing to each local board member of the time and place of meetings. Such notification may be provided by the adoption of a schedule of business meetings.
   • sections 46, 46(A) and 47 in Part 7 of the LGOIMA, which requires that meetings be publicly notified, agendas and reports are available at least two working days before a meeting and that local board meetings are open to the public.
8. That schedule provided for an additional meeting on 6 May 2020 to decide on their feedback and advocacy for the Annual Budget 2020/2021, based on submissions from their local board area.
9. The timeframes for the Annual Budget 2020/2021 process have been modified due to delays in receiving the processed submissions caused by the Covid-19 lockdown.

10. The local board will need to cancel the scheduled 6 May additional meeting due to the delay in these timeframes and approve a new additional meeting on 13 May 2020 so that the modified Annual Budget 2020/2021 timeframes can be met.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**  
**Analysis and advice**

11. The local board has two choices:

   i) add the meeting as an addition to the meeting schedule
   
   or
   
   ii) add the meeting as an extraordinary meeting.

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

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

14. Since there is enough time to meet statutory requirements, staff recommend option one, approving this meeting as an addition to the meeting schedule, as it allows more flexibility for the local board to consider a range of issues. This requires a decision of the local board.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**  
**Climate impact statement**

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

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

16. There is no specific impact for the council group from this report.

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

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

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

18. There is no specific impact for Māori arising from this report. Local boards work with Māori on projects and initiatives of shared interest.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
19. There are no financial implications in relation to this report apart from the standard costs associated with servicing a business meeting.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
20. If the local board decides not to add the additional business meeting to their schedule this will cause a delay to the Annual Budget 2020/2021 process, which would result in the feedback of this local board not being presented to the Governing Body for its consideration and inclusion in the Annual Budget.

Ngā korinaga ā-muri
Next steps
21. Implement the processes associated with preparing for business meetings.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Beth Corlett - Advisor Plans &amp; Programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local board feedback for inclusion in Auckland Council submissions

File No.: CP2020/04114

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To recommend that the Papakura 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 a 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 obtained within a local board business meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Papakura 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 approved at a business meeting | - 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. |
| 2. Local board input                 | - Provides a mechanism for local                                   | - Extraordinary meeting needs to be held.                            |

Local board feedback for inclusion in Auckland Council submissions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **approved at an extraordinary meeting of the local board** | boards to provide their formal views where submission deadlines do not align with local board meeting schedules.  
- 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. | 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.  
- There are additional costs incurred to run an unscheduled meeting.  
- It may be difficult to schedule a time when enough local board members can attend to achieve a quorum. |
| **Local board input approved using urgent decision mechanism (staff recommend this option)** | It provides a mechanism for local boards to provide their formal views where submission deadlines do not align with local board meeting schedules.  
- 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.  
- The urgent decision needs the sign-off from two local board members (ie the Chair and Deputy Chair), rather than just one. | 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.  
- Chair and deputy may not have time to properly consult and ascertain view of the full local board. |
| **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)** | 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.  
- 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. | 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.  
- The chair who has the delegated authority may not have time to properly consult and ascertain views of the full local board. |
| **Local board input submitted and ratified at a later date** | 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. | Local board input submitted is considered to be the informal views of the local board until they are approved.  
- Local board input can be challenged or changed at ratification or approval stage.  
- 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).  
- 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 views have not been ratified by the local board.  
- If the local board changes its views, |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>there is a reputational risk for the council.</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 whakaaweawehāhuarangi**  
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 whakaaweawemengātirohanga 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 whakaaweawē 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.

**Tauākī whakaaweawemāori**  
Māori impact statement

22. A decision of this procedural nature is not considered to have a positive or negative impact for Māori.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

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

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

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.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

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.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Carol Stewart - Senior Policy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urgent Decision - Papakura Local Board input on the Water Services Regulatory Bill (Taumata Arowai)

File No.: CP2020/04390

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Noting the Papakura Local Board input on the Water Services Regulatory Bill (Taumata Arowai).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. In mid-2017 the government launched the Three Waters Review, in parallel to the latter stages of the Havelock North Inquiry into drinking water safety. The review focussed on improving regulation and service delivery arrangements of drinking water, wastewater and stormwater.

3. In July 2019, Cabinet agreed to a suite of system-wide reforms to the regulation of drinking water, including the establishment of a centrally located regulator to oversee a new drinking water regulatory system. Cabinet also agreed to targeted reforms to improve the regulation and performance of wastewater and stormwater systems, including some new regulatory functions that would be undertaken by a central regulatory body.

4. The Three Waters Review is a separate but related work programme to the Ministry for the Environment’s Essential Freshwater programme. The government released the Action for Healthy Waterways Discussion Document in September 2019, which outlined the proposals of the Essential Freshwater programme. The discussion document covered some proposals related to the Three Waters Review, such as the government’s intent to amend the National Environmental Standards for Human Drinking Water and the proposed approach to improving management of stormwater and wastewater systems. The discussion document did not include any information about the structure or function of the proposed central regulator.

5. Taumata Arowai – the Water Services Regulatory Bill (Taumata Arowai) was introduced to Parliament on 17 December 2019. It is expected this will be followed by introduction of the Water Services Bill in the coming months. These bills build on the government’s work to date on the Three Waters review. Submissions on Taumata Arowai close on 4 March 2020. The submission period for the Water Services Bill has not yet been announced.

6. Taumata Arowai will establish a stand-alone regulatory body with responsibilities relating to drinking water safety and administration of the drinking water regulatory system, along with improving the environmental performance and transparency of stormwater and wastewater networks.

7. Taumata Arowai – the Water Services Regulator Bill proposes the establishment of a new regulator, which will be a standalone crown agent, with the objectives of:
   a) protecting and promoting drinking water safety and public health outcomes
   b) effectively administering the drinking water regulatory system
   c) building and maintaining capability among drinking water suppliers and across the wider industry
   d) giving effect to Te Mana o te Wai, to the extent that Te Mana o te Wai applies to functions and duties of Taumata Arowai
e) providing oversight of (and advice on) the regulation, management, and environmental performance of wastewater and stormwater networks

f) promoting public understanding of the environmental performance of wastewater and stormwater networks.

8. While the regulator’s primary focus is drinking water, its functions include providing national-level oversight, leadership, communication, coordination, guidance, advice and information in relation to statutory requirements for and environmental performance of wastewater and stormwater networks and network operators.

9. Auckland Council’s role in the delivery of drinking water, wastewater and stormwater services will not be significantly affected by the establishment of the regulator. The details within the Water Services Bill are expected to have implications for how council delivers these services, and how the planning and regulatory functions are carried out. Further detail and analysis of the implications of the Water Services Bill for Auckland Council will be provided following its release.

10. Auckland Council’s draft submission on Taumata Arowai was considered by the Environment and Climate Change Committee on 12 March 2020. The official submission period closed on 4 March, however, the Health Select Committee Secretariat permitted an extension for Auckland Council until 17 March 2020.

11. Local board input into the draft submission on Taumata Arowai was required by 24 February 2020 in order to be appended to the Auckland Council submission. The next scheduled meeting of the Papakura Local Board was 26 February 2020. Therefore, an urgent decision was required.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) note the urgent decision of the Papakura Local Board which provided input into the Water Services Regulator Bill (Taumata Arowai) as follows:

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) endorse the following Papakura Local Board input into the central government’s Water Services Regulator Bill (Taumata Arowai):

i) While the Papakura Local Board support the provision of quality drinking water, the board question whether having a crown entity controlling water services would have made any difference to the Havelock North scenario or the collapsing of infrastructure in Wellington.

ii) In the board’s view the issue for local authorities is the cost of infrastructure including renewals. The smaller the local authority the more difficult it is to finance based on the smaller rating base. The challenge of funding the infrastructure becomes prohibitive.

iii) The proposed crown entity is another regulatory layer that local authorities will have to comply with.

iv) Where smaller local authorities struggle with infrastructure financing this entity could also assist with raising capital for projects, ie: underwrite infrastructure projects.
The board is concerned that local authorities will lose control over the resource which is one of the core functions local authorities are responsible for.

Local authorities have the accountability back to the community, it would be concerning if the crown entity did not have any direct accountability to the public.

The Council-Controlled Organisation Auckland model hasn’t always been smooth sailing in terms of accountability. Essentially the Council-Controlled Organisation model is once removed from consumer. This becomes problematic when the Council-Controlled Organisation decides to increase costs at a higher than expected level. Although it is acknowledged that the Statement of Intent negotiations generally cover this issue.

The board believe the Watercare Services Council-Controlled Organisation does a wonderful job in the Auckland region and the board was very impressed with the work Watercare is doing in regard to research in wastewater and waste solids treatment.
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Urgent Decision Memo

21 February 2020

To: Manoj Ragupathy, Relationship Manager Papakura & Manurewa Local Board
cc: Papakura Local Board Chair and Members
From: Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor

Subject: Urgent decision - Papakura Local Board input on the Water Services Regulator Bill (Taumata Arowai)

Purpose

To endorse the Papakura Local Board’s feedback on the Water Services Regulator Bill (Taumata Arowai).

Reason for the urgency:

- Local Board feedback is required by 24 February 2020 to be appended to the Auckland Council submission, which is before 26 February 2020, being the next scheduled meeting of the Papakura Local Board.

Decision sought from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles)

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) endorse the following Papakura Local Board input into the central government’s Water Services Regulator Bill (Taumata Arowai):

  i) While the Papakura Local Board support the provision of quality drinking water, the board question whether having a crown entity controlling water services would have made any difference to the Havelock North scenario or the collapsing of infrastructure in Wellington.

  ii) In the board’s view the issue for local authorities is the cost of infrastructure including renewals. The smaller the local authority the more difficult it is to finance based on the smaller rating base. The challenge of funding the infrastructure becomes prohibitive.

  iii) The proposed crown entity is another regulatory layer that local authorities will have to comply with.

  iv) Where smaller local authorities struggle with infrastructure financing this entity could also assist with raising capital for projects, ie: underwrite infrastructure projects.

  v) Local authorities have the accountability back to the community, it would be concerning if the crown entity did not have any direct accountability to the public.

  vi) The Council-Controlled Organisation Auckland model hasn’t always met the public’s expectations of accountability and transparency. Essentially the
Council-Controlled Organisation model is once removed from the consumer. This becomes problematic when the Council-Controlled Organisation decides to increase costs at a higher than expected level. Although it is acknowledged that the Statement of Intent negotiations generally cover this issue.

vii) The board believe the Watercare Services Council-Controlled Organisation does a wonderful job in the Auckland region and the board was very impressed with the work Watercare is doing in regard to research in wastewater and waste solids treatment.

About the Papakura Local Board

1. Papakura Local Board is one of 21 local boards which are part of the Auckland Council co-governance model. The board has responsibility for local decision making while the Governing Body has the regional decision making focus.

2. The board’s population, as at the 2018 census, was 57,638. The population is ethnically diverse with 49.1% European, 26.8% Māori, 23.4% Asian and 16.9% Pacific peoples. Since the 2013 census there has been a significant growth in the Asian population. Papakura still has the largest Māori population per head of capita. The median age in Papakura is 32 years, with 23.6% of the population being aged between 0 and 14 years.

3. Veolia Water Papakura provides water services in the Papakura Local Board area.

Background

4. In mid-2017 the government launched the Three Waters Review, in parallel to the latter stages of the Havelock North Inquiry into drinking water safety. The review focussed on improving regulation and service delivery arrangements of drinking water, wastewater and stormwater.

5. In July 2019, Cabinet agreed to a suite of system-wide reforms to the regulation of drinking water, including the establishment of a centrally located regulator to oversee a new drinking water regulatory system. Cabinet also agreed to targeted reforms to improve the regulation and performance of wastewater and stormwater systems, including some new regulatory functions that would be undertaken by a central regulatory body.

6. The Three Waters Review is a separate but related work programme to the Ministry for the Environment’s Essential Freshwater programme. The government released the Action for Healthy Waterways Discussion Document in September 2019, which outlined the proposals of the Essential Freshwater programme. The discussion document covered some proposals related to the Three Waters Review, such as the government’s intent to amend the National Environmental Standards for Human Drinking Water and the proposed approach to improving management of stormwater and wastewater systems, including a proposed National Environmental Standard for Wastewater Discharges and Overflows. The discussion document did not include any information about the structure or function of the proposed central regulator.

7. Taumata Arowai – the Water Services Regulator Bill (Taumata Arowai) was introduced to Parliament on 17 December 2019. It is expected this will be followed by introduction of the Water Services Bill in the coming months. These bills build on the government’s work to date on the Three Waters review. Submissions on Taumata Arowai close on 4 March 2020; the submission period for the Water Services Bill has not yet been announced.

8. Taumata Arowai will establish a stand-alone regulatory body with responsibilities relating to drinking water safety and administration of the drinking water regulatory system, along with improving the environmental performance and transparency of stormwater and wastewater networks.
8. Taumata Arowai will establish a stand-alone regulatory body with responsibilities relating to drinking water safety and administration of the drinking water regulatory system, along with improving the environmental performance and transparency of stormwater and wastewater networks.

6. Taumata Arowai – the Water Services Regulator Bill proposes the establishment of a new regulator, which will be a standalone crown agent, with the objectives of:
   a) protecting and promoting drinking water safety and public health outcomes
   b) effectively administering the drinking water regulatory system
   c) building and maintaining capability among drinking water suppliers and across the wider industry
   d) giving effect to Te Mana o te Wai, to the extent that Te Mana o te Wai applies to functions and duties of Taumata Arowai
   e) providing oversight of, and advice on, the regulation, management, and environmental performance of wastewater and stormwater networks
   f) promoting public understanding of the environmental performance of wastewater and stormwater networks.

7. While the regulator’s primary focus is drinking water, its functions include providing national-level oversight, leadership, communication, coordination, guidance, advice and information in relation to statutory requirements for and environmental performance of wastewater and stormwater networks and network operators.

9. Auckland Council’s role in the delivery of drinking water, wastewater and stormwater services will not be significantly affected by the establishment of the regulator. The details within the Water Services Bill are expected to have implications for how council delivers these services, and how the planning and regulatory functions are carried out. Further detail and analysis of the implications of the Water Services Bill for Auckland Council will be provided following its release.

10. Auckland Council’s draft submission on Taumata Arowai will be considered by the Environment and Climate Change Committee on 12 March 2020. The official submission period closes on 4 March, however, the Health Select Committee Secretariat have permitted an extension for Auckland Council until 17 March 2020.

11. Local board input into the draft submission on Taumata Arowai is required to 24 February 2020.
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Urgent Decision - Papakura Local Board feedback on central government's Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill

File No.: CP2020/04389

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To note the urgent decision for the Papakura Local Board feedback on central government's Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill is a new way of funding and financing local infrastructure by providing a tool that is independent of local authorities.

3. The tool will enable urban development projects to begin sooner than council funding for infrastructure allows, by enabling finance for infrastructure projects (or bundles of projects) to be raised through a stand-alone entity, a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV). This tool will also help to make the cost of new infrastructure more transparent and will spread the costs by way of a levy so the cost falls primarily on the landowners who benefit, including over time and across generations.

4. The levy would be in place until the infrastructure is paid off by those who are expected to benefit. When a property is sold, the new owner would pay the levy. This levy would be collected by councils via their normal rates collection mechanisms on behalf of the SPV.

5. All infrastructure assets built using the tool would transfer to the relevant public body. In most circumstances this will be a council, who will be responsible for the ongoing operation and maintenance of the new assets. Prior to an agreement on an SPV proposal, endorsement will be sought from the council.

6. This tool will work alongside other related central government initiatives such as the Urban Development Bill.

7. Public submissions are open until 5 March 2020. However, the council has been granted an extension until 9 March to allow the Planning Committee to consider the draft submission.

8. Local Board feedback was required by 19 February 2020 to be appended to the Auckland Council submission, which was before scheduled February meeting of the Papakura Local Board. Hence the necessity for an urgent decision.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) note the urgent decision for the Papakura Local Board feedback on central
government's Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill in Attachment A to this report.
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Urgent Decision Memo

19 February 2020

To: Manoj Ragupathy, Relationship Manager Papakura & Manurewa Local Board
Cc: Papakura Local Board Chair and Members
From: Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor

Subject: Urgent decision - Papakura Local Board input into Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill

Purpose

To endorse the Papakura Local Board's feedback on the Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill.

Reason for the urgency:

- Local Board feedback is required by 19 February 2020 to be appended to the Auckland Council submission, which is before 26 February 2020, being the next scheduled meeting of the Papakura Local Board.

Decision sought from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles)

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) endorse the following Papakura Local Board input into the central government’s Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill:

i) The Papakura Local Board supports the intent of the Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill to provide a tool to raise additional capital for infrastructure.

ii) The board believe the Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill should be more explicit in how it relates to the Urban Development Bill and clearly stipulate one levy for one site.

iii) The board is concerned about a possibility of two or more levies applying to one site, i.e.: one raised as a special purpose vehicle for infrastructure leading up to a development area and another under the Urban Development Bill for the infrastructure within a development. Potentially a ratepayer would be paying two or more levies. This would add considerably to the day to day costs of living.

iv) The board support council being able to collect the levy and believe council should be able to claim the administrative costs for this service.

v) The board has a concern that the first purchasers may understand the purpose of the charge, however, over time subsequent purchasers may not necessarily understand. This could create a political risk for future elected members.
vi) The board believe council endorsement must be required for asset specifications.

vii) The board express concern at a local authority’s ability to manage future operational expenditure should special purpose vehicles become more common.

About the Papakura Local Board

1. Papakura Local Board is one of 21 local boards which are part of the Auckland Council co-governance model. The board has responsibility for local decision making while the Governing Body has the regional decision making focus.

2. The board’s population, as at the 2018 census, was 57,636. The population is ethnically diverse with 49.1% European, 26.8% Māori, 23.4% Asian and 16.9% Pacific peoples. Since the 2013 census there has been a significant growth in the Asian population. Papakura still has the largest Māori population per capita. The median age in Papakura is 32 years, with 23.6% of the population being aged between 0 and 14 years.

Background

3. The Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill is a new way of funding and financing local infrastructure by providing a tool that is independent of local authorities.

4. The tool will enable urban development projects to begin sooner than council funding for infrastructure allows, by enabling finance for infrastructure projects (or bundles of projects) to be raised through a stand-alone entity, a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV). This tool will also help to make the cost of new infrastructure more transparent and will spread the costs by way of a levy so the cost falls primarily on the landowners who benefit, including over time and across generations.

5. The levy would be in place until the infrastructure is paid off by those who are expected to benefit. When a property is sold, the new owner would pay the levy. This levy would be collected by councils via their normal rates collection mechanisms on behalf of the SPV.

6. All infrastructure assets built using the tool would transfer to the relevant public body. In most circumstances this will be a council, who will be responsible for the ongoing operation and maintenance of the new assets. Prior to an agreement on an SPV proposal, endorsement will be sought from the council.

7. This tool will work alongside other related central government initiatives such as the Urban Development Bill.

8. Public submissions are open until 5th March 2020, however, the council has been granted an extension until 9th March to allow the Planning Committee to consider the draft submission.

9. Local Board input is required by Wednesday 19 February to be appended to the Auckland Council submission.
Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process

Signed by Manoj Ragupathy
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Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. Noting the urgent decision report endorsing the Papakura Local Board feedback on the Council Controlled Organisations Review.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. Auckland Council’s CCOs were established as part of the 2010 re-organisation of local government in the Auckland.

3. There are five substantive CCOs:
   - Auckland Transport (AT)
   - Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development Limited (ATEED)
   - Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku)
   - Regional Facilities Auckland (RFA)
   - Watercare Services Limited (Watercare)

4. Council has requested an independent panel undertake a review of its CCOs. The objectives are to ensure:
   - an effective and efficient model of service delivery for Auckland Council and Aucklanders; and
   - a sufficient level of political oversight, public transparency and accountability of CCOs in their decision-making.

5. The public consultation period for the CCO Review was 21 February to 22 March 2020.

6. Local board input was required by 6 April 2020 which was before 22 April 2020 being the next scheduled business meeting of the Papakura Local Board. Hence the urgent decision mechanism was activated.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) note the urgent decision report endorsing the Papakura Local Board feedback on the Council Controlled Organisations Review as outlined in Attachments A and B to the report entitled “Urgent Decision – Papakura Local Board feedback on the Council Controlled Organisations Review”.

Urgent Decision - Papakura Local Board feedback on the Council Controlled Organisations Review

Page 83
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Urgent Decision Memo
3 April 2020

To: Manoj Ragupathy, Relationship Manager Papakura & Manurewa Local Board
cc: Papakura Local Board Chair and Members
From: Lee Manaia – Local Board Advisor

Subject: Urgent decision - Papakura Local Board feedback on the Auckland Council Controlled Organisations Review

Purpose

To endorse the Papakura Local Board’s feedback on the Auckland Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs) Review.

Reasons for the urgency:

- Local Board feedback is required by 6 April 2020 which is before 22 April 2020, being the next scheduled meeting of the Papakura Local Board.
- An urgent decision is required in order for the local board feedback to be provided in time to meet the deadline.

Decision sought from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles)

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) endorse the Papakura Local Board feedback on Auckland Council Controlled Organisations Review provided as Attachment A to this report

b) request the Papakura Local Board feedback on the CCO Review be circulated to all local boards for information.

About the Papakura Local Board

1. Papakura Local Board is one of 21 local boards which are part of the Auckland Council shared governance model. The local board has responsibility for local decision making while the Governing Body has a regional focus.

2. The board’s population, as at the 2018 census, was 57,636. The population is ethnically diverse with 49.1% European, 26.8% Māori, 23.4% Asian and 16.9% Pacific peoples. Since the 2013 census there has been a significant growth in the Asian population. Papakura still has the largest Māori population per capita in Auckland. The median age in Papakura is 32 years, with 23.6% of the population being aged between 0 and 14 years.

Background

3. Auckland Council’s CCOs were established as part of the 2010 re-organisation of local government in the Auckland.

4. There are five substantive CCOs:
   - Auckland Transport (AT)
   - Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development Limited (ATEED)
5. Council has requested an independent panel undertake a review of its CCOs. The objectives are to ensure:
   - an effective and efficient model of service delivery for Auckland Council and Aucklanders; and
   - a sufficient level of political oversight, public transparency and accountability of CCOs in their decision-making.

6. The public consultation period for the CCO Review was 21 February to 22 March 2020.

7. Local board input is required by 6 April 2020.

Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process
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Papakura Local Board feedback on the Independent Panel Council-Controlled Organisations (CCOs) review

CCO model, roles and responsibilities

1. Does the CCO model deliver council services with the maximum of operational efficiency, transparency and accountability, or are there better ways to deliver such services?
   a) The CCO model can be useful in delivering services efficiently if the correct balance is struck between efficient delivery and responsiveness/accountability to the community.
   b) The CCO model can create barriers to the integration of service delivery. When council departments work together to integrate services, the CCO model makes it difficult for them to participate, due to their perceived independence from the council parent.
   c) CCOs duplicate council services to staff, such as IT and HR services. If they were able to share council services, this would reduce costs to ratepayers. CCOs also have their own remuneration policies and guidelines creating unnecessary competition for staff and contractors within the council family.
   d) The CCOs’ IT services are not compatible with Auckland Council technology. Having these compatible would make better efficient use of technology and potentially speed up timeframes for responses.
   e) Where positive relationships between local boards, council and CCOs are developed significant achievements can be made. Developing positive relationships is often dependent on individual staff. The board would like to see a change of culture in a number of the CCOs, especially Panuku and Auckland Transport, where there is a perceived lack of understanding of local interests and the effects of their decisions on communities, a poor level of communication and explanation of actions. There seems to be a lack of understanding and/or recognition of the two equal governing parts of Auckland Council i.e. the Governing Body and local boards.
   f) Local board budgets are small when compared with the CCOs and with the wider council balance sheet. Local boards make the best decisions for the future of our community, and much of our funding is based on partnership and community development. Local boards recognise the need to partner with CCOs to fully realise the potential within the local board area.
   g) The CCO strategic and operational plans should have environmental, social and governance goals which are planned down to local board level.
CCO accountability

2. Could the council’s current approach to holding CCOs to account on behalf of Aucklanders be improved?

2a) Appointments to CCO boards should provide for representation of local community views. CCO boards are not reflective of Auckland’s diverse communities.

2b) The Papakura Local Board submits that councillors should be appointed to the board of AT, as elected members are the representatives of their local community’s views.

The local board acknowledges the conflict of interest concerns when Governing Body members sit on the board of AT. The Papakura Local Board believes there is a vast difference between members being “liaison councillors” as is currently the case and being decision-makers around the AT board table when it comes to improving the accountability of the CCOs such as AT.

Elected members are uniquely aware of their responsibility to manage conflicts of interest in all aspects of their work. Their conduct on both the Governing Body and on the board of AT will also be subject to public transparency and scrutiny.

Parliament also specifically sought to allow Governing Body members to sit on the AT board despite concerns around conflict of interest, given the wider concerns about accountability and responsiveness to the public by such an important CCO. The council should therefore respect Parliament’s decision-making in this instance and allow Governing Body members to sit on the board of AT.

2c) For other CCOs where there are statutory restrictions on appointing elected members to their boards, elected members should be involved in the appointment of directors. Both Governing Body and local board members should sit on the selection panel, so CCO board members understand they serve both co-equal parts of the council. This will also be consistent with the Joint Governance Framework.

2d) There needs to be a greater focus on appointing community representatives, or candidates with experience in working for community organisations, to CCO boards.

2e) Local boards should have input into CCO Statements of Intent and Letters of Expectation to CCOs to enable greater alignment with local board plans and other relevant local strategies.

CCO culture

3. Do CCOs need to improve how they consult, engage with and respond to the wider community and council?

3a) The quality and frequency of communication and consultation between CCOs and local boards, and between CCOs and local communities, needs to improve.

3b) Most CCOs are not focused on the local level, and there is a disconnect between their priorities and those of local communities.

3c) CCOs would benefit from forming meaningful partnerships with local boards to help them gain insights into the views and preferences of local communities.

3d) CCOs generally treat local boards like an external stakeholder and do not reflect the board’s place in the shared governance structure of Auckland Council.
e) There should be more governor-to-governor relations between local boards and the boards of CCOs, so they recognise their accountability to both parts of council’s governance system.

f) Local residents often do not differentiate between CCOs and Auckland Council, so poor engagement by CCOs also reflects badly on the wider council family, and especially elected members.

Feedback on specific CCOs

The following is the Papakura Local Board’s feedback on the CCOs that we have most frequent contact with:

4. Auckland Transport (AT)

a) The relationship with AT is challenging and they do not seem to be able to respond to local board and the communities’ needs in a timely manner.

b) There seems to be a disconnect between the AT representative assigned to the board and the rest of the AT organisation. When a way forward is agreed as part of a consultation/engagement with the board or local community, it doesn’t get communicated back into the AT organisation or gets ignored by the organisation, and things simply progress as originally proposed by staff. If there’s a reason why something can’t be progressed, it doesn’t get communicated back to the board.

c) Timeframes for delivery are not well communicated, which means that expectations are not managed. Elected members are often left to manage missed or false expectations created by AT staff to our stakeholders and public.

d) Communication with the community is poor. For example, safety measures in Takanini were programmed but the timeframe was not communicated to the board or the community.

e) The board does not consider AT responsive to the communities’ needs. Examples include:

i) The board reflected significant community concern about bus layovers on Opaheke Road to AT as AT contracted buses are parking in public parking spaces rather than bus layover areas further down Opaheke Road. This leaves no parking for the public to access the playground and public toilets at Central Park.

The board suggested another location of unused land at the corner of Settlement Road and Great South Road. Initial discussions with AT staff suggested that an alternative location was a great idea which AT agreed to investigate and advised so in a public report.

The board eventually heard, after chasing, that the original bus layover plan had been implemented therefore they wouldn’t do anything further with the idea raised by the local board or progress the investigation of alternatives as reported to the public of Papakura. AT also argued that it has no power to make its own bus contractors comply with parking in designated areas,
which reflects poorly on AT as a contract manager and the board as local governors.

This is a key example of a disconnect between the AT team dealing with the board and the rest of AT, AT’s dismissiveness of the board’s and public’s concerns, and poor communication and expectation management.

ii) In 2012 the Papakura Local Board advocated for more parking at the Papakura park and ride.

In 2018 AT recommended including a bus metro in the one local initiative project for the park and ride. In that presentation visuals were presented of a multi-storey 300 car park and ride with a bus metro underneath. The board agreed to support a bus metro and discussed the idea with constituents.

The 2018 Regional Land Transport Plan included the Papakura park and ride as a multi-storey 300 car park building. The bus metro was in the unfunded projects.

AT undertook a single stage business case (SSBC). The business case identified significant geotechnical issues to overcome for a multi-storey car park. The SSBC did not support a multi-storey park and ride as the cost benefit ratio for a $25million car park would not attract NZTA funding and recommended an at grade proposal of 117 car parks.

AT has advised that the bus metro will take 50 car parks of the park and ride although that will be three to five years away.

AT has therefore provided advice (including visuals) that raised the board’s expectations of the scale and volume of the park and ride that was going to be delivered. Then AT provided advice based on further investigations that all that could be supported was an at grade extension to the car park. Board members are therefore left explaining the different advice to members of the public.

f) AT must strengthen consultation and accountability to local boards, Governing Body and ratepayers of Auckland in a meaningful way, including:

- recognition within the AT organisation that they are a CCO and not a stand-alone business

- that the Governing Body holds decision-making authority for AT and all CCOs, including decision-making in relation to bonus and supplementary payments to directors and staff of AT and other CCOs

- the inclusion of an improved performance standard for AT 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
• A requirement for AT to provide wider consultation and communication channels for local boards rather than only filtering e-mail communications through the AT local board relationship manager.

• Assignment of senior management at the executive level as liaisons for board who have the ability to provide quality advice, co-ordinate action within different parts of AT and exercise proper accountability to local boards.

g) AT funding of safety projects and other initiatives needs to be more transparent.

h) The provision of AT’s decision-making criteria and weighting system for projects to proceed to the Governing Body and local boards so that AT are more accountable to local needs, including the ability for local boards to question the AT prioritisation of certain projects.

i) AT must provide a more rapid response to ratepayer queries.

j) There should be service level agreements established for the 21 local boards with AT – so the local board can decide collaboratively how planning initiatives, public works and projects will be effectively and efficiently delivered for the board’s areas; on a timely basis.

5. **Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED)**

a) The relationship with the Papakura Local Board and ATEED is largely as a budget holder for work programme lines such as our Commercial Projects Group. As such, we question whether they are playing an active role in driving local economic development.

b) The focus of ATEED on events in the city centre means they are largely irrelevant to 20 of 21 local boards.

c) It is not clear why the local economic development function of ATEED needs to be done through a CCO rather than a council department.

d) The board does not receive any support for local economic development from ATEED.

e) Tourism is another area where there could be more support at the local level. There needs to be an approach where the sum of the parts make the whole rather than just the focus on the central area of Auckland.

f) There is no support to grow regional events at a local level.

g) ATEED functionality should 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.

6. **Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku)**

a) Panuku is the CCO with the greatest local focus, albeit only in the areas where it has a Transform, Unlock or Support projects underway.

b) The board would like Panuku to have the ability to raise debt as a way of funding projects rather than funding them through the proceeds of asset sales. This would allow them to act as a developer in their own right.
c) The board would like to see Panuku work with boards that are zoned for intensification to assist in finding development opportunities.

d) The relationship of Panuku to Kainga Ora, in its role as an urban development authority, will need to be carefully defined going forward.

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

f) The financial imperative for Panuku to predominantly self-fund its projects through property sales and developer agreements should be re-balanced as it is currently compromising good community outcomes. Currently, the availability of non-service public property is a key criteria of whether an area is a focus for Panuku’s development activity. This could be done through re-focusing the transform/unlock criteria, allowing Panuku to raise debt or the council parent further capitalising Panuku.

7. Regional Facilities Auckland

a) Community-led events or programmes should not have to pay commercial rates for the use of council facilities, e.g. the Auckland Primary Principal’s Association Music Festival had to pay $50,000 hire fee for the use of the Auckland Town Hall. Commercial rates have been charged for the last three years. It becomes prohibitive for groups to put on such events.

8. Watercare Services Limited (Watercare)

a) We appreciate the regular and timely communications from Watercare and believe they are successful in engaging with local communities in the development of projects and activities. However, Papakura has a franchised service with Veolia for water and wastewater requirements. It should be noted that Veolia reports through to Watercare.

b) Watercare Services should be retained as a Council Controlled Organisation.

c) 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.

d) Watercare should continue to engage with the local boards, council, and community organisations to inform its planning for local projects.

Brent Catchpole  
Chairperson  
Papakura Local Board

Jan Robinson  
Deputy Chairperson  
Papakura Local Board

Date: 6 April 2020
Urgent Decision - Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency's Accessible Streets Regulatory Package

File No.: CP2020/04612

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Noting the urgent decision endorsing the Papakura Local Board’s feedback on the Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency’s Accessible Streets Regulatory Package.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

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

3. These rules are intended to:
   - make footpaths, shared paths, cycle lanes and cycle paths safer and more accessible
   - accommodate the increasing use of micro-mobility devices like e-scooters on streets and footpaths
   - encourage active modes of transport and support the creation of more liveable and vibrant towns and cities
   - make social and economic opportunities more accessible, and
   - make buses and active transport such as walking and cycling safer and more efficient.

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

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

6. The package consists of nine proposals:
   - Proposal 1: Change and re-name the types of device that are used on footpaths, shared paths, cycle paths and cycle lanes
   - Proposal 2: Establish a national framework for the use of footpaths
   - Proposal 3: Establish a national framework for the use of shared paths and cycle paths
   - Proposal 4: Enable transport devices to use cycle lanes and cycle paths
   - Proposal 5: Introduce lighting and reflector requirements for powered transport devices at night
   - Proposal 6: Remove barriers to walking, transport device use and cycling through rule changes
• Proposal 7: Mandate a minimum overtaking gap for motor vehicles passing cycles, transport devices, horses, pedestrians and people using mobility devices on the road

• Proposal 8: Clarify how road controlling authorities can restrict parking on berms

• Proposal 9: Give buses priority when exiting bus stops.

7. Local board input is required by 17 April 2020 to be appended to the Auckland Council submission.


**Ngā tūtohunga**

**Recommendation/s**

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) note the urgent decision endorsing the Papakura Local Board’s feedback on the Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency’s Accessible Streets Regulatory Package, included as Attachments A and B to this report.
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</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**
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Urgent Decision Memo

14 April 2020

To: Manoj Ragupathy, Relationship Manager Papakura & Manurewa Local Board
cc: Papakura Local Board Chair and Members
From: Lee Manaia – Local Board Advisor

Subject: Urgent decision - Papakura Local Board feedback on the Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency’s Accessible Streets Regulatory Package

Purpose

To endorse the Papakura Local Board’s feedback on the Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency’s Accessible Streets Regulatory Package.

Reasons for the urgency:

- Local Board feedback is required by 17 April 2020 to be appended to the Auckland Council submission, which is before 22 April 2020, being the next scheduled meeting of the Papakura Local Board.

Decision sought from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles)

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) endorse the Papakura Local Board feedback on the Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency’s Accessible Streets Regulatory Package as detailed in attachment A to this urgent decision.

Background

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

2. These rules are intended to:
   - make footpaths, shared paths, cycle lanes and cycle paths safer and more accessible
   - accommodate the increasing use of micro-mobility devices like e-scooters on streets and footpaths
   - encourage active modes of transport and support the creation of more liveable and vibrant towns and cities
   - make social and economic opportunities more accessible, and
   - make buses and active transport such as walking and cycling safer and more efficient.

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

6. The proposed rules also clarify how road controlling authorities may regulate pedestrians, devices and spaces like the footpath; and propose changes to the priority given to a range of road users to remove barriers to walking, device use and cycling.
7. The package consists of nine proposals:
   - Proposal 1: Change and re-name the types of device that are used on footpaths, shared paths, cycle paths and cycle lanes
   - Proposal 2: Establish a national framework for the use of footpaths
   - Proposal 3: Establish a national framework for the use of shared paths and cycle paths
   - Proposal 4: Enable transport devices to use cycle lanes and cycle paths
   - Proposal 5: Introduce lighting and reflector requirements for powered transport devices at night
   - Proposal 6: Remove barriers to walking, transport device use and cycling through rule changes
   - Proposal 7: Mandate a minimum overtaking gap for motor vehicles passing cycles, transport devices, horses, pedestrians and people using mobility devices on the road
   - Proposal 8: Clarify how road controlling authorities can restrict parking on berms
   - Proposal 9: Give buses priority when exiting bus stops.

8. Local board input is required by 17 April 2020 to be appended to the Auckland Council submission.


**Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process**

Signed by Manoj Ragupathy
Relationship Manager Papakura & Manurewa Ward
Date: 15 April 2020

________________________
Brent Catchpole
Chairperson, Papakura Local Board
Date: 15 April 2020

________________________
Jan Robinson
Deputy Chairperson, Papakura Local Board
Date: 15 April 2020
Papakura Local Board feedback on the Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency’s Accessible Streets Regulatory Package

About the Papakura Local Board

1. Papakura Local Board is one of 21 local boards which are part of the Auckland Council. The board has responsibility for local decision making while the Governing Body has a regional decision making focus.

2. The board’s population, as at the 2018 census, was 57,636. The population is ethnically diverse with 49.1% European, 26.6% Māori, 23.4% Asian and 16.9% Pacific peoples. Since the 2013 census there has been a significant growth in the Asian population. Papakura still has the largest Māori population per head of capita in Auckland. The median age in Papakura is 32 years, with 23.6% of the population being aged between 0 and 14 years.

Background

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

4. These rules are intended to:
   - make footpaths, shared paths, cycle lanes and cycle paths safer and more accessible
   - accommodate the increasing use of micro-mobility devices like e-scooters on streets and footpaths
   - encourage active modes of transport and support the creation of more liveable and vibrant towns and cities
   - make social and economic opportunities more accessible, and
   - make buses and active transport such as walking and cycling safer and more efficient.

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

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

7. The package consists of nine proposals:
   - Proposal 1: Change and re-name the types of device that are used on footpaths, shared paths, cycle paths and cycle lanes
   - Proposal 2: Establish a national framework for the use of footpaths
   - Proposal 3: Establish a national framework for the use of shared paths and cycle paths
   - Proposal 4: Enable transport devices to use cycle lanes and cycle paths
- Proposal 5: Introduce lighting and reflector requirements for powered transport devices at night
- Proposal 6: Remove barriers to walking, transport device use and cycling through rule changes
- Proposal 7: Mandate a minimum overtaking gap for motor vehicles passing cycles, transport devices, horses, pedestrians and people using mobility devices on the road
- Proposal 8: Clarify how road controlling authorities can restrict parking on berms
- Proposal 9: Give buses priority when exiting bus stops.

8. Local board input is required by 17 April 2020 to be appended to the Auckland Council submission.


Papakura Local Board feedback

### Proposal 1: Change and re-name the types of device that are used on footpaths, shared paths, cycle paths and cycle lanes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal 1A: Pedestrians and powered wheelchair users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you agree that powered wheelchairs should be treated as pedestrians? Why/why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Papakura Local Board supports the proposal to create a new category for powered wheelchairs which clarifies the difference between a powered wheelchair and a high-speed mobility scooter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The board supports powered wheelchairs no longer being considered a mobility device and being re-categorised as pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Powered wheelchairs should be treated as pedestrians as they do not reach significant speeds and do not pose a significant risk to other pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal 1B: Changing ‘wheeled recreational devices’ to Transport devices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you agree with the proposal to replace wheeled recreational devices with new categories for unpowered and powered transport devices? Why/why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The board supports replacing wheeled recreational devices category with two new categories:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>unpowered transport devices</em>, which includes devices such as push-scooters and skateboards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>powered transport devices</em>, which includes devices such as e-scooters and YikeBikes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The board agrees that the proposed changes provide clarity for road controlling authorities to assess where transport devices can be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The proposed changes also allow a mechanism for future technology to be assessed and categorised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The board would like to see clarification in this section in relation to the transport devices using footpaths 'under certain conditions' to ensure pedestrian safety is paramount.

The board would like to see clarification in this section about a definition regarding motorised mini motorbikes.

3. What steps should the Transport Agency take before declaring a vehicle not to be a motor vehicle?

- Research from other parts of the world that have these devices is required to ascertain the risks and support decision making.
- New Zealand statistics relating to accidents or incidents relating to these devices should be obtained.
- Look at the Australian Sunshine Coast shared pathway rules - bicycles have bells. When a cyclist approaches a group of pedestrians they ring the bell and the pedestrians step to the left to allow the cyclist to pass – which is very civil and organised. This could apply to other transport devices, eg: mobility scooters, e-skateboards, e-scooters etc.
- How do we teach everyone to be courteous to one another as our population increases and more people with devices utilise footpaths, cycleways and shared pathways? Some basic courtesy goes a long way so all can enjoy these spaces.

4. If the Transport Agency declares a vehicle to not be a motor vehicle, do you think it should be able to impose conditions? If yes, should such conditions be able to be applied regardless of the power output of the device?

- The board agree the Transport Agency should be able to impose conditions on devices (vehicles that are not motor vehicles) regardless of the power output of the device.

5. We propose to clarify that:
   a. low powered vehicles that have not been declared not to be motor vehicles by the Transport Agency (e.g. hover boards, e-skateboards and other emerging devices) are not allowed on the footpath
   b. these vehicles are also not allowed on the road under current rules, because they do not meet motor vehicle standards
   c. if the Transport Agency declares any of these vehicles not to be motor vehicles in the future, they will be classified as powered transport devices and will be permitted on the footpath and the road (along with other paths and cycle lanes).

Do you agree with this proposed clarification? Why/why not?

- The board believes it is logical that these devices should be allowed to use the footpath, however, there should be speed restrictions placed on the use of the devices.
- The board believes there are safety concerns in relation to where the device is used, for either the general public (if allowed to use the footpath) or the individual using the device (if allowed to use the road).
- Safety of pedestrians using footpaths must be paramount.
- Users should be made to wear helmets.
- Where these devices should be used needs to be addressed as soon as possible to avoid public confusion.
### Proposal 1C: Clarifying cycles and e-bikes

6. Do you agree with the proposal that:
   - Small-wheeled cycles that are propelled by cranks be defined as cycles, and
   - Small-wheeled cycles that are not propelled by cranks, such as balance bikes, be defined as transport devices?

Why/why not?
   - The board would like to see clarification in this section in relation to the cycles and e-bikes using footpaths ‘under certain conditions’ to ensure pedestrian safety is paramount.

### Proposal 1D: Mobility devices

7. Mobility devices have the same level of access as pedestrians but will have to give way to pedestrians and powered wheelchairs under the proposed changes. Do you agree? Why/why not?

   - The board agrees with mobility devices having the same level of access as pedestrians with the requirement to give way to pedestrians and powered wheelchairs.
   - It would not be safe to allow mobility devices on the road.

8. Do you think there will be any safety or access-related problems with mobility devices operating in different spaces? Please explain.

   - Speed the mobility devices can travel at will be a safety issue for the user and other users of the footpaths. Speed restrictions on mobility devices should be part of the regulatory rules.

9. We intend to review the mobility device category at a later date. What factors do you think we need to consider?

   - A speed limit restriction should be in place for mobility devices that use the footpath. Share with care and maximum widths guidance of the mobility devices is needed.

### Proposal 2: Establish a national framework for the use of footpaths

11. Our proposed changes will allow mobility devices, transport devices, and cycles on the footpath - provided users meet speed, width and behavioural requirements. Do you support this? Why/why not? Should there be any other requirements?

   - The board support the proposed changes that will allow mobility devices, transport devices, and cycles on the footpath provided users meet speed, width and behavioural requirements.
   - However, the board does see a difference between an experienced cyclist and a novice/beginner cyclist (whatever the age). Some of the experienced cyclists travel at speed and would be better suited to cycleways or on the road.
   - An education campaign would be required to build the courteous culture of use of a shared space.
• Every device sold could come with a standard educational information about courteous use of the device. Start the campaign where the device is purchased.

12. We have outlined two alternative options to address cycling on the footpath. These are:
   a. allow cyclists up to 16 years of age to use the footpath; or
   b. Continue the status quo, where most cyclists are not allowed to use the footpath.

Do you prefer either of these options instead of allowing cyclists on the footpath?

• The board does not support either of the two options.
  • Allowing cyclists up to 16 years of age use the footpath would preclude older learners or less experienced cyclists from using the footpath. This would be a deterrent for those over 16 to cycle.
  • Continuing with the status quo does not provide a safe option for cyclists if there is no separated cycle lane.

13. Would you support an age limit for cycling on the footpath? What age would you prefer?

• The board does not support an age limit for cycling on the footpath. An age limit is a barrier for people embracing cycling as an alternative mode of transport.

14. Our proposal allows road controlling authorities to restrict cycle or device use on certain footpaths or areas of footpaths to suit local communities and conditions. Do you agree with this proposal? Why/why not? Do you have any comments on the proposed process?

• The board agrees with the proposal allowing road controlling authorities the ability restrict cycle or device use on certain footpaths or areas of footpath to suit local communities and conditions, for example town squares.
  • However, the board believes a consistent approach with the minimum amount of restrictions as possible lessens general public confusion.

15. We envisage that local authorities will make decisions to regulate the use of paths by resolution, rather than by making a bylaw. Should this be specified in the Land Transport Rule: Paths and Road Margins 2020 to provide certainty? Why/why not?

• The board believes there should be an opportunity for public input whether the decision to regulate the use of paths is made by resolution or a bylaw.

16. We're proposing that road controlling authorities consider and follow criteria in addition to their usual resolution processes if they want to restrict devices from using the footpath. Do you agree with this proposal and the proposed criteria? Why/why not?

• The board agrees with the proposal and proposed criteria for road controlling authorities to follow.

17. We have also outlined an option to maintain current footpath rules. Would you prefer this option instead of the proposed framework with speed and width requirements? Why/why not?
The board believes current footpath rules do not cater to the current needs of the users.

As the population ages it is likely there will be more mobility devices and e-wheelchair users.

The roads are congested, there are very few separated cycleways. Where there are no cycleways, cycling on the road for novice/beginning cyclists (no matter the age) is dangerous.

Proposal 2A: Users on the footpath will operate vehicles in a courteous and considerate manner, travel in a way that isn’t dangerous and give right of way to pedestrians.

18. We propose that pedestrians should always have right of way on the footpath. Do you agree with this proposal? Why/why not?

- The board agrees in part that pedestrians should always have right of way on the footpath, however, courtesy is a two-way street. Pedestrians should not block the pathway for use by others either. There’s a precedent on the Sunshine Coast where it is mandatory for cycles to have bells. When cycling on a shared path the cyclist rings the bell to warn they are coming and the pedestrians allow space for the cyclist to pass. It appears to work well and could be applied to all devices powered or unpowered.

19. This proposal sets out three behavioural requirements; that footpath users will:
- operate vehicles in a courteous and considerate manner,
- travel in a way that isn’t dangerous, and
- give right of way to pedestrians.

Do you agree with these three requirements? Are there any others we should consider?
- The board agrees with the three requirements and believe ‘give right of way to pedestrians’ should be the first bullet point. Once again courtesy is paramount so all can enjoy.
- The board believes transport devices should be operated in the manner they were designed to be used. The board has a concern about those cyclists that perform tricks on footpaths or ride down the road on their back wheel with the front wheel raised off the ground, therefore abdicating any safe control of the bike.

Proposal 2B: Default 15km/h speed limit for vehicles using the footpath

20. Do you agree with the proposed default speed limit of 15km/h for footpaths? Why/why not? Do you think the proposed speed limit should be higher/lower?

- The board agrees with the proposed default speed limit of up to 15km/hr for footpaths and agrees it makes it easier to enforce than the current state.
- The board notes there are limitations in terms of enforcement but feels the proposed change future proofs the regulations in a way that allows for growth in technology and new devices.

21. Do you agree with the proposal that road controlling authorities will be able to lower the default speed limit for a footpath or areas of footpaths? Why/why not?

- The board agrees with the proposal that road controlling authorities will be able to lower the default speed limit for a footpath or areas of footpaths. Any change to the speed limit should be regularly clearly marked on the pathway or communicated to the users.
22. Are there other ways, that you can think of, to improve footpath safety? Please explain.

- The board believes the ideal is for separated cycleways for cyclists and other transport devices that can travel at higher speeds than 15km/hr.
- There should be a requirement for all transport devices to be fitted with a bell and an etiquette developed where a transport device users ring the bell when approaching pedestrians, pedestrians move to the side to left to allow the cyclist to move past.
- There should be a requirement for wider footpath widths in developments to allow for safe shared pathways.

Proposal 2C: 750mm width restriction for vehicles that operate on the footpath

23. Do you agree with the proposed maximum width measurement of 750mm (except for wheelchairs) for devices on the footpath? Should this maximum width limit be wider/narrower?

- The board agrees with reservations with the proposed maximum width measurement of 750mm (except for wheelchairs) for devices on the footpath. However, the board is mindful of the obesity issue in New Zealand which leads to people needing to use wider mobility devices due to health circumstances.

24. Do you use a mobility device? If yes, what is the width of your device? Would the proposed width restriction impact you?

- N/A

25. Should the maximum width limit apply to mobility devices? Why/why not?

- The board believe there should be an exemption process for those who require wider mobility devices for health reasons.

26. We propose that people who already own a device wider than 750mm could apply for an exemption. This document also considers three alternative approaches to mitigate the impact on existing device owners:
   a. mobility devices purchased before the rule changes could be automatically exempt from the width limit.
   b. The Transport Agency could declare certain wider devices to be mobility devices under section 168A of the Land Transport Act, and exclude them from width requirements, or
   c. Apply a separate width limit to mobility devices.

Which is your preferred option? Do you have any comments on these alternatives?

- The board believes that eventually a separate width limit may be required for mobility devices. A conversation should be had with users and those that sell the wider devices to more fully understand the need. As mentioned with obesity rates rising and the associated health issues that brings, wider mobility devices may potentially be on the increase. The regulations should be future proofed to allow for this.

Proposal 3: Establish a national framework for the use of shared paths and cycle paths
27. Do you agree that road controlling authorities should be able to declare a path a shared path or a cycle path? What factors should be considered when making this decision?

- The board agrees that road controlling authorities should be able to declare a path a shared path or a cycle path providing there is a minimum width of 3 metres.

28. Do you agree with the behavioural requirements we are proposing? Should there be other requirements or rules to use a shared path or cycle path?

- The board agrees with the behavioural requirements proposed and suggest some sort of signalling mechanism should be required on devices to warn others they are approaching.

29. Do you agree that all users be required to give way to pedestrians when using a shared path? Why/why not?

- The board agrees that all users be required to give way to pedestrians when using a shared path as pedestrians are the most vulnerable users. Pedestrian courtesy will required as well.

30. Do you agree with the proposed speed limits for shared paths and cycle paths and the ability of road controlling authorities to change these limits? Please explain.

- The board agrees with the proposed speed limits for shared paths and cycle paths and the ability of road controlling authorities to change the limits as there may be circumstances where a lower speed limit should be applied for safety. Any change to the maximum speed limit should be clearly marked at regular intervals along the shared path or cycle path.

31. Do you think that the Transport Agency should be able to investigate and direct road controlling authorities to comply with the required criteria? Why/why not?

- The board agrees with the Transport Agency having the power to investigate and direct road controlling authorities to comply with the required criteria as it will ensure consistency in approach believe a consistent approach.

- The board believes it would be helpful for the Transport Agency to maintain a national speed limit register as this could potentially assist with analysing trends to inform future changes.

Proposal 4: Enable transport devices to use cycle lanes and cycle paths

32. Do you agree that devices other than cycles should be allowed to use cycle lanes and/or cycle paths? Why/why not?

- The board agrees that devices other than cycles should be allowed to use cycle lanes and/or cycle paths as this gives the opportunity for those devices that travel at higher speeds to move more freely.

- If other devices are allowed to use cycle lane they should do so with care and courtesy of cyclists.

- The board believes all cycle lanes should be separated by barriers or be separated shared cycle/pedestrian pathways to ensure maximum safety for users.
33. Do you agree that road controlling authorities should be able to exclude powered transport devices or unpowered transport devices from cycle lanes and/or cycle paths? Why/why not?

- The board agrees that road controlling authorities should be able to exclude powered or unpowered transport devices from cycle lanes and/or cycle paths. Road controlling authorities need to have the flexibility to respond at the local level to maximise safety for the users.

Proposal 5: Introduce lighting and reflector requirements for powered transport devices at night

34. Do you agree with the proposal that powered transport devices must be fitted with a headlamp, rear facing position light, and be fitted with a reflector (unless the user is wearing reflective material) if they are used at night? Why/why not?

- The board agrees with the proposal that powered transport devices must be fitted with a headlamp, rear facing position light and be fitted with a reflector (unless the user is wearing reflective material).
- The board is of the view that these safety measures should be in place for devices. The board sees these devices on a par with cycles.
- The board supports regulation that would require powered transport device users to wear helmets.

35. Do you think these requirements are practical? For example, if you own a powered transport device, will you be able to purchase and attach a reflector or lights to your device or yourself?

- The board believes this could be challenging for some powered transport devices, however, hardware stores sell all sorts of things these days, including reflective tape. You can even purchase a head lamp from the two dollar shop. If there’s a demand for a solution it will be found.

36. Do you think unpowered transport device users should be required to meet the same lighting and reflector requirements as powered transport device users at night time? Why/why not?

- The board is of the view that unpowered transport devices should be required to meet the same lighting and reflector requirements as powered transport device users at night time for safety reasons.
- The board supports regulation that would require unpowered transport device users to wear helmets.

Proposal 6: Remove barriers to walking, transport device use and cycling through rule changes

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

37. Do you agree that cyclists and transport device users should be able to ride straight ahead from a left turn lane at an intersection, when it is safe to do so? Why/why not?
- The board agrees that cyclists and transport device users should be able to ride straight ahead from a left turn lane at an intersection when it is safe to do.
- The board is concerned that the cyclist could potentially be at risk if the light is green for left turning traffic and red for straight through traffic.

Proposal 6B: Allow cycles and transport devices to carefully pass slow-moving vehicles on the left, unless a motor vehicle is indicating a left turn

38. Do you agree that cyclists and transport devices should be allowed to carefully ‘undertake’ slow-moving traffic? Why/why not?
   - The board agrees that cyclists and transport devices should be allowed to carefully "undertake" slow-moving traffic, unless a motor vehicle is indicating a left turn.

Proposal 6C: Give cycles, transport devices and buses priority over turning traffic when they're travelling through an intersection in a separated lane

39. Do you agree that turning traffic should give way to users travelling straight through at an intersection from a separated lane? Why/why not?
   - The board agrees that turning traffic should give way to users travelling straight through at an intersection in a separated lane.

40. Our proposed change will introduce a list of traffic control devices used to separate lanes from the roadway to help you understand what a separated lane is and if the user has right of way at an intersection. Is such a list necessary? Why/why not?
   - If the user of a separated lane has right of way a list of traffic control devices shouldn’t be necessary.

41. Should the definition of a separated lane include the distance between the lane and the road? Why/why not?
   - The board believes the more prescriptive a rule becomes the less future proofed it is. The principle is that turning traffic must give way to cyclists and transport devices using separated lanes.

Proposal 6D: Give priority to footpath, shared path and cycle path users over turning traffic where the necessary traffic control devices are installed

42. Do you agree that turning traffic should give way to path users crossing a side road with the proposed markings? Why/why not?
   - The board does not agree with this proposal.
   - While this rule might work in theory, motorists will need to be educated about this change. In practical terms turning traffic having to give way to footpath users will add to congestion.
   - There is a potential logistical safety issue with the proposed change, essentially vehicles are bigger and move faster than footpath users. Therefore, a footpath user anticipating right of way would be risking their safety if they crossed a road without checking turning traffic is going to give way.
43. **Do you think that the proposed minimum markings are appropriate?**
   - The rationale behind implementing this change will require an education campaign to ensure motorists are aware of what the line markings mean.

44. **We are proposing future guidance for additional treatments. Is there any guidance that you would like to see or recommend?**
   - While raised tables for delineating footpath user priority crossing points will slow traffic down, it will be some time before they can be installed at existing crossings because of the associated costs.
   - The two straight white line markings may not be readily visible to motorists, particularly in wet weather.

**Proposal 7: Mandate a minimum overtaking gap for motor vehicles passing cycles, transport devices, horses, pedestrians and people using mobility devices on the road**

45. **Do you agree with the proposal for a mandatory minimum overtaking gap for motor vehicles of 1 metre (when the speed limit is 60km/h or less), and 1.5 metres (when the speed limit is over 60km/h) when passing pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders, and users of other devices? Why/why not?**
   - The board agrees with the proposal for a mandatory minimum overtaking gap.

**Proposal 8: Clarify how road controlling authorities can restrict parking on berms**

46. **Do you agree with the proposal that road controlling authorities should be able to restrict berm parking without the use of signs and instead rely on an online register? Why/why not?**
   - Why are people parking on the berms? It is usually because the roads are not wide enough. A sensible approach would be to ensure there is a minimum road width, particularly in new subdivisions, where road widths are incredibly narrow. In some cases where cars are parked on the street no-one can move down the street until the rubbish collection vehicle has passed. Sometimes the rubbish collection or emergency services vehicles cannot get down the road at all.
   - There is an added issue with new subdivisions where there are many driveways adjacent to each other with less than a 3 metre entrance to the garage. Vehicles are parked outside the garage door and impede the footpath space. There is no on-street parking available. Garages are often single stacked parking or are being utilised for other purposes other than parking.
   - The board agrees with the proposal that road controlling authorities should be able to restrict berm parking without the use of signs and instead rely on an online register.
   - An educative approach could be taken with enforcement, i.e: the first incident is a warning advising of the restriction. The second incident incurs the fine.
   - Clarity is also required regarding the differences between rural and urban local authorities’ definitions of a berm.

47. **Would it be helpful if information on berm parking restrictions was available in other places, like at a local library, i-SITE, or a local council?**
Absolutely, this information needs to be readily available in as many places as possible, even Citizens Advice Bureaux. The question to ask is what will prompt people to go look it up? Hence the preferred two phase approach to infringements, ie: first infringement a warning, second infringement a fine.

**Proposal 9: Give buses priority when exiting bus stops**

48. Do you agree that traffic should give way to indicating buses leaving a bus stop on a road with a speed limit of 60km/h or less? Why/why not?

- The board agrees that traffic should give way to indicating buses leaving a bus stop on a road with a speed limit of 60km/h or less.

49. Should traffic give way to buses in other situations? For example, when a bus is exiting a bus lane and merging back into traffic lanes? Why/why not?

- The board believes traffic should give way to buses in other situations, eg: when a bus is exiting a bus lane and merging back into traffic lanes as this will prioritise public transport. By making the public transport trip faster more people may choose to use it.

---

Brent Catchpole  
Chairperson  
Papakura Local Board

Jan Robinson  
Deputy Chairperson  
Papakura Local Board

Date: 14 April 2020
Urgent Decision - Papakura Local Board feedback on Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework

File No.: CP2020/04311

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To notify the Papakura Local Board of a decision made under the local board’s urgent decision-making process for the Papakura Local Board feedback on Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) note the urgent decision relating to the Papakura Local Board feedback on Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework, in Attachment A to this report.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Urgent decision Papakura Local Board feedback on Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urgent Decision Memo

25 March 2020

To: Manoj Ragupathy, Relationship Manager Papakura & Manurewa Local Board
cc: Papakura Local Board Chairperson and Members
From: Paula Brooke, Democracy Advisor Papakura Local Board

Subject: Urgent decision Papakura Local Board feedback on Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework

Purpose
Seeking the Papakura Local Board’s feedback on Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework report placed on the March 2020 meeting agenda.

Reason for the urgency
- The 25 March 2020 business meeting was cancelled due to the Covid-19 pandemic crisis as the country moved into level 3 and then level 4 alert status.
- Arrangements for future local board meetings during the level 4 alert restrictions and into the future are still in the planning stages.
- The feedback on this item is required by the end of March 2020.

Decision sought from the chairperson and deputy chairperson (or any person acting in these roles)

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) provide the following feedback on the changes to the draft Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework:

i) support the name change to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: 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” as a way 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”

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. For Papakura this will require significant upgrading of the local public transport network, including:
● extending the cycle and active transport mode network within the Papakura area, in particular providing safe off-road connections to the State Highway 1 cycleway
● investing in more separated cycleways to encourage increased uptake of cycling, including separating the cycleway on Great South Road
● providing more bus shelters as there is a deficit of these in south Auckland
● addressing the affordability of fares to increase usage of public transport in low income communities
● providing complimentary services to support the utilisation of public transport, which will lessen the need for on street parking around the Papakura park and ride
● increasing education about free bus trips to and from train transport

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:

● reviewing whether current local board funding levels are adequate to allow boards to effectively respond to this issue
● addressing disparities in regional investment in south Auckland compared with other parts of the city.

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

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

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

4. In February 2020, a memorandum and consultation summary was circulated to share key findings from the public consultation as provided in Attachments A and B to the attached meeting agenda report.

5. Key structural changes to the framework include:
   ● introducing three pillars representing the core drivers to which all actions will align (i.e. a place-based approach; emissions reduction; preparing for climate change)
   ● moving from eleven key moves to eight priorities to streamline actions and address feedback.

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

7. The proposed changes meet the requirements of a climate action plan as defined by C40 Cities.
8. Local board feedback is required by the end of March 2020.

Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process:

Manoj Ragupathy
Relationship Manager, Papakura & Manurewa Ward

30 March 2020
Date

Brent Catchpole
Chairperson, Papakura Local Board

30 March 2020
Date

Jan Robinson
Deputy Chairperson, Papakura Local Board

30 March 2020
Date
Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework - Proposed changes

File No.: CP2020/03796

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

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. In February 2018, the Environment and Community Committee resolved to develop an integrated climate action plan for the Auckland region (ENV/2018/11).
3. To meet this requirement, Auckland Council led the development of Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework (ACAF) with extensive collaboration and engagement with mana whenua, public, private and voluntary sectors.
4. In June 2019, the Environment and Community Committee approved a consultation draft of ACAF and associated materials.
5. In February 2020, a memorandum and consultation summary was circulated to share key findings from the public consultation as provided in Attachments A and B to this report.
6. To address the feedback from the consultation, this report outlines key structural changes proposed for the framework including:
   - introducing three pillars representing the core drivers to which all actions will align (i.e. a place-based approach; emissions reduction; preparing for climate change)
   - moving from eleven key moves to eight priorities to streamline actions and address feedback.
7. It is also proposed that the title of the document is changed from Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan to reflect feedback and the greater focus on the impact of actions against our climate goals and roles in delivery. In addition, this provides certainty for roles and responsibilities with regards to implementation.
8. The proposed changes meet the requirements of a climate action plan as defined by C40 Cities.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) provide feedback on the changes to the draft Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework including:
   - introducing three pillars representing the core drivers for climate action (i.e. a place-based approach; emissions reduction; preparing for climate change)
   - moving from eleven key moves to eight priorities
   - changing the title from Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan.
Horopaki
Context
9. In February 2018, the Environment and Community Committee resolved to develop an integrated climate action plan for the Auckland region, addressing both emissions reduction (i.e. mitigation) and preparing for the impacts of a changing climate (i.e. adaptation) (ENV/2018/11).

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

11. Local board engagement and insights were sought throughout development of the framework, including meetings and cluster workshops. A summary of feedback from local boards is available in Attachments C and D to this report.

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

13. In February 2020, a memo and a consultation summary was circulated to all local boards to share key findings from the public consultation on the draft ACAF as provided in Attachments A and B to this report.

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

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

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

17. To address this feedback a number of key structural changes are proposed.
18. The first of these is establish three core drivers for action – our ‘pillars’ as provided in Attachment E. These provide greater clarity on the goals of the framework and all actions will align to how they deliver against these goals:

- **A Tāmaki response**: This pillar reflects the uniqueness of Auckland and our place-based response to climate change. It is informed by learning from Māori principles and practice, provides a greater focus on equity and a better definition of roles and responsibilities and collective action across governance and sectors.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- clarify any ambiguities that were raised in consultation
- remove repetition or overlapping actions
- make additions in response to consultation feedback
- strengthen alignment to delivery of the three pillars.

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

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

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

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

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

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

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

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

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

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

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

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

Next steps

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

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

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>ACAF Consultation Summary Memo (Under Separate Cover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>ACAF Consultation Summary (Under Separate Cover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Engagement Summary - LB workshops June 2018 (Under Separate Cover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Engagement Summary - Clusters workshops Oct 2018 (Under Separate Cover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ACAF Proposed Three Pillars (Under Separate Cover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ACAF Proposed Eight Priorities (Under Separate Cover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>ACAF Proposed Priority Areas and Actions (Under Separate Cover)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

Authors  
Sarah Anderson - Principal Specialist Sustainability and Climate Resilience  
Lauren Simpson - Principal Sustainability & Resilience Advisor

Authorisers  
Jacques Victor - GM Auckland Plan Strategy and Research  
Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa & Papakura
Urgent Decision - for Transfer of Ownership for basketball facilities at Smiths Reserve in Papakura

File No.: CP2020/04313

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To notify the Papakura Local Board of a decision made under the local board’s urgent decision-making process for transfer of ownership for basketball facilities at Smiths Reserve in Papakura,

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) note the urgent decision for transfer of ownership for basketball facilities at Smiths Reserve, Papakura as provided in Attachment A to this report.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Urgent decision Papakura Local Board for Transfer of Ownership for basketball facilities at Smiths Reserve in Papakura</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urgent Decision Memo

25 March 2020

To: Manoj Ragupathy, Relationship Manager Papakura & Manurewa Local Board
cc: Papakura Local Board Chairperson and Members
From: Paula Brooke, Democracy Advisor Papakura Local Board

Subject: Urgent decision for Transfer of Ownership for basketball facilities at Smiths Reserve in Papakura

Purpose
Seeking the Papakura Local Board’s decision on the Transfer of Ownership for basketball facilities at Smiths Reserve in Papakura report, placed on the March 2020 meeting agenda.

Reason for the urgency:
- The 25 March 2020 business meeting where this matter was to be considered was cancelled due to the Covid-19 pandemic crisis as the country moved into level 3 and then level 4 alert status.
- Arrangements for future local board meetings during the level 4 alert restrictions and into the future are still in the planning stages.
- This matter has been canvassed with the local board and all members are supportive of the staff recommendations and using the urgent decision process to determine this matter.

Decision sought from the chairperson and deputy chairperson (or any person acting in these roles):
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) approve the transfer of ownership of one basketball hoop from the ‘There’s a Better Way’ programme to Auckland Council for Smiths Reserve in Papakura.

b) request that staff offer the ‘There’s a Better Way’ programme an opportunity to remove the four seating units installed by them, or to give council permission to remove and dispose of the units.

c) note that new spectator seating will be installed as part of the Smiths Reserve development.

Background
- In December 2019, staff attended a local board workshop to discuss assets that were installed at Smiths Reserve in 2018 for a basketball program run by “There’s a Better Way” (TABW).
- The assets include a basketball hoop and spectator seating modules, and are currently being maintained by the asset owner, TABW.
- Physical works are currently taking place to redevelop Smiths Reserve, as per the Smiths Reserve Concept Plan adopted by the local board (PPK/2018/146). Staff met with TABW founder Glen Green in November 2019 to discuss the future of the non-council assets.
- TABW are pleased to transfer ownership of the assets to Auckland Council as part of the Smiths Reserve Concept Plan.
- Staff propose to retain and relocate the basketball hoop in accordance with the adopted concept plan as provided in Attachment A. The spectator seating modules are in poor condition and staff propose to replace these with a more durable solution as part of the wider enhancement works within the reserve.
- This report seeks to formalise the local boards request for Auckland Council to own and maintain assets gifted by TABW.

**Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process:**

Manoj Ragupathy  
**Relationship Manager, Papakura & Manurewa Ward**

30 March 2020  
**Date**

Brent Catchpole  
**Chairperson, Papakura Local Board**

30 March 2020  
**Date**

Jan Robinson  
**Deputy Chairperson, Papakura Local Board**

30 March 2020  
**Date**
Papakura Local Board  
22 April 2020

Transfer of ownership for basketball facilities at Smiths Reserve in Papakura

File No.: CP2020/03057

Te take mō te pūrongo  
Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval for the transfer of assets installed by the “There’s a Better Way” programme at Smiths Reserve, Papakura, into council ownership.

Whakarāpopototanga matua  
Executive summary

2. In December 2019, staff attended a local board workshop to discuss assets that were installed at Smiths Reserve in 2018 for a basketball programme run by “There’s a Better Way” (TABW).

3. The assets include a basketball hoop and spectator seating modules, and are currently being maintained by the asset owner, TABW.

4. Physical works are currently taking place to redevelop Smiths Reserve, as per the Smiths Reserve Concept Plan adopted by the local board (PPK/2018/146). Staff met with TABW founder Glen Green in November 2019 to discuss the future of the non-council assets.

5. TABW are pleased to transfer ownership of the assets to Auckland Council as part of the Smiths Reserve Concept Plan.

6. Staff propose to retain and relocate the basketball hoop in accordance with the adopted concept plan as provided in Attachment A. The spectator seating modules are in poor condition and staff propose to replace these with a more durable solution as part of the wider enhancement works within the reserve.

7. This report seeks to formalise the local boards request for Auckland Council to own and maintain assets gifted by TABW.

Ngā tūtohunga  
Recommendation/s

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) approve the transfer of ownership of one basketball hoop from the ‘There’s a Better Way’ programme to Auckland Council for Smiths Reserve in Papakura.

b) request that staff offer the ‘There’s a Better Way’ programme an opportunity to remove the four seating units installed by them, or to give council permission to remove and dispose of the units.

c) note that new spectator seating will be installed as part of the Smiths Reserve development.

Horopaki  
Context

8. The concept plan at Smiths Reserve, Papakura, reflects the community’s aspirations and was adopted in 2018 by the Papakura Local Board. (PPK/2018/146).
9. While the concept plan was in development, the Papakura Local Board funded a basketball programme run by TABW for the Smiths Avenue community’s youth.

10. Organisers of the programme installed a basketball half court, including one basketball hoop and four spectator seating modules. These were installed on the reserve without landowner approval.

11. The local board have indicated to staff that they would like some of the equipment be transferred to Auckland Council for ownership and maintenance.

12. Council staff have observed basketball as a popular activity within the Smiths Avenue community and keeping the basketball assets aligns with the community aspirations in the Smiths Reserve concept plan.

13. The concept plan identified relocating the basketball half court to the opposite side of the community hall. This caters for the relocation of the playground in its place as per the community’s request.

14. TABW have expressed support for council to own and maintain the assets.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

15. An asset report has been prepared by council staff and presented to the local board for consideration. It is summarised below:

Stadium style seats
- the seats are in poor condition
- graffiti, cracks and holes, as a result of vandalism, will require repairs or replacement (refer to figures 1a, 1b and 1c)
- due to exposure to the elements including UV weathering, the colour of the seats has faded.

Basketball hoop
- the basketball hoop is in good condition
- the hoop’s stand is made from high-grade steel with bolted flanges
- the construction of the hoop has been engineered and has been constructed to a compliant standard.

16. The basketball hoop has already been relocated as per the Smiths Reserve Concept Plan.

17. Council staff believe that the seating installed by TABW is not an appropriate design for the long term, and due to its current poor condition should be removed and replaced with a more durable and versatile replacement to reflect the overall upgrade of the surrounding reserve.
18. TABW will be given the opportunity to remove the seats if they want to retain them. Alternatively, council will remove and dispose of the seats.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

19. In June 2019, Auckland Council declared a climate emergency and a commitment to the community to look at ways on how we can consider climate implications in everything that we do. Auckland faces risks such as heat waves, droughts and tropical storms.

20. Maintaining our green spaces is a proven climate solution to reduce harmful carbon pollution. The replacement seats have been sourced locally and are made from natural materials. They are more durable and versatile to increase resilience to climate impact.

21. Providing a more visually pleasing natural style of seating aligns with the community's aspirations in the concept plan to encourage utilisation of our green spaces.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

22. Council staff from Community Facilities and Community Services collaborated to provide advice for this report. Staff agree that council taking ownership of the hoop and an upgrade of the spectator seating modules will improve recreation opportunities and the overall utilisation and care of the reserve.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

23. The local board has supported the redevelopment at Smiths Reserve, Papakura and has provided feedback regarding the assets in June, July and December 2019 local board workshops.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

24. In 2019, staff engaged Mana Whenua as part of the Smiths Development. Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngai Tai Kū Tamaki and Ngāti te Ata met with Council staff and members of the community. Iwi have expressed their support of the concept plan and are interested in participating in future story telling that may well develop in line with the concept plan.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial Implications**

25. If resolved by the local board, council will be responsible for future maintenance of the basketball hoop.

26. In 2018, the local board approved $297,526 from their Local Driven Initiatives (LDI) capital budget to investigate and implement the Smiths Reserve Concept Plan - Stage One (PPK/2018/146).
27. Staff will work within the current budget for new replacement spectator seating modules from the current LDI allocation. No further funding from the local board is required. The new seats will be more durable and versatile, these will be delivered as part of the playground and courts renewal project.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

28. Due to the current state of the spectator seating modules staff believe further damage could prove to be an issue if not monitored and maintained.

29. The spectator seating modules do not reflect the current upgrade and facilities of the site and do not align with the community’s aspirations. If the proposal is not supported by the local board, it could cause disappointment for locals, as well as contribute to a drop in the community’s engagement as part of future projects.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

30. Following approval from the local board, staff will contact the asset owner and arrange removal of the spectator seating modules and the handover of the basketball hoop to the council’s operations team.

31. The basketball hoop will be mapped into the council system to confirm ownership and future maintenance.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

There are no attachments for this report.

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Jasmine Samuel - Community Led &amp; LDI Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Transfer of ownership for basketball facilities at Smiths Reserve in Papakura
Urgent Decision - Parerekau Boardwalks Asset Acceptance report placed on the March 2020 meeting agenda

File No.: CP2020/04316

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To notify the Papakura Local Board of a decision made under the local board’s urgent decision-making process for the Parerekau Boardwalks Asset Acceptance report placed on the March 2020 meeting agenda.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) note the urgent decision relating to the Parerekau Boardwalks Asset Acceptance report placed on the March 2020 meeting agenda, as provided in Attachment A to this report.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Urgent decision: Urgent decision for Parerekau Boardwalks Asset Acceptance report placed on the March 2020 meeting agenda</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urgent Decision Memo

25 March 2020

To: Manoj Ragupathy, Relationship Manager Papakura & Manurewa Local Board
cc: Papakura Local Board Chairperson and Members
From: Paula Brooke, Democracy Advisor Papakura Local Board

Subject: Urgent decision for Parerekau Boardwalks Asset Acceptance report placed on the March 2020 meeting agenda

Purpose
Seeking the Papakura Local Board's decision on the Parerekau Boardwalks Asset Acceptance report placed on the March 2020 meeting agenda, which is seeking approval for proposed boardwalk connection to Parerekau Island at 149A Capriana Drive, Hingaia.

Reason for the urgency:
- The 25 March 2020 business meeting where this matter was to be considered was cancelled due to the Covid-19 pandemic crisis as the country moved into level 3 and then level 4 alert status.
- Arrangements for future local board meetings during the level 4 alert restrictions and into the future are still in the planning stages.
- The developer needs the local board’s approval of the plans as the delivery of the boardwalks is a condition of consent.
- This matter has been canvassed with the local board and all members are supportive of the staff recommendations and using the urgent decision process to determine this matter

Decision sought from the chairperson and deputy chairperson (or any person acting in these roles):
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) approve the Parerekau Island Boardwalk Plans, prepared by Civil Plan Consultants as provided in Attachment A to the report “Parerekau Boardwalks Asset Acceptance report”

b) delegate the approval of engineering detailed design to Parks, Sport & Recreation and Community Facilities.

Background
- An esplanade reserve is being created as part of the residential development at Parerekau Island. The proposed boardwalks connect Karaka Harbourside to the new esplanade around the perimeter of this unique island via Kopuhihihenga Island.
- Development of the Parerekau Island Boardwalk will be carried out by Karaka Harbourside Estate Ltd.
- Karaka Harbourside Estate Ltd have prepared concept plans for the Parerekau Island Boardwalk in consultation with council staff and the local board following a workshop held on 5 February 2020 and a follow up workshop to discuss the wider project on 2 March 2020.
- These plans are provided for the local board’s consideration and approval.
Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process:

Manoj Ragupathy
Relationship Manager, Papakura & Manurewa Ward

30 March 2020

Date

Brent Catchpole
Chairperson, Papakura Local Board

30 March 2020

Date

Jan Robinson
Deputy Chairperson, Papakura Local Board

30 March 2020

Date
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval for the proposed boardwalk connection to Parerekau Island at 149A Capirana Drive, Hingaia.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. An esplanade reserve is being created as part of the residential development at Parerekau Island. The proposed boardwalks connect Karaka Harbourside to the new esplanade around the perimeter of this unique island via Kopuhingahinga Island.
3. Development of the Parerekau Island Boardwalk will be carried out by Karaka Harbourside Estate Ltd.
4. Karaka Harbourside Estate Ltd have prepared concept plans for the Parerekau Island Boardwalk in consultation with council staff and the local board following a workshop held on 5 February 2020 and a follow up workshop to discuss the wider project on 2 March 2020. These plans are provided for the local board’s consideration and approval.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) approve the Parerekau Island Boardwalk Plans, prepared by Civil Plan Consultants as provided in Attachment A to this report

b) delegate the approval of engineering detailed design to Parks, Sport & Recreation and Community Facilities.

Horopaki
Context
5. Karaka Harbourside Estate Ltd, a land development organisation formed in January 1997, is overseeing the development of Parerekau Island in Hingaia, Auckland. The development of this land was initiated in 2015 when the site was rezoned to the Single Housing Zone. The development involves the creation of approximately 103 new homes across 18 hectares.

6. The development will also include an esplanade reserve around the perimeter of the island. This will vary in width between 20m and 51m and is a great opportunity for recreation and access all around the island.

7. The site is located 30km south of Auckland city, 2km northwest of the Southern Motorway and 4km west of Papakura township.

8. Resource consent for the subdivision creating the 103 residential lots and esplanade reserve was granted in December 2019. Works will begin mid-way through 2020.

9. The esplanade reserve to vest is currently in private ownership and will be transferred to Auckland Council as part of the residential subdivision. This means the new boardwalks connecting the reserves will be owned and maintained by Auckland Council long term.
10. The development of the Parerekau Island Boardwalk will be completed by Karaka Harbourside Estate Ltd in accordance with the Parerekau Island Boardwalk Plans, prepared by Civil Plan Consultants as provided in Attachment A to this report. The Parerekau Island Boardwalks meet the Auckland Council standards and Auckland Council will be responsible for the ongoing management and maintenance of these assets following handover to Council. Handover will be arranged as part of the resource consent process.

11. The Parerekau Island Boardwalk Plans have been developed following consultation with council staff and the local board at a workshop held on 5 February 2019.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

12. These boardwalks provide access to Kopuahingahinga Island and the Parerekau Island Esplanade Reserve and are a great open space opportunity to provide access to and along the coast. The provision of these assets is aligned with the key principles in the Parks and Open Space Strategic Action Plan relating to connected open space networks and celebrating the coast.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

13. The proposal has been assessed from a climate change resilience perspective. Coastal Specialist, Ashashika Sharma, confirms the effects on marine ecology including avifauna will be short term and localised. The design of the boardwalks uses piles, which means the coastal processes will continue underneath the deck level. The two boardwalks are in low energy areas and the piles will only interact with coastal processes at high tide. The height of the boardwalks is 1m above current sea levels, which is considered appropriate. Council’s technical experts conclude that the boardwalks will not have an adverse effect on coastal processes.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

14. The proposal has been assessed from a maintenance, safety, accessibility and design perspective by council staff. Parks, Sport and Recreation and Community Facilities staff have discussed the concept plans and support the preferred concept for the Parerekau Island boardwalks. The design has been reviewed by Regulatory Services Engineers and Coastal Specialists who support the design and proposal.

15. Community Facilities Asset Management Team Engineers and Coastal Specialists have also reviewed and endorse the design. The boardwalks will be constructed with timber posts and have handrails for pedestrian safety. These will be of an open nature and will not stand out in the proposed location. The Parks, Sport & Recreation department endorse these becoming council assets to provide public access to and all the way around Parerekau Island.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

16. The proposal for the Parerekau Island Boardwalk was presented to the local board in a workshop on 5 February 2019. Feedback from the local board was supportive of the boardwalks and agreement that the link to the new Parerekau esplanade is a great opportunity. However, the Papakura Local Board raised concerns over the wider project, specifically whether the coastal hazards are being adequately addressed by the subdivision scheme plan that has been approved.

17. Parerekau Island is likely to experience between 17m and 30m of erosion combined with sea level rise over the next 100 years. Instead of armouring the perimeter of the island, the
wider subdivision has taken a precautionary approach to the coastal hazards at Parereka island and provides an esplanade of up to 51m in width. This avoids rather than mitigates against the hazard and aligns with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Part 2 of the Resource Management Act. A wall would have a 35-year consenting life, while the approved subdivision will ensure there is a 20m wide esplanade reserve for the public to enjoy in 100 years from now. The modelling looks at the worst-case scenario and is considered a low risk solution as council do not anticipate needing to construct, own or maintain any coastal management structures for the next 100 years.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
18. No direct impacts on iwi arising from this development have been identified.
19. Karaka Harbourside Estate Ltd have undertaken consultation with with Te Akitai Waichua, Ngati Tamaoho and Ngati Te Ata. Iwi have provided a Cultural Impact Statement (CIA) looking at the development as a whole. The CIA supports boardwalks and asks that archaeological sites are avoided. No such sites are impacted by the two boardwalks proposed. Overall, the CIA is supportive of the approach, and the recommendations contained in the CIA are being implemented as part of the proposal.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial Implications
20. All construction costs will be funded and carried out by Karaka Harbourside Estate Ltd. The annual operational costs of maintaining the proposed Parereka Island Boardwalk has been estimated by Community Facilities to be between $1,400 and $3,700 per year, subject to detailed design. The funding for this will come from the operational expenditure budget.
21. Council’s obligation for maintenance of the boardwalks will commence upon the completion of the assets, which will be 1-5 years from now. The procedure for inspections and handover to Community Facilities is outlined in the resource consent. There will be one agreement for the esplanade development and a second for the playground so that these may be delivered in stages.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
22. Risks associated with the proposed Parereka Island Boardwalk development sits with the private developer. The Unitary Plan requires these links to be constructed and the developer is obligated to construct them under their resource consent. A bond will also be taken by council if it is not constructed by the time subdivision is complete. It is also noted that this is a low risk as the developer has a proven track record.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
23. The developer wishes to develop the Parereka Island Boardwalk in mid-2020. Once approval for the concept plan has been provided, council staff will work with Karaka Harbourside Estate Ltd on engineering details of the proposed developments to ensure the proposal meets the council’s park construction standards and is appropriate in regard to maintenance.
24. Parks Planning and Community Facilities staff have reviewed concept design and provided their approval.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Parerekau Island Boardwalk Plans</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

Author: Kate Richardson – Senior Parks Planner
Authorisers: Mace Ward - General Manager Parks, Sports and Recreation
Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa & Papakura
Urgent Decision - Parerekau Boardwalks Asset Acceptance report placed on the March 2020 meeting agenda
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Item 25

Papakura Boardwalks Asset Acceptance report placed on the March 2020 meeting agenda.
**Urgent Decision - Parerekau Boardwalks Asset Acceptance report placed on the March 2020 meeting agenda**

**Attachment A**

**Item 25**
Urgent Decision - Community Safety Fund

File No.: CP2020/04651

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To notify the Papakura Local Board of a decision made under the local board’s urgent decision-making process for Community Safety Fund projects.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) note the urgent decision relating to Community Safety Fund projects as provided in Attachment A to this report.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Urgent decision Papakura Local Board Community Safety Fund projects</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urgent Decision Memo 6 April 2020

To: Manoj Ragupathy, Relationship Manager Papakura & Manurewa Local Board
cc: Papakura Local Board Chair and Members
From: Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor

Subject: Urgent decision of the Papakura Local Board on Community Safety Fund projects.

Purpose
Seeking an urgent decision from the Papakura Local Board on its Community Safety Fund projects.

Reason for the urgency
- The 25 March 2020 business meeting of the Papakura Local Board was cancelled due to the Covid-19 pandemic crisis.
- Auckland Transport needs a decision from the board in order to progress works relating to its Community Safety Fund.
- This matter has been canvassed with the local board and all members are supportive of the staff recommendations and using the urgent decision process to determine this matter.

Decision sought from the chairperson and deputy chairperson (or any person acting in these roles)
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) receive the Community Safety Fund report provided as Attachment B to the report “Auckland Transport update report to the Papakura Local Board for March 2020”, and provide the following direction:

i) remove project ‘CSFA 1.2 East Street - zebra crossing' with a rough order of cost of $260,000, from the list of Papakura Local Board Community Safety Fund projects as it is no longer considered a priority for the board

ii) move project ‘CSFA 1.7 Settlement Road - safety improvements' up the short list as a priority project and endorse the alternative design of a raised speed table

iii) request Auckland Transport more detail and discuss further options with the board to progress project ‘CSFA 1.5 Porchester Road/Manuroa Road – refuge improvements’.

Background
- Each month, Auckland Transport provides an update to the Papakura Local Board on transport-related matters, relevant consultations in its area, Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) projects and decisions of Auckland Transport’s Traffic Control Committee.
- In the Papakura Local Board’s March 2020 agenda AT sought direction from the board on two of its Community Safety Fund projects. The Community Safety Fund report was attached to the report “Auckland Transport update report to the Papakura Local Board for March 2020” as Attachment B.
- The March 2020 meeting of the Papakura Local Board was cancelled due to the Covid-19 crisis.
A decision is required from the board on continuing with the following Community Safety Fund projects as further investigation has found the original funding allocation to be insufficient:
  o CSFA1.5 Porchester Rd Manuroa Road Refuge Improvements.
  o CSFA1.7 Settlement Road Safety Improvements.

The board can choose to continue, discontinue or change the order of priority of its projects to stay within the overall Community Safety Fund allocation, or choose to fund its community safety Fund projects through other sources such as the Local Board Transport Capital Fund.

Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process

Signed by Manoj Ragupathy
Relationship Manager, Papakura & Manurewa Ward
8 April 2020
Date

Brent Catchpole
Chairperson, Papakura Local Board
8 April 2020
Date

Jan Robinson
Deputy Chairperson, Papakura Local Board
8 April 2020
Date
Decision Report – Community Safety Fund Allocation

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. For the Papakura Local Board to advise Auckland Transport (AT) on its direction regarding two Community Safety Fund (CSF) Projects.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. A decision is required this month on allocation for the following CSF projects:
   - CSFA1.5 Porchester Rd Manurea Road Refuge Improvements
   - CSFA1.7 Settlement Road Safety Improvements

   This decision may see reallocation of existing CSF funds, or topping up the programme from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF).

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
a) receive the decision report and provide a direction to AT.

Horopaki

Context
3. In the 2018 Regional Land Transport Plan Auckland Council’s Governing Body set aside $20 million to address local road safety concerns raised by the community to their elected members. This project is named the Community Safety Fund (CSF).
4. Beginning in March 2019, AT conducted workshops with the region’s 21 local boards whose members were invited to share their candidate projects. Local Boards were also encouraged to involve ward councillors in selection and prioritisation of these projects.
5. AT undertook detailed assessment of these candidate projects to determine their feasibility in terms of budget and site-constraints.
6. After assessment, AT conducted another series of workshops to present projects that were selected from the original candidate lists supplied by the local boards.
7. AT provided indicative costs which included all stages for development and delivery of projects.
8. Local boards then selected the shortlisted projects that could be accommodated within their Community Safety Fund budgets.
9. A total of 84 safety projects were identified for full or significant funding across Auckland’s 21 local board areas. The below table depicts the projects for the Papakura Local Board Area:
Attachment A

Item 26

10. As these projects have moved into the design phase, issues have arisen with the following projects:

   a) CSFA1.5 Porchester Rd Manuroa Road Refuge Improvements.
   b) CSFA1.7 Settlement Road Safety Improvements

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

**CSFA1.5 Porchester Road / Manuroa Road Refuge Improvements**

11. $65,000 is currently allocated to this project. The initial proposal was to widen the existing refuge/splitter islands on the northern and western legs of this intersection. The investigation has confirmed that tracking requirements mean that the improvements requested by the Board cannot be progressed.

12. The alternative is to install raised crossings on these legs. Locations will be further away from the intersection, with the exact locations to be determined. To achieve this would bring the project to $270,000, meaning a $205,000 shortfall in funding.

**CSFA1.7 Settlement Road Safety Improvements**

13. $65,000 is currently allocated to this project. The recent installation of the central refuge island improvements on Settlement Road has impacted on the ability to provide splitter islands Kelvin Road as tracking cannot be provided for.

14. An alternative design for a raised speed table to be installed on Kelvin Road appears feasible. To achieve this would bring the project up to $135,000 meaning a $70,000 shortfall.
Options Available to the Board
15. The following options are available to the board in order to progress these projects:
a) Re-allocate the $65,000 from the CSFA1.5 Porcher Road / Manuroa Road Refuge Improvements project to the CSFA1.7 Settlement Road Safety Improvements.
b) Utilise the LBCTF to allocate an additional $205,000 to CSFA1.5 Porcher Road / Manuroa Road Refuge Improvements, and an additional $70,000 to the CSFA1.7 Settlement Road Safety Improvements.
16. AT have no preferred option and it will be up to the board to select which project they want to proceed with, and how they want to manage their LBCTF allocation.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate Impact statement
17. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no identified impacts or opportunities for climate change.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
18. The impact of information (or decisions) in this report are confined to AT and do not impact on other parts of the council group.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
19. The Papakura Local Board have indicated that safety and delivery of CSF projects is a high priority.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
20. The proposed decision of this report has no specific impacts or opportunities for Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
21. The proposed decision of receiving the report has financial implications on the boards LBCTF allocation for the term. Current allocations are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papakura Local Board Transport Capital Fund Financial Summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Funds Available in current political term</td>
<td>$3,851,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount committed to date on projects approved for design and/or construction</td>
<td>$1,518,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget left</td>
<td>$2,332,263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOLD - AT
Ngā rau tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

22. The decision made by the board will impact on the ability for delivery of either CSF project. Should the board elect to not allocate further funding to the Porchester Road / Manuroa Road Refuge Improvements, AT will continue to investigate what potential improvement options are available at this location.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

23. AT will take the decision on direction of the board regarding allocation of funding on these projects and advance accordingly.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

24. The following diagrams are attached to this report:

a) Diagram of proposed amendments to project CSFP1.5 – Manuroa Road & Porchester Road pedestrian safety improvements.

b) Diagram of proposed amendments to project CSFP1.7 – Settlement Road Safety Improvements.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>James Ralph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urgent Decision - Community Safety Fund
Urgent Decision - Papakura Local Board’s decision on the Papakura Local Board Grants Programme 2020/2021 report

File No.: CP2020/04320

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To notify the Papakura Local Board of a decision made under the local board’s urgent decision-making process on the Papakura Local Board Grants Programme 2020/2021 report placed on the March 2020 meeting agenda.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) note the urgent decision on the Papakura Local Board Grants Programme 2020/2021 report placed on the March 2020 meeting agenda, as provided in Attachment A to this report.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Urgent decision: Papakura Local Board's decision on the Papakura Local Board Grants Programme 2020/2021 report placed on the March 2020 meeting agenda.</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

Author          Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor
Authoriser      Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa & Papakura
Urgent Decision Memo

25 March 2020

To: Manoj Ragupathy, Relationship Manager Papakura & Manurewa Local Board
cc: Papakura Local Board Chairperson and Members
From: Paula Brooke, Democracy Advisor Papakura Local Board

Subject: Urgent decision for Papakura Local Board Grants Programme 2020/2021

Purpose
Seeking the Papakura Local Board’s decision on the Papakura Local Board Grants Programme 2020/2021 report placed on the March 2020 meeting agenda.

Reason for the urgency:
- The 25 March 2020 business meeting where this matter was to be considered was cancelled due to the Covid-19 pandemic crisis as the country moved into level 3 and then level 4 alert status.
- Arrangements for future local board meetings during the level 4 alert restrictions and into the future are still in the planning stages.
- This matter has been canvassed with the local board and all members are supportive of the staff recommendations and using the urgent decision process to determine this matter.

Decision sought from the chairperson and deputy chairperson (or any person acting in these roles):

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) adopt the Papakura Grants Programme 2020/2021.

Background
- The Papakura Local Board Grants Programme 2020/2021 March 2020 report is attached to this memo, and the attachment to the report “Papakura Local Board Grants Programme 2020/2021” confirms the boards grants programme.
- The Community Grants Policy supports each local board to review and adopt its own local grants programme for the next financial year. The local board grants programme guides community groups and individuals when making applications to the local board.
- The local board community grants programme includes:
  - outcomes as identified in the local board plan
  - specific local board grant priorities
  - which grant types will operate, the number of grant rounds and opening and closing dates
  - any additional criteria or exclusions that will apply


- other factors the local board consider to be significant to their decision-making.

- Once the local board grants programme 2020/2021 has been adopted, the types of grants, grant rounds, criteria and eligibility with be advertised through an integrated communication and marketing approach which includes utilising the local board channels.

**Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process:**

Manoj Ragupathy  
*Relationship Manager, Papakura & Manurewa Ward*

30 March 2020  
*Date*

Brent Catchpole  
*Chairperson, Papakura Local Board*

30 March 2020  
*Date*

Jan Robinson  
*Deputy Chairperson, Papakura Local Board*

30 March 2020  
*Date*
Papakura Local Board
22 April 2020

Papakura Local Board
25 March 2020

Papakura Local Board Grants Programme 2020/2021
File No.: CP2020/03276

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To adopt the Papakura Grants Programme 2020/2021.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Auckland Council Community Grants Policy guides the allocation of local, multi-board and regional grant programmes to groups and organisations delivering projects, activities and services that benefit Aucklanders.
3. The Community Grants Policy supports each local board to review and adopt their own local grants programme for the next financial year.
4. This report presents the Papakura Grants Programme 2020/2021 for adoption as provided in Attachment A to this report).

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
a) adopt the Papakura Grants Programme 2020/2021.

Horopaki
Context
5. The Auckland Council Community Grants Policy guides the allocation of local, multi-board and regional grant programmes to groups and organisations delivering projects, activities and services that benefit Aucklanders.
6. The Community Grants Policy supports each local board to review and adopt its own local grants programme for the next financial year. The local board grants programme guides community groups and individuals when making applications to the local board.
7. The local board community grants programme includes:
   • outcomes as identified in the local board plan
   • specific local board grant priorities
   • which grant types will operate, the number of grant rounds and opening and closing dates
   • any additional criteria or exclusions that will apply
   • other factors the local board consider to be significant to their decision-making.
8. Once the local board grants programme 2020/2021 has been adopted, the types of grants, grant rounds, criteria and eligibility will be advertised through an integrated communication and marketing approach which includes utilising the local board channels.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

9. The aim of the local board grant programme is to deliver projects and activities which align with the outcomes identified in the local board plan. The new Papakura Grants Programme has been workshopped with the local board and feedback incorporated into the grants programme for 2020/2021.

10. The new grant programme includes the requirement for applications to provide quotes.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

11. The local board grants programme aims to respond to Auckland Council’s commitment to address climate change by providing grants to individuals and groups with projects that support community climate change action. Local board grants can contribute to climate action through the support of projects that address food production and food waste; alternative transport methods; community energy efficiency education and behaviour change; build community resilience and support tree planting.

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

12. The grants programme has no identified impacts on council-controlled organisations and therefore their views are not required.

13. Based on the main focus of an application, a subject matter expert from the relevant council unit will provide input and advice. The main focus of an application is identified as arts, community, events, sport and recreation, environment or heritage.

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

14. The grants programme has been developed by the local board to set the direction of its grants programme. This programme is reviewed on an annual basis.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

15. All grant programmes respond to Auckland Council’s commitment to improving Māori wellbeing by providing grants to organisations delivering positive outcomes for Māori. Applicants are asked how their project aims to increase Māori outcomes in the application process.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

16. The allocation of grants to community groups is within the adopted Long-Term Plan 2018 - 2028 and local board agreements.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

17. The allocation of grants occurs within the guidelines and criteria of the Community Grants Policy. Therefore, there is minimal risk associated with the adoption of the grants programme.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

18. An implementation plan is underway and the local board grants programme will be locally advertised through the local board and council channels, including the council website, local board facebook page and communication with past recipients of grants.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Papakura Grants Programme 2020/2021</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Marion Davies - Grants and Incentives Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Rhonwen Heath - Head of Rates Valuations &amp; Data Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Papakura Local Board – Local Grants Programme 2020/2021

Our Grants Programme provides a funding source that is aimed at helping local communities to achieve their aspirations. Together we can contribute to making Papakura a thriving, safe and vibrant community.

Outcomes sought by the Papakura Local Board

Our grants programme will be targeted towards supporting the following outcomes, as outlined in our local board plan 2017:

- Activities that contribute to a vibrant and prosperous metropolitan centre.
- Activities that focus on people in Papakura to lead active, healthy and connected lives.
- Activities that contribute to a strong local economy.
- Activities that contribute to Papakura being well-connected and easy to move around.
- Activities that contribute to ensuring that Papakura is treasured for its environment and heritage.

Our priorities sought from grant applications

The Papakura Local Board particularly welcomes grant applications that:

- Enable people to participate, celebrate and contribute to their local community.
- Contribute to a thriving, vibrant and safe town centre.
- Provides for local cultural and arts experiences in the Papakura local board area.
- Ensure that Papakura’s parks, sports and recreation facilities are well used.
- Support communities to achieve their goals and aspirations.
- Increase numbers of visitors who contribute to the local economy.
- Contribute to the environment in and around the harbour and streams are enjoyed by increasing numbers of people.
- Focus on reducing, reusing and recycling.
- Celebrate and highlight Papakura’s history and heritage.

Higher priorities:

The Papakura Local Board will prioritise:

- events or activities that are held in the local board area or can demonstrate the benefit for the local community.
- applicants who have considered other sources of funding for their project and/or are collaborating with other community groups
- projects or events that align with the healthy environment principles
Lower priorities:

1) Papakura Local Board has identified the following activities as lower priorities:
   - Fundraising events.
   - Costs towards travel expenses, salaries, vehicles, electronic equipment and catering.

2) Papakura Local Board has also identified the following financial situation of an applicant, as a lower priority for funding:
   - The applicant has little demonstrated financial need for the project.

Ineligibility

In addition to the eligibility criteria outlined in the Community Grants Policy, the Papakura Local Board will not fund:

- applicants who have failed to complete or provide a satisfactory accountability form from previous grants received.
- applications with no quotes provided.
- applications applying for the same project or activity more than once in a financial year.
- applications requesting funding for projects or events which have already taken place.

Investment approach

Papakura Local Board has a budget to support the local grants programme. The following minimum and maximum amounts apply:

i. Small Grants:
   a. Minimum amount per grant: $300
   b. Maximum amount per grant: $2,000

ii. Local Grants:
   a. Minimum amount per grant: $2,000
   b. Maximum amount is generally up to $5,000 per grant unless there are exceptional circumstances.

iii. Discretionary Grants:
   a. Requests will be assessed on a case by case basis but must demonstrably support at least one of the Papakura Local Board Plan outcomes.

Application dates

Grant rounds for 2020/2021 will close on the following dates:
Small Grants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020/2021 grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round One</td>
<td>31 August 2020</td>
<td>25 September 2020</td>
<td>28 October 2020</td>
<td>1 November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two</td>
<td>12 October 2020</td>
<td>8 November 2020</td>
<td>9 December 2020</td>
<td>10 December 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Three</td>
<td>26 April 2021</td>
<td>21 May 2021</td>
<td>23 June 2021</td>
<td>1 July 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Grants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020/2021 grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round One</td>
<td>22 June 2020</td>
<td>31 July 2020</td>
<td>23 September 2020</td>
<td>1 October 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two</td>
<td>26 February 2021</td>
<td>2 April 2021</td>
<td>28 May 2021</td>
<td>1 June 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-board grants

We will consider multi-board funding on a case by case basis but will be particularly interested in applications concerning the environmentally sensitive use of the Manukau Harbour or a safe cycling and walking network across the south.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020/2021 Multi-board grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round One</td>
<td>22 June 2020</td>
<td>31 July 2020</td>
<td>23 September 2020</td>
<td>1 October 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two</td>
<td>26 February 2021</td>
<td>2 April 2021</td>
<td>26 May 2021</td>
<td>1 June 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accountability measures

The Papakura Local Board requires that all successful applicants:

- Include the Papakura local board logo on their publicity and promotional material, with the words “funded by/part funded by Papakura Local Board”.
- Be available to work with Council staff on media coverage and provide at least one photograph of the event or activity.

Additionally, successful applicants would be welcome to provide a verbal report at a Papakura Local Board business meeting. Ten minutes at the start of the meeting can be set aside for a deputation or three minutes during public forum. Please contact the local board’s Democracy Advisor to make arrangements.
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To provide an opportunity for the Papakura Local Board to receive reports and resolutions that have been referred from the Governing Body committee meetings, Council Controlled Organisations, forums or other local boards for information.

2. The following information was circulated to the local board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Governing Body Committee or Council Controlled Organisation or Forum or Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays Local Board feedback on the CCO Review – emailed to members 15 April 2020,</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19 March 2020</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays Local Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) receive the following information from the following Governing Body committee meetings, Council Controlled Organisations, forums or other local board meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Governing Body Committee or Council Controlled Organisation or Forum or Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays Local Board feedback on the CCO Review – emailed to members 15 April 2020,</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19 March 2020</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays Local Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Papakura Local Board Achievements Register 2019-2022 Political Term

File No.: CP2020/04306

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an opportunity for members to record the achievements of the Papakura Local Board for the 2019 – 2022 political term.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. An opportunity to note the achievements of the Papakura Local Board for the 2019 – 2022 political term.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:

a) request any new achievements be added to the Papakura Local Board Achievements Register for the 2019-2022 political term.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board Achievements Register 2019-2022 Political Term</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 February 2020</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Constituent Drop In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 February 2020</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Crimewatch monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 February 2020</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Wild Street Play at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 February 2020</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Wild Families Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 February 2020</td>
<td>Attended the Massey Park User Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 February 2020</td>
<td>Supported the Papakura Commercial Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 February 2020</td>
<td>Attended the Rosehill College 50th Anniversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 February 2020</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Community network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 February 2020</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Youth Council meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 January 2020</td>
<td>Attended the Improving Maori Input into Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 January 2020</td>
<td>Attended the Hui – Papakura Marae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 January 2020</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 January 2020</td>
<td>Attended the Wet and Wild Slides – Drury Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 January 2020</td>
<td>Attended the Kura Connect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 January 2020</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Wild Thing – Southern Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 January 2020</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Library Dare to Explore finale party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 January 2020</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Kite Day – Keri Downs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 January 2020</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Papakura Youth Council bbq dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 January 2020</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Mayor’s visit to Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 January 2020</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Junky Monkeys – Central Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 January 2020</td>
<td>Attended the MPS Addison group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 January 2020</td>
<td>Attended the Takanini Residents Association Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 January 2020</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Amazing Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 December 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Southern Corridor Improvements Project Opening event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 December 2019</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Wild Child Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 December 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Addison Annual Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 December 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Kura Connect Steering Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 December 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Takanini Residents Association Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 December 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Army Cadets Prizegiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 December 2019</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Pukekiwiriki Paa Joint Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 December 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Kiwi Property drop in session in Drury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 December 2019</td>
<td>Attended the 4 Squadron Air Training Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 December 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Coastguard Christmas party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 December 2019</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Papakura Chilling in the Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 December 2019</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Papakura Santa Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 December 2019</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Papakura Carols in the Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 December 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Ardmore Airport Christmas party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Franklin/Papakura Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Business Association meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December 2019</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Papakura Local Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December 2019</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Papakura Local Board Stakeholder Christmas afternoon tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Community Network meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 December 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Book launch – History of Drury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 December 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Community Crimewatch Patrol Christmas Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 December 2019</td>
<td>Attended the 28th Annual Sporting Excellence Awards for 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 December 2019</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Cross Street Playground opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 November 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Sikh Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 November 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Counties Manukau Gymnastics end of year prizegiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 November 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura Business Association end of year function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 November 2019</td>
<td>Attended Christmas at the Paa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 November 2019</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Papakura Commercial Projects Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 November 2019</td>
<td>Attended the KURA Connect Steering Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 November 2019</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Franklin and Papakura Citizenship ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 November 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Pahurehure Inlet Protection Society meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 November 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Takanini Residents Action Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 November 2019</td>
<td>Attended Hotaka Piri Kura graduation ceremony at Papakura High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 November 2019</td>
<td>Supported and attended Clarice Reserve Playground opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 November 2019</td>
<td>Attended the opening of ‘Dad’s Army’ at Off Broadway Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 November 2019</td>
<td>Attended the kumara planting event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 November 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Sikh Games at Pulman Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 November 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Papakura High School Senior Prizegiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 November 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Conifer Grove Residents meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 November 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Local Board Chairs forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 November 2019</td>
<td>Supported and attended the Armistice Parade and Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 November 2019</td>
<td>Attended the Free Family event – kuraconnect Turbo Touch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 November 2019</td>
<td>Attended the 2019 Rangatahi Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 November 2019</td>
<td>Inaugural Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Election of Chair, Brent Catchpole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Deputy Chair, Jan Robinson
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To present to the Papakura Local Board the three months Governance Forward Work Calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The Governance Forward Work Calendar is a schedule of items that will come before the local board at business meetings and workshops over the next three months. The Governance Forward Work Calendar for the Papakura Local Board is included in Attachment A of this report.

3. The calendar aims to support local boards' governance role by:
   i) ensuring advice on agendas and workshop material is driven by local board priorities
   ii) clarifying what advice is required and when
   iii) clarifying the rationale for reports.

4. The calendar will be updated every month, be included on the agenda for business meetings and distributed to relevant council staff. It is recognised that at times items will arise that are not programmed. Board members are welcome to discuss changes to the calendar.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) note the Governance Forward Work Calendar as at 16 April 2020.

Horopaki

Context

5. The council’s Quality Advice Programme aims to improve the focus, analysis, presentation and timeliness of staff advice to elected representatives. An initiative under this is to develop forward work calendars for Governing Body committees and local boards. These provide elected members with better visibility of the types of governance tasks they are being asked to undertake and when they are scheduled.

6. There are no new projects in the Governance Forward Work Calendar. The calendar brings together in one schedule reporting on all of the board’s projects and activities that have been previously approved in the local board plan, long-term plan, departmental work programmes and through other board decisions. It includes Governing Body policies and initiatives that call for a local board response.

7. This initiative is intended to support the board’s governance role. It will also help staff to support local boards, as an additional tool to manage workloads and track activities across council departments, and it will allow greater transparency for the public.

8. The calendar is arranged in three columns, “Topic”, “Purpose” and “Governance Role”: 
i) Topic describes the items and may indicate how they fit in with broader processes such as the annual plan.

ii) Purpose indicates the aim of the item, such as formally approving plans or projects, hearing submissions or receiving progress updates

iii) Governance role is a higher-level categorisation of the work local boards do. Examples of the seven governance categories are tabled below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Capex projects, work programmes, annual plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local initiatives / specific decisions</td>
<td>Grants, road names, alcohol bans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input into regional decision-making</td>
<td>Comments on regional bylaws, policies, plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Local board agreement, quarterly performance reports, review projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability to the public</td>
<td>Annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Community hui, submissions processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Briefings, cluster workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Board members are welcome to discuss changes to the calendar. The calendar will be updated and reported back every month to business meetings. Updates will also be distributed to relevant council staff.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

10. This report is an information report providing the governance forward work programme for the next three months.

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

11. The council is required to provide Governance Forward Work Calendar to the Manurewa Local Board for their consideration.

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

12. All local boards are being presented with a Governance Forward Work Calendar for their consideration.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

13. The projects and processes referred to in the Governance Forward Work Calendar will have a range of implications for Māori which will be considered when the work is reported.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

14. There are no financial implications relating to this report.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
15. This report is a point in time of the Governance Forward Work Calendar. It is a living document and updated month to month. It minimises the risk of the board being unaware of planned topics for their consideration.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
16. Staff will review the calendar each month in consultation with board members and will report an updated calendar to the board.

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>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<p>| | |</p>
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<th></th>
<th></th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Manoj Ragupathy - Relationship Manager Manurewa &amp; Papakura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Papakura Local Board Governance Forward Calendar as at 16 April 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop / Business meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>22/04/2020</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board Sports Awards 2020 - review brief proposal</td>
<td>Sorting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>22/04/2020</td>
<td>Community Facilities draft 2020/2021 work programme review</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buss Meeting</td>
<td>22/04/2020</td>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>23/04/2020</td>
<td>Workshop Four - Local Board Agreement - review consultation feedback</td>
<td>Sorting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>23/04/2020</td>
<td>General business</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>23/04/2020</td>
<td>Arts Community and Events monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>23/04/2020</td>
<td>Community Facilities monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>23/04/2020</td>
<td>Parks, Sports and Recreation monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>23/04/2020</td>
<td>ATEED Local Board Quarterly update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Informal dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>6/05/2020</td>
<td>Workshop Five - Local Board Agreement - finalise work programmes</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>6/05/2020</td>
<td>Thriving Communities Action Plan Releaish</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Informal dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>6/05/2020</td>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>6/05/2020</td>
<td>General business</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>13/05/2020</td>
<td>Grants applications, local and multiboard 2019/2020 round two</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Review community grant applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>12/05/2020</td>
<td>Stakeholder groups update - The Papakura Business Association</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>13/05/2020</td>
<td>Stakeholder groups update - Papakura Community Crawlerwatch Patrol</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>13/05/2020</td>
<td>Stakeholder groups update - Neighbourhood Support</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>13/05/2020</td>
<td>Stakeholder groups update - Papakura Police</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>13/05/2020</td>
<td>Stakeholder groups update - Papakura Meori Wardens</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>13/05/2020</td>
<td>General business</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>13/05/2020</td>
<td>Local Board Plan - review of amended draft</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buss Meeting</td>
<td>13/05/2020</td>
<td>Additional meeting: Annual planning (LEA) agrees feedback and advocacy</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>20/05/2020</td>
<td>Connected Communities update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>20/05/2020</td>
<td>Arts Community and Events monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>20/05/2020</td>
<td>General business</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>20/05/2020</td>
<td>Community Facilities monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>20/05/2020</td>
<td>Parks, Sports and Recreation monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Date</td>
<td>Item Dated</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/05/2020</td>
<td>20/05/2020</td>
<td>Report a problem online using the new Auckland Council online form</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Informal dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/05/2020</td>
<td>27/05/2020</td>
<td>Expected reports on the agenda:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Local and Multiboard Grants 2019/2020 Round Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Adopt draft Local Board Plans and SCP content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/06/2020</td>
<td>3/06/2020</td>
<td>Panmuku quarterly update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/06/2020</td>
<td>3/06/2020</td>
<td>Veddia quarterly update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/06/2020</td>
<td>3/06/2020</td>
<td>ATERD quarterly update and Local Board Engagement Plan update/earnings</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/06/2020</td>
<td>3/06/2020</td>
<td>General business</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/06/2020</td>
<td>3/06/2020</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Forward Works Programme review</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06/2020</td>
<td>10/06/2020</td>
<td>Workshop 8th - Local Board Agreement - Finalise local board agreement</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06/2020</td>
<td>10/06/2020</td>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06/2020</td>
<td>10/06/2020</td>
<td>General business</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06/2020</td>
<td>10/06/2020</td>
<td>Small Grants Round Two applications</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Review community grant applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06/2020</td>
<td>10/06/2020</td>
<td>Governance Framework Review - Service Levels and Funding project proposals</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Provide feedback on policy options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/06/2020</td>
<td>17/06/2020</td>
<td>Connected Communities update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/06/2020</td>
<td>17/06/2020</td>
<td>Arts Community and Events monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/06/2020</td>
<td>17/06/2020</td>
<td>General business</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/06/2020</td>
<td>17/06/2020</td>
<td>Community Facilities monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/06/2020</td>
<td>17/06/2020</td>
<td>Parks, Sports and Recreation monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / Inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/06/2020</td>
<td>17/06/2020</td>
<td>Additional meeting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual planning (Local Board Agreement) adopt local board agreements, and fees and charges schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/06/2020</td>
<td>24/06/2020</td>
<td>Expected reports on the agenda:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual planning (Local Board Work Programme) approve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>1/07/2020</td>
<td>Papakura Youth Council update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>8/07/2020</td>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>15/07/2020</td>
<td>Arts Community and Events monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>15/07/2020</td>
<td>General business</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>15/07/2020</td>
<td>Community Facilities work monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>15/07/2020</td>
<td>Parks, Sports and Recreation monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buss Meeting</td>
<td>22/07/2020</td>
<td>Expected reports on the agenda:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>29/07/2020</td>
<td>Auckland Waters Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>5/08/2020</td>
<td>Stakeholder groups update - Papakura Business Association</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Check in on performance / inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>5/08/2020</td>
<td>Stakeholder groups update - Papakura Community CenreWatch Patrol</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Check in on performance / inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>5/08/2020</td>
<td>Stakeholder groups update - Neighbourhood Support</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Check in on performance / inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>5/08/2020</td>
<td>Stakeholder groups update - Police</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Check in on performance / inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>5/08/2020</td>
<td>Stakeholder groups update - Maori Wardens</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Check in on performance / inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>5/08/2020</td>
<td>General business</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>12/08/2020</td>
<td>General business</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>12/08/2020</td>
<td>Revised content of draft Local Board Plan</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Confirm advocacy priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>19/08/2020</td>
<td>Arts Community and Events monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>19/08/2020</td>
<td>General business</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>19/08/2020</td>
<td>Community Facilities monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / inform future direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>19/08/2020</td>
<td>Parks, Sports and Recreation monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Check in on performance / inform future direction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To note the Papakura Local Board record for the workshops held on 29 January, 5, 12 and 19 February, 4, 11, 18 and 25 March, and 1 and 8 April 2020.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. In accordance with Standing Order 12.1.4, the local board shall receive a record of the general proceedings of each of its local board workshops held over the past month.
3. Resolutions or decisions are not made at workshops as they are solely for the provision of information and discussion. This report attaches the workshop record for the period stated below.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
 a) note the Papakura Local Board Workshop Records held on:
   i) 29 January 2020
   ii) 5 February 2020
   iii) 12 February 2020
   iv) 19 February 2020
   v) 4 March 2020
   vi) 11 March 2020
   vii) 18 March 2020
   viii) 25 March 2020
   ix) 1 April 2020
   x) 8 April 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board Workshop Record 29 January 2020</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board Workshop Record 5 February 2020</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board Workshop Record 12 February 2020</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board Workshop Record 19 February 2020</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board Workshop Record 4 March 2020</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 31

<table>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
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</tr>
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Papakura Local Board Induction Workshop Record

Induction workshop record of the Papakura Local Board held in the Papakura Local Board Chambers, Papakura Service Centre, 35 Coles Crescent on Wednesday, 29 January 2020, commencing at 12.30pm.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Brent Catchpole
Members: Jan Robinson
Felicity Auva’a
George Hawkins
Keven Mealamu
Sue Smurthwaite

Also present: Manoj Ragupathy (Relationship Manager)
Victoria Hutt (Senior Advisor)
Lee Manaia (Advisor)
Paula Brooke (Democracy Advisor)
Tracey Hainsworth Fa-aoto

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elected Member Whole Brain Thinking (Herrman Brain Dominance Instrument – HBDI) session</strong></td>
<td>Elected member only session – 12.30pm – 3.30pm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Suzy Craies (Organisational Development Advisor, Strategy and Capability) | The board discussed the following items:  
  - **Standing agenda item** - updates from members in relation to external organisation meetings / topic area updates.  
    - Hunua Falls  
    - Junky Monkeys event.  
    - Pescara Point footbridge opening  
    - Ashdown Place walkway lighting  
    - Youth council meeting  
    - RMA process  
    - Youth Council planning BBQ.  
  - Landowner approval delegates  
  - Creating videos of boards projects  
  - LGNZ Conference and Excellence Awards 2020  
  - Maori Outcomes  
  - Waiaata Shores Bridge |
<p>| <strong>Local Board general Business</strong> | |
| <strong>Board members</strong> | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pulman Park – dog attack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kura – five -episode series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Development Bill and Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Waste Solutions food scraps pilot

Via SKYPE
Georgina Langdon-Pole
(Senior Community Advisor, Waste Solutions)

Miriana Knox
(relationship Advisor, Infrastructure & Environmental Services)

Jenny Chilcott
(Community Recycling Centre Relationship and Partnering Project Manager, Waste Solutions)

Staff provided an update on the uptake of the waste solutions food scraps pilot and an overview of the council waste plan.

Supporting Growth business case

Sarah MacCormick
(Engagement Area Lead – South, Supporting Growth)

Supporting Growth planning team:
- Amelia Linzay
- Emma Fisk
- Laura Christian
- Rory Fraser – Auckland Transport

John Dunshea
(General Manager, Development Programme Office)

Staff provided an update on the supporting growth project, starting with the project progress to date as a refresh.

The workshop concluded at 5.24 pm
Papakura Local Board Induction Workshop Record

Induction workshop record of the Papakura Local Board held in the Papakura Local Board Chambers, Papakura Service Centre, 35 Coles Crescent on Wednesday, 5 February 2020, commencing at 12:30 pm.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Brent Catchpole
Members: Jan Robinson
Felicity Auva’a
George Hawkins
Sue Smurthwaite

Apologies: Keven Mealamu

Also present: Manoj Ragupathy (Relationship Manager)
Victoria Hutt (Senior Advisor)
Lee Manaia (Advisor)
Jacqueline Pryor (PA Liaison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pararekau Island boardwalk proposal</strong></td>
<td>Staff presented the proposal for new boardwalks around and connecting to Pararekau Island.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Kate Richardson**  
(Senior Parks Planner, Parks, Sports and Recreation) | |
| **Debra Langton**  
(PSR Portfolio Manager, Parks, Sports and Recreation) | |
| **Papakura Commercial Project Group update** | Leigh Auton led a discussion with the new board to determine the direction and key priorities for the 2019 – 2022 term of the Commercial Projects Group. |
| **Leigh Auton**  
(Papakura Commercial Project Group) | |
| **Manoj Ragupathy**  
(Relationship Manager, Local Board Services) | |
<p>| <strong>Richard Knott</strong> | |
| <strong>Tracy Shackleton</strong> | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Luong</td>
<td>The board discussed the following items:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ralph</td>
<td>- Radio Waatea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Norman (via Skype)</td>
<td>- Tuia programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board General Business</td>
<td>- Puakeiwiriiki Paa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Kura Kawana training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community network meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Southern Initiative meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Papakura Youth Council – YouthFest on 29 Feb 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rosehill College 50th anniversary this weekend –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Presentations from four mana whenua groups at Ngāti Ōtara marae – 30 Jan 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder groups quarterly update - The Papakura Business Association</td>
<td>Tracy Shackleton, Papakura Business Association Manager, gave an update covering the activities undertaken over the last quarter, and spoke about the upcoming projects, activities or programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Shackleton</td>
<td>(Papakura Business Association Town Centre Manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Newman</td>
<td>(Safety Co-ordinator, Papakura Town Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder groups quarterly update – Papakura Community Crimewatch patrol</td>
<td>Glenn Torrens from Crimewatch provided an update of the activities undertaken over the last quarter and information on proposed activities and programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Torrens</td>
<td>(Crimewatch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder groups quarterly update – The Papakura Māori Wardens</strong></td>
<td>Jan Piahana explained the powers and duties of the Māori Wardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Piahana and the Papakura Māori Wardens (Māori Wardens)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder groups quarterly update – The NZ Police</strong></td>
<td>Senior Sergeant Alan Nash gave an overview of the statistics relating to crimes over the last 12-month period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Sergeant Alan Nash (Relieving Community Services Manager, Papakura, NZ Police)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Ainsworth (Neighbourhood Support)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Smith (Neighbourhood Support)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Transport work programme update</strong></td>
<td>James Ralph provided an update on the current Auckland Transport work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ralph (Elected Members Relationship Manager, Auckland Transport)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Transport Local Board Transport Capital Fund projects</strong></td>
<td>James Ralph sought direction from the board on the preferred options for the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ralph (Elected Members Relationship Manager, Auckland Transport)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 5.43pm.
Papakura Local Board Induction Workshop Record

Induction workshop record of the Papakura Local Board held in the Papakura Local Board Chambers, Papakura Service Centre, 35 Coles Crescent on Wednesday, 12 February 2020, commencing at 12.30pm.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Brent Catchpole
Members: Jan Robinson
           Felicity Auva’a
           George Hawkins
           Keven Mealamu
           Sue Smurthwaite
Also present: Manoj Ragupathy (Relationship Manager)
              Victoria Hutt (Senior Advisor)
              Lee Manala (Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Business</td>
<td>The board discussed the following topics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Member Roles and Duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Community and Events (ACE) 2019/2020 work programme update</td>
<td>Staff presented the 2019/2020 ACE work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Hainsworth-Fa’aofo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Strategic Broker, Arts, Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Events (ACE))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus the ACE team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronelle Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Practice Manager - Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(via skype))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Dawson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Manager Strategic Brokers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice McCarthy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Event Facilitator)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Arts &amp; Culture Advisor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Lelo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Specialist Advisor, Youth Specialist)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan McLaggan (Service and Integration Manager)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickie Humphries (Specialist Advisor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facilities current multi-year work programme update</strong></td>
<td>Staff presented the current multi-year Community Facilities work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigo Pizarro (Manager Project Delivery – Rima, Community Facilities)</td>
<td>Staff also provided individual updates on the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Barratt-Boyes (Programme Principal (Coastal &amp; Slips Projects))</td>
<td>• Growth funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Klinac (Head of Specialist Delivery Unit)</td>
<td>• Coastal projects review - Bottletop Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohamed Eltayeb (Project Manager)</td>
<td>• Takanini Community Hub and Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Keat (Senior Growth Development Specialist)</td>
<td>• Smiths Reserve progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Taunga (Head of Community Libraries South &amp; East)</td>
<td>• Community Facilities Work Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine Samuel (Community Led &amp; LDI Specialist)</td>
<td>• Introduction - Sam Pohiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Pohiva (Area Operations Manager)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Hope (Work Programme Lead)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Martin (Manager Programme Development)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Southern Initiative 2020/2021 work programme proposals</strong></td>
<td>Staff presented three proposals for the board’s consideration for funding in the 2020/2021 Southern Initiative work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhaya Haran (Specialist Advisor, Youth Employment, The Southern Initiative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The workshop concluded at 5.37pm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Papakura Local Board Induction Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Papakura Local Board held in the Papakura Local Board Chambers, Papakura Service Centre, 35 Coles Crescent on **Wednesday, 19 February 2020, commencing at 12.30pm.**

**PRESENT**

**Chairperson:** Brent Catchpole  
**Members:** Jan Robinson  
Felicity Auva’a  
George Hawkins (until 5.30pm)  
Keven Mealamu (until 5.46pm)  

**Apologies:** Sue Smurthwaite  

**Also present:** Manoj Ragupathy (Relationship Manager)  
Victoria Hutt (Senior Advisor)  
Lee Manaia (Advisor)  
Paula Brooke (Democracy Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Community and Events (ACE) proposed 2020/2021 work programme discussion</td>
<td>Staff presented the ACE 2019/2020 and proposed 2020/2021 work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Hainsworth Fa’aofo (Strategic Broker, Arts, Community and Events (ACE))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronelle Baker (Practice Manager, Operations, CEU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danika Waiti (Specialist Advisor, CEU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Dawson (Manager Strategic Brokers, CEU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karem Colmeneres (Senior Event Organiser, Events)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Lelo (Specialist Advisor, Youth Specialist, CEU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickie Humphries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 31</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Specialist Advisor, CEU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Takanini Business Improvement District (BID)</strong></td>
<td>Staff presented the 2019/2020 and proposed 2020/2021 work programmes for the board’s review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul Thompson</strong> (BID Senior Advisor, BID team)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plans and Places</strong> 2019/2020 work programme update and advice on proposed 2020/2021 work programme</td>
<td>Staff provided an update on the Manurewa, Takanini and Papakura Area Plan and the next steps for the board’s feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Craig Caimcross</strong> (Team Leader, Planning, Plans and Places)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anna Boyer</strong> (Senior Specialist Community Heritage, Plans and Places)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gill Pannell</strong> (Manager Library Operations, Libraries and Information)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cathy Cooper</strong> (Manager Papakura Community Library)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Business</strong></td>
<td>The board discussed the following items:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Franklin’s Hunua Trail Aspiration Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tour of Airside at Auckland Airport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Centennial Building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meeting with NZTA about the Takanini business issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Member’s event attendance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Neighbourhood Support grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks, Sports and Recreation (PSR) 2019/2020 work programme and advice on proposed 2020/2021 work programme</strong></td>
<td>Staff updated on the 2019/2020 and proposed 2020/2021 work programme for the boards review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debra Langton (PSR Portfolio Manager Parks, Sports and Recreation)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opaheke Sports Park Clubrooms project update</strong></td>
<td>Staff updated on the Opaheke Sports Park Clubrooms project work programme line #1138.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debra Langton (PSR Portfolio Manager Parks, Sports and Recreation)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rose Ward (Sport and Recreation Lead, Parks, Sports and Recreation)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Solutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure and Environmental Services (I&amp;ES) 2019/2020 work programme update and advice on proposed 2020/2021 work programme</strong></td>
<td>Staff presented the I&amp;ES 2019/2020 work programme, along with projections for the 2020/2021 work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prasanthi Cottingham (Relationship Advisor, Infrastructure and Environmental Services)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Recognition Awards</td>
<td>Staff presented the proposed plan for the 2020 Volunteer Recognition Awards for the board's feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karem Colmenares Borrego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Senior Event Organiser (Civic), Events)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 6.05pm.
Papakura Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Papakura Local Board held in the Papakura Local Board Chambers, Papakura Service Centre, 35 Coles Crescent on **Wednesday, 4 March 2020, commencing at 11.00pm.**

**PRESENT**
- Chairperson: Brent Catchpole – Papakura Local Board
- Members: Jan Robinson - Papakura Local Board
- Felicity Auva’a - Papakura Local Board
- George Hawkins - Papakura Local Board
- Sue Smurthwaite – Papakura Local Board
- Keven Mealamu – Papakura Local Board

**Also present:** Victoria Hutt (Senior Local Board Advisor)
- Paula Brooke (Local Board Democracy Advisor)
- Jacqueline Pryor (PA/Liaison, Local Board Services)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) project review</strong></td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>James presented the draft Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) list of projects the board will indicate they wish to proceed with for a rough order of costs (ROC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James Ralph</strong></td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board discussed the following items:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Elected Member Relationship Manager, Auckland Transport)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Movies in the Park</strong> - Fri 6 March: ‘Have Your Say’ event seeking feedback on Local Board Plan and Annual Plan 6-8pm and the movie follows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Marae dinner</strong> – Thurs 2 April from 5-7pm. This is also Neighbours Day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Papakura Business Association monthly meeting</strong> – 4 March at Noel Lemming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Youth Council</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Community Network meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Bus layover issue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veolia Quarterly update</strong></td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Yolanda and Gary updated on the recent activities of Veolia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yolanda Oosthuizen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Auckland Regional Manager, Papakura)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Governance role</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Gary Stevenson**  
(Customer Service Manager, Veolia) | | |
| **Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED) Engagement Plan** | Oversight and monitoring | Holly updated on the ATEED Engagement Plan. |
| **Holly Franklin**  
(External Relationship Advisor, ATEED) | | |
| **Local Board Plan** | Setting direction / priorities / budget | Vic workshoped with the board their preferred objectives and initiatives within their proposed new māori outcome in the draft Local Board Plan. |
| **Vic Hutt**  
(Senior Advisor, Local Board Services) | | |
| **Shelvin Munit-imo**  
(Engagement Advisor, Local Board Services) | | |
| **Supporting Growth update** | Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions | The Supporting Growth team updated on the project. |
| **James Ralph**  
(Elected Member Relationship Manager, Auckland Transport) | | |
| **Supporting Growth team:**  
Emma Fisk  
Rory Power  
Laura Christina | | |
| **Airport to Botany Rapid Transit update** | Input to regional decision-making | Southwest Gateway Program consists of three major projects – Airport to Botany Rapid Transit, 20Connect and Auckland Airport precinct improvements. |
| **James Ralph**  
(Elected Member Relationship Manager, Auckland Transport) | | |
<p>| <strong>Mel Taylor</strong> | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Transport Planner, Auckland Transport)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Austin Kim</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Advisor, Comms and Engagement, NZTA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marion introduced herself and presented the criteria for the 2020/2021 grants round for the boards review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review of the 2020/2021 Grants Programme</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Marion Davies</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Grant Operations Manager)</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Marion introduced herself and presented the criteria for the 2020/2021 grants round for the boards review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop ended at 4.48 pm.
Papakura Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Papakura Local Board held in the Papakura Local Board Chambers, Papakura Service Centre, 35 Coles Crescent on **Wednesday, 11 March 2020, commencing at 12.00pm.**

**PRESENT**

Chairperson: Brent Catchpole – Papakura Local Board  
Members:  
- Jan Robinson - Papakura Local Board  
- Felicity Auva’a - Papakura Local Board (from 12.08pm)  
- George Hawkins - Papakura Local Board (from 12.31pm)  
- Sue Smurthwaite – Papakura Local Board  
- Keven Mealamu – Papakura Local Board  

Also present:  
- Manoj Ragupathy (Relationship Manager)  
- Victoria Hutt (Senior Local Board Advisor)  
- Paula Brooke (Local Board Democracy Advisor)  
- Lee Manaia (Advisor, Local Board Services)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>One Local Initiative (OLI) next steps / options / process decision</strong></td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Roscoe Webb gave an overview of the current situation of the Papakura One Local Initiative (OLI), in order to assist the board in next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roscoe Webb (Programme Principal – OLI, Community Facilities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ralph (Elected Member Relationship Manager, Auckland Transport)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport monthly work programme update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>James updated on the Auckland Transport monthly work programme update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ralph (Elected Member Relationship Manager, Auckland Transport)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop Three – Local Board Agreement</strong></td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
<td>The board reviewed the draft 2020/2021 work programmes presented by staff today, with a view to balancing LDI Opex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic Hutt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Governance role</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Senior Advisor, Papakura Local Board)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faithe Smith</td>
<td>(Lead Financial Advisor, Financial Strategy and Planning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Team:</td>
<td></td>
<td>The board discussed the following items:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- John Norman – ATEED - Skype</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Standing agenda item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dhaya Haran – TSI - Skype</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Coronavirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Debra Langton – PSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prasanthi Cottingham – I&amp;ES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tracey Hainsworth Fa-aoho – ACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Jenny Young – Community Leases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop ended at 5.40pm.
Workshop record of the Papakura Local Board held in the Papakura Local Board Chambers, Papakura Service Centre, 35 Coles Crescent on *Wednesday, 18 March 2020, commencing at 12.30 pm.*

**PRESENT**

*Chairperson:*
Brent Catchpole – Papakura Local Board  
Jan Robinson - Papakura Local Board  
Felicity Auva’a - Papakura Local Board  
George Hawkins - Papakura Local Board  
Sue Smurthwaite – Papakura Local Board  
Keven Mealamu – Papakura Local Board  

*Members:*
Manoj Ragupathy (Relationship Manager)  
Victoria Hutt (Senior Local Board Advisor)  
Paula Brooke (Local Board Democracy Advisor)  
Lee Manaia (Advisor, Local Board Services)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connected Communities update</strong></td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Auckland Transport (AT) staff presented the Connected Communities programme of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Via Skype:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **James Ralph**  
(Elected Member  
Relationship Manager,  
Auckland Transport) | | |
| **Theresa Walsh**  
(Theresa Walsh Consulting) | | |
| **Anthony Pearse**  
(Senior Planner,  
Integrated Corridors – Planning and Investment Group,  
Auckland Transport) | | |
<p>| <strong>Auckland Transport Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) projects</strong> | Oversight and monitoring | James presented on the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) projects from the last workshop. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>James Ralph</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Elected Member Relationship Manager, Auckland Transport)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wellbeing and Injury prevention</strong></td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Staff presented on the Wellbeing and Injury Prevention findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Skype:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wayne Levick</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Strategic Advisor, Safety Collective, Arts, Community and Events)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alisa Wilson</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Auckland Regional Public Health Service)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tracey Hainsworth</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Strategic Broker, ACE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The board discussed the following items:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Standing agenda item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Hamilton to Papakura (Te Hua) trains start 3 August 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Covid-19 and working remotely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Smiths Ave event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Business meeting 25 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facilities monthly work programme update</strong></td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Staff updated on the 2019/2020 Community Facilities work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Skype:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sam Pohiva</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Manager Area Operations, Community Facilities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helen Biffin</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Work Programme Lead, Community Facilities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Governance role</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Young</td>
<td>(Community Lease Specialist, Community Facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drury Sports Complex and Prince Edward Park masterplans update</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Staff presented the draft Drury Sports Complex and Prince Edward Park masterplans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Skype:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Gedge</td>
<td>(Sports Parks Specialist, Community Facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Ward</td>
<td>(Sport and Recreation Lead, PSR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Dube</td>
<td>(Assistant Landscape Architect, Community Facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Pohiva</td>
<td>(Manager Area Operations, Community Facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Plan Workshop Three – Community Facilities</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Staff took the board through the draft 2020/2021 Community Facilities work programme line by line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Skype:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Pohiva</td>
<td>(Manager Area Operations, Community Facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Biffin</td>
<td>(Work Programme Lead, Community Facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop ended at 5.45pm.
Papakura Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Papakura Local Board held in the Papakura Local Board Chambers, Papakura Service Centre, 35 Coles Crescent on **Wednesday, 25 March 2020, commencing at 1pm**.

**PRESENT - via Skype for Business**

**Chairperson**
- Brent Catchpole – Papakura Local Board

**Members:**
- Jan Robinson - Papakura Local Board
- Felicity Auva’a - Papakura Local Board
- George Hawkins - Papakura Local Board
- Sue Smurthwaite – Papakura Local Board
- Keven Mealamu – Papakura Local Board

**Also present:**
- Manoj Ragupathy (Relationship Manager)
- Victoria Hutt (Senior Local Board Advisor)
- Paula Brooke (Local Board Democracy Advisor)
- Lee Manaia (Advisor, Local Board Services)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACE monthly work programme update</strong></td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Staff provided an update on the 2019/2020 ACE work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Skype:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tracey Hainsworth-Fa-fofo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Strategic Broker, Arts Community and Events)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karem Colmenares</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Senior Event Organiser, Events, ACE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leanne Roche</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Event Development Manager, Event, ACE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General business</strong></td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board discussed the following items:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Skype:</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Standing item: Members updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Upcoming events – budget reallocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Music in the Park 2020/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Litter Prevention sign locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Local Board Plan photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Massey Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Governance role</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Plan development</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Staff sought input from the board on the development of the local board plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Skype:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic Hutt (Senior Local Board Advisor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelvin Munif-Imo (Engagement Advisor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop ended at 4.10pm.
**Papakura Local Board Workshop Record**

Workshop record of the Papakura Local Board held in the Papakura Local Board Chambers, Papakura Service Centre, 35 Coles Crescent on **Wednesday, 1 April, commencing at 12.30 pm**.

**PRESENT via Skype for Business**

**Chairperson**

Brent Catchpole – Papakura Local Board

**Members:**

Jan Robinson - Papakura Local Board
Felicity Auva’a - Papakura Local Board
George Hawkins - Papakura Local Board
Sue Smurthwaite – Papakura Local Board
Keven Mealamu – Papakura Local Board

**Also present:**

Manoj Ragupathy (Relationship Manager, Local Board Services)
Victoria Hutt (Senior Advisor, Local Board Services)
Paula Brooke (Democracy Advisor, Local Board Services)
Lee Manaia (Advisor, Local Board Services)
Jacqueline Pryor (PA/Liaison, Local Board Services)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Board Plan – drafting Outcome 5 – Partner with Māori to create a Papakura where Māori identity, culture and aspirations are embraced</strong></td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>Staff sought input from the board on the development of the local board plan Outcome 5 – Partner with Māori to create a Papakura where Māori identity, culture and aspirations are embraced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Via Skype:</strong> Manoj Ragupathy (Relationship Manager, Local Board Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Papakura Art Gallery update and the Community fees and charges setting for FY21</strong></td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Christine presented the Venue for Hire Fees and Charges activity report for FY20 and the proposed fees and charges for FY21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Via Skype:</strong> Tracey Hainsworth-Fa-fo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Governance role</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Corey Walden**  
(Facility Manager, Arts Community and Events) | | |
| **Christine Waugh**  
(Manager Venues for Hire, Arts Community and Events) | | |
| **Paula Green**  
(arts and Culture Advisor, Arts Community and Events) | | |
| **NZTA Papakura to Bombay update** | Keeping informed | Staff provided an update on the NZTA Papakura to Bombay project. |
| Via Skype: | | |
| **Jenni Wild**  
(Senior Advisor, Engagement and Partnerships, NZTA) | | |
| **Papakura to Bombay Project team:**  
- Prasad Tala | | |
| **Southern Corridor update** | Keeping informed | Staff provided an update on the Southern Corridor project. |
| Via Skype: | | |
| **Jenni Wild**  
(Senior Advisor, Engagement and Partnerships, NZTA) | | |
| **Southern Corridor Project team:**  
- James Eyre  
- Jenni Wild  
- Kevin Stevens | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol Ban extension</strong></td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Staff sought the board’s feedback on whether to extend the existing Papakura Town Centre 24 hours, seven days a week alcohol ban, to include all of the Papakura Train Station and surrounds, including park and ride facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Skype: Elizabeth Osborne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Policy Advisor, Regulatory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Policy Manager, Regulatory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Freebairn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Manager Facilities Operation, Auckland Transport)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General business</strong></td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The members discussed the following items:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Skype:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Standing item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td></td>
<td>• 2019/2020 &amp; 2020/2021 budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No Q3 report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• South Auckland Social Welfare Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CCO feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual budget submissions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop ended at 4.15pm.
Workshop record of the Papakura Local Board held in the Papakura Local Board Chambers, Papakura Service Centre, 35 Coles Crescent on **Wednesday, 8 April 2020, commencing at 2pm.**

**PRESENT via Skype for Business**

**Chairperson**
Brent Catchpole – Papakura Local Board

**Members:**
Jan Robinson - Papakura Local Board
Felicity Auva’a - Papakura Local Board
George Hawkins - Papakura Local Board
Sue Smurthwaite – Papakura Local Board
Keven Mealamu – Papakura Local Board

**Also present:**
Manoj Ragupathy (Relationship Manager, Local Board Services)
Victoria Hutt (Senior Advisor, Local Board Services)
Paula Brooke (Democracy Advisor, Local Board Services)
Lee Manaia (Advisor, Local Board Services)
Jacqueline Pryor (PA/Liaison, Local Board Services)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Board Agreement advocacy</strong></td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>Staff sought input from the board on the advocacy items for the Local Board Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Skype: Manoj Ragupathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Relationship Manager, Local Board Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic Hutt (Senior Advisor, Papakura Local Board)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Transport monthly update</strong></td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>James presented two Auckland Transport projects for the boards review and feedback: Intersection of Popes Road and Porchester Road and the proposed remedies. Intersection at Manuroa Road / Takanini School Road – proposal is to signalise the intersection, Proposing to go to external consultation after the lock down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Skype: James Ralph (Elected Member Relationship Manager, Auckland Transport)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COVID-19 update and discussion</strong></td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Cr Dalton provided an update on the COVID-19 situation from a Governing Body perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Governance role</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Skype:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Councillor Angela Dalton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks, Sports and Recreation work programme monthly update</strong></td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Debra introduced Howell who presented on the Urban Ngahere Strategy, for the board’s feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Skype:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debra Langton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PSR Portfolio Manager, Parks Sports and Recreation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Howell Davies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Senior Advisor, Urban Forest, Parks Sports and Recreation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General business</strong></td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The members discussed the following items:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Skype:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop ended at 4.50pm.
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Item 8.1

Connecting our Papakura Community
# Lean-in Fun, #Lean-in Whānau, #Lean-in Kotahitanga
‘We as a community and a Nation benefit when our young people are functioning to their fullest potential’.

Our Kuraconnect kaupapa, is to about connecting our Papakura CommUNITY.

Together we can encourage, equip and actively engage with the young people of Papakura and their families, to help them reach their full potential.

We want to invest into their lives, by developing future leaders, and role models for the next generation.

By building a positive platform through Kuraconnect, by encouraging everyone in our community to use their influence for good and are able to help our young people see their worth and purpose.

Everyone involved is sharing their own journey in sport and music and the creative arts, encouraging and inspiring young people to believe in themselves and go after their dreams.

With the sharing of people’s personal journey’s, it will encourage young people to pursue their dreams, to stand tall and not let their past dictate their future.

We want to partner with people who have hearts of integrity and a genuine heart to help our young people realize their potential.
OUR VISION

We seek to see that whanau in Papakura are thriving, safe and connected through holistic well-being, active engagement, sport, recreation and culture.

Te Kaha Te Tautoko Me Te Oranga O Papakura - E Tu Whanau.
KuraConnect is about connecting our CommUNITY in a culture of Whanau (family), Tika-PonoAroha (Do what’s right not easy), Kotahitanga and fun.

The core groups who are party to this agreement will work together in a culture of respect and support of each other and the community gathering around the principles of a holistic framework and the importance of sport and well-being.
The four quadrants of the holistic framework are: Mental, Physical, Social and Spiritual Health.

Together the group will provide the following support:

- Resources & facilities
- Local knowledge & wisdom
- Collective social impact strategies Communication between organisations
- Security & protection services
- Sport and wellbeing services
- Governance, operational & fundraising experience Social, employment and training opportunities
OUR MISSION

- Introduce more youth to sport.
- Educate people about the connection between sport, wellbeing and mental health. To improve communication between organisations, community members and government departments.
- Create a network of organisations focused on "Whanau wrap around community services" for at risk youth and families.
- Raise the profile of sporting facilities and wellbeing organisations in our community. Create a fun and engaging educational event for our community.
- Raise money for sports clubs.
# Lean-in Fun
# Lean-in Whānau
# Lean-in Kotahitanga
Kuraconnect Team
Website: https://www.kuraconnect.co.nz

Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/kuraconnect
Item 8.1

Community doing Community well.

Attachment A
'Kuraconnect Community Day’
May 3
Bruce Pulman Park
Papakura
11:00am - 3:00pm
Attachment A

Item 8.1

KuraConnect, is all about encouraging life, and the potential of our tamariki and, our rangatahi the next generation.

We want to build a positive brand and influence across all ages, provide added value to the whanau of these young people.

Everyone involved is sharing their own journey in sport and the arts, encouraging and inspiring young people to believe in themselves and go after their dreams.

Events like this grows a sense of pride in our community for both whanau and our rangatahi, when they can celebrate who they are in their hometown.

It also gives huge opportunities for our young people to learn transferable skills to take into the work force or help young people to see what further education they need to do to achieve their dreams.

Their sense of wellbeing is enhanced when they have something positive to be involved in.
We also recognise that Music plays a huge part in our communities’ lives. As well as the sport initiative we are also looking to reach the many young people that love the performing arts. And we can give them a platform to be a part of the ‘Kuraconnect Community Day’

There will be 8-9 Sporting Codes that anyone can participate in, and a stage showcasing 4x hours of local talent

Invited Guest Artists ARDIJAH and BEAU MONGA that have a heart for our Papakura Community

Free Sausage Sizzle, Live Music, Dance, Food Stalls, Massages, Yoga, Health checks, Arm Forces Stalls.

We want to have this event yearly, to build a positive initiative in Papakura for our tamariki and rangatahi and their whanau.

We, Kuraconnect, along with over 23 local organisations who are working collaboratively to promote a positive, healthy lifestyles through sport as a vehicle especially for our families who cannot afford to take part in sport and wouldn’t otherwise have the opportunity to do so.
We want to encourage everyone in our community to use their influence for good and is able to help young people see their worth and purpose. With the sharing of people’s personal journey’s,

- it will encourage young people to pursue their dreams. To stand tall and not let their past dictate their future.

- We want to partner with people who have hearts of integrity and a genuine heart in helping young people realize their potential.

- We will be championing the local talent across all creative sectors, marae’s, schools, studios, and all creative organisations.

- Bringing a inclusive combination of all cultures, music, dance, spoken word, and creative graphics, on a stage that will showcase all local artists and invited guests artists to entertain the community for 4 Hours of entertainment.
From highest to lowest in substance use – 15/16 year old students in Iceland

Based on the Icelandic Prevention Model

%
It’s all about risk and protective factors

**Risk:** Factors in the life of young children and adolescents that increase the likelihood of substance use

**Protective:** Factors in the life of young children and adolescents that decrease the likelihood of substance use
The main risk and protective factors

- Organized activities vs. unorganized
- Extracurricular activities, sports
- General well being
- Time spent with parents: Support, Monitoring, Control
- Peer group effect

Positive and negative effects. How we as parents approach the peer group. Staying outside late. Hanging out in shopping centers.
Global reach

As of 2019, we have partnered with over 150 communities in over 30 countries including Chile, Portugal, Spain, Australia, Canada, USA, France, Malta, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Slovakia, Romania, Moldova, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Sweden, Norway, Faeroe Islands, The Netherlands, Ireland, Ukraine, Kenya and Guinea-Bissau.
How we work with our partners

Five year cyclical process

Attachment A

Item 8.1
Data driven approach

- Questionnaires (adapted to community context) sent to schools
- 70-80 questions, 10-18 years old (depends on country and project)

1. Your family
2. Connection to others
3. Health / mental health
4. Substance use
5. Your studies and school
6. Your leisure participation
7. Your diet
8. Bullying
9. Physical activities
10. Anger and behavior
11. Social media, computer use
12. And more
Intervention and implementation design

- A workshop based process aimed at designing the **intervention strategy** focusing on minimizing risk factors and enhancing protective factors

- **Stakeholder participation** based on national set-up but can include: Community organizations, Municipalities, Schools, Planet Youth partner organizations, federal and national organizations and governments

- Focus on using the data to evaluate and select the most **appropriate intervention strategies**, using the **Planet Youth toolbox** as a reference
The Planet Youth Toolbox
A few examples

- Dissemination of reports
- Empowerment of parents
- Friendship groups
- Organized leisure activities
- The leisure time-card
- Outside hours limitations
- Empowering NGOs
- A National/Local prevention day
- Campaigns
- And more

But it is up to the community stakeholders – with Planet Youth support to adapt and design the interventions that fit with their culture and context.
How does TRF work?
A hand up NOT A handout !!
CONSISTENT PROGRESS

OVER FIVE TO SEVEN YEARS

10%

70%

20%
The Rising Foundation Seven Year Journey

GROWING UP HEALTHY

“It’s like a safe family at High School.”

Working through our cycle of 12 Transformational Themes

- Building Character and Responsibility
- Strong Values Sense of Purpose
- Improved Career Prospects
- Reduced Substance Abuse
- Improved Overall Health
- Safer and Kinder as Partners
- Safer and Better as Parents
- More Hopeful for the Future

INTERMEDIATE | JUNIOR SCHOOL | SENIOR SCHOOL | TRANSITION TO THE WORKFORCE
TRF OFFERS A LIFE OF ADVENTURE, CHALLENGE AND ACHIEVEMENT
Attachment A

Item 8.2

TRF OFFERS GROWTH IN CULTURAL IDENTITY AND EXPOSURE TO THE RICH DIVERSITY OF NEW ZEALAND SOCIETY.

OUR COHORT INCLUDES:

NZ Maori 35%
Pacific Peoples 52%
NZ European 11%
Other 2%
TRF promotes the value of hard work and the importance of community involvement.

Our students learn commitment and responsibility in life.
TRF OFFERS OTHERWISE UNACHIEVEABLE EXPERIENCES. OUR CAMPS AND EXCURSIONS ARE SERIOUS FUN AND COVER RELEVANT THEMES OF LIFE
RESULTS

- Not just good enough to apply for funds and have a “Trust me” attitude towards effectiveness.
- Funders need to see results and so do we!!
- We survey external customers – Funders, Parents, Caregivers, Schools.
- We constantly monitor for internal improvements – (Kaizen type analysis).
- We are independently audited.
In the past year ...
91% of our students have gained confidence
85% of our students have gained leadership skills
92% of our students have gained self-respect
92% of our students have gained determination
91% of our students have gained purpose

This growth improves academic performance:
The Rising Foundation students across our five secondary schools achieved 88% NCEA pass rate for all students, versus school average across all schools of 65%.
SCHOOL LEADERSHIP ROLES

Across our five schools we currently have 2 Head Prefects, 12 Prefects, 10 House Leaders, 3 Peer Support Leaders and One Board of Trustees Representative.

Our students also won 48 Top Scholar, Cultural and Sporting Awards and gained major Academic Scholarships totalling $12,000.
POST SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

Last year, 39 Year 13 students graduated from our programme:

6 are at University
10 are at other Tertiary Institutions
16 are in Full-time employment
3 are in Part-time employment
4 are in Full-time training
CLOSING THE LOOP - JOBS !!

We prepare our students well for the transition from school into meaningful work.

We equip them in practical ways through drivers training and micro accreditation.

We train them to write good CVs and perform well in interviews.