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1 Welcome

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

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

4 Confirmation of Minutes
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Thursday, 19 March 2020, including the confidential section, and the extraordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Thursday, 7 May 2020, including the confidential section, as a true and correct.

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

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

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

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

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

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
To provide an update to the Puketāpapa Local Board (the Board) on transported related matters in the local board area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua  
Executive summary
1. This report updates the Board on regional and local matters including the Community Safety Fund, Local Board Transport Capital Fund, Frost and Carr Roads safety improvements and construction traffic issues.
2. The report also includes an update on a range of projects and issues.

Ngā tūtohunga  
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) receive the Auckland Transport April 2020 report

b) request Auckland Transport to provide rough orders of costs for the following projects:

   i) Traffic Calming in The Avenue, Lynfield
   ii) Tetra Traps in the May Road and Onehunga catchments
   iii) Bike Parking at Roskill South Shops, Mt Eden Road near Duke Street and at 90 Mt Albert Road
   iv) Five bus shelters
   v) A raised table on Beagle Avenue, Sandringham
   vi) Improvements to the Stoddard Road pedestrian crossing near Tory Street
   vii) A pedestrian refuge near Melrose Street shops
   viii) Cycleway extensions:
       • Sandringham Road – from Gifford Avenue to Mt Albert Road
       • Hillsborough Road from Mt Albert Road to the SW motorway
       • Dominion Road from the SW motorway to Roskill South
       • Hendry Avenue - resolve how the cycleway meets the footpath
   ix) Formalise the walkway under Hayr Road Bridge to join Melrose Rd
   x) Widen and improve the footpaths on Roseman Street and Christie Street and make a link to SH20 shared path
   xi) Add a pedestrian crossing on Queenstown Road, near Hendry Avenue.
Horopaki Context

3. 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.

4. This report updates the Puketāpapa Local Board on Auckland Transport (AT) projects and operations in the local board area, it updates the local board on their consultations and includes information on the status of the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) and Community Safety Fund (CSF).

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. 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).

6. The CSF is a capital budget established by Auckland Transport for use by local boards to fund local road safety initiatives. The purpose of this fund is to allow elected members to address long-standing local road safety issues that are not regional priorities and are therefore not being addressed by the Auckland Transport programme.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Local Board Capital Fund

7. For the 2019/22 term the Puketāpapa Local Board currently has $2,244,897. At its February workshop the Board were advised of the process for considering projects for potential funding. In the workshops in March and April the Board considered which projects it wishes to be assessed to get a rough order of costs (ROC).

8. These projects were to be workshopped in May for decision in June. However, with the restrictions on travel and meetings during levels four and three of the Covid 19 pandemic it has taken longer for most boards, including Puketāpapa to finalise the list of projects than originally planned. It is likely this will lead to the consideration of the RoC’s in June and decisions on projects to proceed to detailed design and construction in July.

9. The assessment of ‘Rough Order of Costs’ is also hampered by travel restrictions. In addition, some projects cannot be assessed until travel patterns, morning and evening peaks and “school runs” return to a semblance of pre-covid levels.

10. At the workshops, AT received clear direction on what projects the Board wished to be assessed and the internal assessment process is now underway. Projects that have been previously considered for the Local Board Capital Fund or the Community Safety Fund do not need be re-assessed but are included for completeness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Avenue Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Traffic calming on the Avenue between Commodore Drive and Halsey to reduce speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetra Traps</td>
<td>Tetra Traps to prevent solid waste entering waterways, May Round area and Onehunga Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Parking</td>
<td>Roskill South shops, Mt Eden Road near Duke St, 90 Mt Albert Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bus Shelters
- Two shelters on near Roskill South
- Mt Albert Road near Waite Street
- Hillsborough Road on the southern side between SH20 and Dominion Road where berm width and topography permits
- Mt Albert Road near Mt Roskill Road
- On Hillsborough Road for the 68 Bus Route

Beagle Ave
An additional raised table on Beagle Ave

Stoddard Road
Improved pedestrian crossing on Stoddard Road near Tory Street

Melrose Road
Pedestrian Refuge near the shops

Cycle Way Extensions
Sandringham Rd extended up to Mt Albert Rd, Hillsborough Rd extended from Mt Albert Rd to the SW cycleway, off the SW cycleway towards Roskill South on Dominion Rd, Hendry Ave resolve how the cycle way joins the footpath

Walkway
Formalise the walkway under Hayr Road Bridge to join Melrose Rd

Footpath enhancement
Widen and improve the footpaths on Roseman and Christie and make a link to SH20 shared path

Pedestrian Crossing
Queenstown Road near Hendry Ave

### Community Safety Fund

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

i) 65 Hillsborough Road to provide a safe crossing place ($90,000)

ii) 244 Hillsborough Road pedestrian crossing facility ($338,000)

iii) 383 Hillsborough Road pedestrian crossing facility ($348,000)

iv) 639 Richardson Road pedestrian crossing facility ($15,000)

v) Pah Road crossing awareness ($10,000)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

13. Since then AT staff have been assessing the projects that were able to be funded with the Board’s allocation. These being:
11. 383 Hillsborough Road pedestrian crossing facility ($348,000)
12. 639 Richardson Road pedestrian crossing facility ($15,000)
13. Pah Road crossing awareness ($10,000)
14. Safety measures around Wesley Primary School ($130,000)

14. It is recommended that the board request that one of the community safety fund projects that is currently unfunded be put forward for detailed design. This would enable the project to be progressed in the near future and be funded from the remaining Community Safety Fund and “topped up” by Local Board Capital Fund. That way the Board can fully utilise its community safety fund.

15. The Board may also wish to consider the currently un-funded CSF projects as part of its list of projects that may be funded in the upcoming Local Board Capital Fund allocation.

16. The updates on these projects are below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossing at 383 Hillsborough Rd, by Waikōwhai Primary (CSF)</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Project team is preparing the consultation documents for new signalised pedestrian crossing near Waikōwhai School. Timeframes for consultation are yet to be confirmed due to current COVID-19 situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossing improvements at 639 Richardson Rd, by Waikōwhai Intermediate and Hay Park School (CSF)</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Project team is awaiting project estimate and delivery timeframes from contractor to install red carpet SLOW patches on 639 Richardson Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pah Road crossing awareness (CSF)</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Project team is currently processing procurement for installing the electronic feedback signs on Pah Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter Ave raised table to replace kea crossing for Wesley Primary School (CSF)</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Project team is preparing the consultation documents for upgrading existing kea crossing on Potter Ave to a raised zebra crossing. Timeframes for consultation are yet to be confirmed due to current COVID-19 situation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frost and Carr Roads Safety Improvements

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

18. The project began in early March but was put on hold when the Government went to Alert Level 4. The site was made safe and works stopped.

19. Once New Zealand dropped to Alert Level 3 works recommenced. Beginning with the completion of stage one, near the school. For the week beginning 4 May the works are to reconstruct concrete footpath, install tactile pavers and subcontractor to install streetlights.

20. With the changes in school term times and reduced traffic, a revised schedule will be developed and the Board informed.
Item 11

Issues with Construction Projects

21. AT has always received and responded to issues related to construction projects. Now that the Unitary Plan is mostly operative, there are large number of apartments, in particular, being constructed.

22. Over the last few months and particularly in the lead up to Christmas 2019, AT received a number of complaints about parking in relation to construction projects. These developments are consented via Auckland Council’s regulatory team. In some cases, AT staff has input about parking, changes in vehicle access ways and traffic implications, however, sometimes not. Some of these developments are notified for public input, but many are not, as they are allowed if they are largely in accord with provisions of the unitary plan.

23. Where the construction methodology does require the temporary occupation of the road corridor, a traffic management plan is required. These are administered by AT and once the plan is in place, they are audited. Where the nearby parking is unrestricted construction vehicles are permitted to park there, as is any other vehicle. Where there is an illegally parked vehicle, such as across a driveway, the quickest was to get enforcement is to call 09 355 3553.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

24. 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

30. Consideration of impacts and opportunities for engagement will be carried out on an individual project basis.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
31. There are no specific financial implications that result from receiving this report. The decision to confirm the Local Board projects for assessment will have implications when the RoC’s are reported back.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
32. The proposed decision of receiving this report has no risks. Auckland Transport has risk management strategies in place for the transport projects undertaken in the local board area.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
33. For a number of these issues further updates via memo or workshop will occur before the next business meeting.
34. The RoC’s will be reported to the June or July meetings.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories
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Approval for two new road names at 16-18, 22-24 Freeland Avenue & 2A-2C Burnett Avenue, and 3-7, 21-25 Sanft Avenue, Mt Roskill

File No.: CP2020/05473

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Puketāpapa Local Board to name two new private roads, both being commonly owned access lots, created by way of a subdivision development at 16-18, 22-24 Freeland Avenue & 2A-2C Burnett Avenue, and 3-7, 21-25 Sanft Avenue, Mt Roskill.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Auckland Council’s road naming guidelines 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. Kāinga Ora have proposed the names presented in the tables below for consideration by the Local Board.
4. Any of the six 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.
5. The proposed names for the two new private roads are:

**COAL 1** (16-18, 22-24 Freeland Avenue & 2A-2C Burnett Avenue, Mt Roskill):
- Rerenga Lane (Applicant preferred)
- Toku Wāhi Lane (Alternative 1)
- Pukewiwi Lane (Alternative 2)

**COAL 2** (3-7, 21-25 Sanft Avenue, Mt Roskill):
- Nekuneku Lane (Applicant preferred)
- Tausiga Lane (Alternative 1)
- Te Ako Tonu Lane (Alternative 2)

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) approve the name (**local board to insert chosen name**) (‘COAL 1’) for the new private road created by way of subdivision at 16-18, 22-24 Freeland Avenue & 2A-2C Burnett Avenue in Mount Roskill in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974 (resource consent reference BUN60330751 and...
Puketapapa Local Board
21 May 2020

Item 12

b) approve the name (local board to insert chosen name) (‘COAL 2’) for the new private road created by way of subdivision at 3-7, 21-25 Sanft Avenue, Mt Roskill in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974 (resource consent reference BUN60333322 and SUB60333323).

Horopaki
Context

6. 16-18, 22-24 Freeland Avenue & 2A-2C Burnett Avenue
Resource consent BUN60330751 (subdivision reference number SUB60330753) was issued in May 2019 for the development of seven residential units and one commonly owned access lot (COAL).

7. 3-7, 21-25 Sanft Avenue, Mt Roskill
Resource consent BUN60333322 (subdivision reference number SUB60333323) was issued in April 2019 for the development of thirteen residential units and one commonly owned access lot (COAL).

8. The six proposed names were first submitted by the applicant to the 20 September 2018 Puketapapa business meeting (CP2018/16758) for consideration at neighbouring sites in Mount Roskill. The names were not chosen by the board in 2018, and having been checked and confirmed by Council and LINZ that they are still acceptable for use in 2020, the applicant has resubmitted the names for the two roads included in this report.

9. In accordance with the National Addressing Standards for road naming (the AS/NZS 4819-2011 standard), the COALs require a road name because they serve more than five lots.

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 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.

12. 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road number</th>
<th>Proposed Name</th>
<th>Meaning as described by the applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COAL 1</td>
<td>Rerenga Lane</td>
<td>&quot;Rerenga can translate to ‘Sunrise’ in Te Reo Māori - Bringing light in a new voyage/journey. Rerenga can also mean new beginnings which resonates with the people of Mount Roskill, whether it is new beginnings in a new home or anything else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Applicant Preferred)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they endeavour throughout their life. Roskill development is a large scale redevelopment of new homes in Mount Roskill. With any difficult circumstances in life, it can seem long and challenging at times. But with challenge and change - comes growth. The redevelopment of Mt Roskill is no different. What is important about the redevelopment of homes and communities is the important kaupapa or the ‘why’ we are doing it. Shedding light about the kaupapa on a voyage/journey is important and this sentiment can resonate with the current and new residents of the community. Rerenga is a ātaahua word in a language that relates to cultures predominantly in Mount Roskill.”

**Toku Wāhi Lane (Alternative 1)**

“Toku Wāhi means ‘My Place’ in Te Reo Māori. Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities places vulnerable New Zealanders into homes that need it. There is a large number of state homes in the area of Roskill South and the people that live there or will move in there may not have had a place to call their own often in their lives. As part of the redevelopment we are building more homes to ensure that more vulnerable people have a chance to really call their home or community ‘My Place’. Toku Wāhi is a ātaahua phrase in a language that relates to cultures predominantly in Mount Roskill.”

**Pukewiwi Lane (Alternative 2)**

“Pukewiwi and Puketāpapa are both gazetted names for the suburb Mount Roskill. This name was chosen previously as it holds significance in Mt Roskill being an official name for the area and in a language that relates to cultures predominantly in Mt Roskill.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road number</th>
<th>Proposed Name</th>
<th>Meaning as described by the applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3-7         | Nekuneku Lane (Applicant Preferred) | “Nekuneku means ‘Sunset’ in Te Reo Māori - To let go of what has been.  
The redevelopment of Roskill South meant that a lot of old homes on underutilised land had to be removed from the community. These homes have been there for a long period of time which surpassed their life span. Regardless, it would have been difficult to see them go – there were memories, relationships, journeys’ etc. that were developed in these homes. But as one door closes, another will open - however there will always be memories and lessons learnt from the past. This idea of ‘Sunset’ or ‘to let go of what has been’ can correlate with not only the old homes of Mount Roskill, but the end of any chapter in one’s life. Nekuneku is a ātaahua word in a language that relates to cultures predominantly in Mount Roskill.” |
| 21-25       | “Toku Wāhi means ‘My Place’ in Te Reo Māori. Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities places vulnerable New Zealanders into homes that need it. There is a large number of state homes in the area of Rosskill South and the people that live there or will move in there may not have had a place to call their own often in their lives. As part of the redevelopment we are building more homes to ensure that more vulnerable people have a chance to really call their home or community ‘My Place’. Toku Wāhi is a ātaahua phrase in a language that relates to cultures predominantly in Mount Roskill.” |
| 3-7         | “Pukewiwi and Puketāpapa are both gazetted names for the suburb Mount Roskill. This name was chosen previously as it holds significance in Mt Roskill being an official name for the area and in a language that relates to cultures predominantly in Mt Roskill.” |
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| Tausiga Lane (Alternative 1) | “Tausiga means ‘Care’ in the Samoan language. Care was one of the core values of Housing New Zealand. As our new values are being formulated, there is no doubt that ‘Care’ will be imbedded into our culture and practices. Kāinga Ora houses about 187000 vulnerable people and holds approximately 65000 homes. With a high number of state homes in Roskill South, we hope that care is imbedded into the community also. Tausiga is a aulelei word in a language that relates to cultures predominantly in Mount Roskill.” |
| Te Ako Tonu Lane (Alternative 2) | “Te Ako Tonu means ‘Learning/Innovate’ in Te Reo Māori. Learning/Innovate was one of the core values of Housing New Zealand. As our new values are being formulated, there is no doubt that ‘Learning/Innovate’ will be imbedded into Kāinga Ora’s culture and practices. Innovation is exactly what we are doing in Mount Roskill by redeveloping and introducing new homes and way of life in the community. There is always room to grow and learn new ideas and this sentiment can correlate into the lives of those within the community. Te Ako Tonu is a ātaahua phrase in a language that relates to cultures predominantly in Mount Roskill.” |

14. **Assessment:** 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.

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

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

17. **Iwi and community consultation:** Kāinga Ora consulted with mana whenua and the local communities before the names were submitted to the board in 2018. No objections were received for any of the proposed names included in this report.

On the 12th December 2019, Kāinga Ora contacted local iwi groups again for feedback or to suggest any new names. Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara responded in support of the names, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua deferred to other iwi groups, who in turn did not respond.

No other 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 the two private roads.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

18. 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
19. 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
20. The decision sought for this report does not trigger any significant policy and is not considered to have any immediate local impact beyond those outlined in this report.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
21. The naming of roads 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 publicly demonstrate Māori identity. To aid Local Board decision making, the ‘Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines’ includes:
   • The Objective of recognising ancestral linkages to areas of land by engagement with mana whenua and the allocation of road names as appropriate and a Principle that Māori road names are actively encouraged, and;
   • An agreed process to enable mana whenua to provide timely feedback on all proposed road names in a manner they consider appropriate.
22. The road names proposed in this report have been provided to all mana whenua for consideration through council’s central facilitator. Where feedback has been received, this has been indicated.
23. Five Māori road name options have been proposed.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
24. 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
25. 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
26. Approved road names are notified to Land Information New Zealand which records them on its New Zealand wide land information database which includes street addresses issued by local councils.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Site Plan</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Location Plan</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Elizabeth Salter - Subdivision Technical Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>David Snowdon - Team Leader Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki &amp; Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Plan for 16-18, 22-24 Freeland Avenue & 2A-2C Burnett Avenue, Mt Roskill

New Road Name as more than 6 units off of JoAL
Units 1-7. The others use existing.

Approval for two new road names at 16-18, 22-24 Freeland Avenue & 2A-2C Burnett Avenue, and 3-7, 21-25 Sanft Avenue, Mt Roskill
Approval for two new road names at 16-18, 22-24 Freeland Avenue & 2A-2C Burnett Avenue, and 3-7, 21-25 Sanft Avenue, Mt Roskill
Approval for two new road names at 16-18, 22-24 Freeland Avenue & 2A-2C Burnett Avenue, and 3-7, 21-25 Sanft Avenue, Mt Roskill
Attachment B

Item 12

Location plan for 16-18, 22-24 Freeland Avenue & 2A-2C Burnett Avenue and 3-7, 21-25 Sanft Avenue, Mt Roskill

Approval for two new road names at 16-18, 22-24 Freeland Avenue & 2A-2C Burnett Avenue, and 3-7, 21-25 Sanft Avenue, Mt Roskill
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Puketāpapa Local Board to name a new private road, being a commonly owned access lot, created by way of a subdivision development at 2-4 & 6 Budock Road, Hillsborough.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Auckland Council’s road naming guidelines 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. On behalf of the developer and applicant, Budock Prop Ltd, agent Plan Co Limited have proposed the names presented in the tables 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.
5. The proposed names for the new private road at 2-4 & 6 Budock Road, Hillsborough are:
   - Borough Lane (Applicant Preferred)
   - Monte Cecilia Lane (Alternative 1)
   - Pah Hill Lane (Alternative 2)

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
   a) approve the name (local board to insert approved name) for the new private road created by way of subdivision at 2-4 & 6 Budock Road, Hillsborough in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974 (resource consent reference BUN60332602 & SUB60332604).

Horopaki
Context
6. Resource consent BUN60332602 (subdivision reference number SUB60332604) was issued in March 2019 for the construction of 11 new townhouses and one commonly owned access lot (COAL). The COAL will serve the rear 6 dwellings.
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 five lots.
8. Site and location plans of the development can be found in Attachments A and B respectively.
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. **Theme:** The applicant has proposed names that reflect the name of the development (‘The Borough’), as well as the history of Pah Homestead and the surrounding local landmarks.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed name</th>
<th>Meaning as described by applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borough Lane</td>
<td>The proposed name ‘Borough’ is derived from the name of the suburb being Hillsborough, which was named after James Carlton Hill who left the land to the City for use as a public domain in his 1858 will.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Applicant preferred)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Cecilia Lane</td>
<td>The historic Pah Homestead mansion in Hillsborough was purchased by the Roman Catholic Church in 1913 and renamed Monte Cecilia. Throughout the years, a number of sites have paid homage to this initial naming, with the opening of Monte Cecilia Primary School and Monte Cecilia Park. Being within the vicinity of these sites, the proposed name ‘Monte Cecilia Lane’ continues to pay homage to their local landmarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Alternative 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pah Hill Lane</td>
<td>Through researching the history of Hillsborough, Pah Homestead was found to be constructed for James Williamson on the Pah Farm estate in 1877-79. Aptly referred to as “The House on the Hill”, the proposed name ‘Pah Hill Lane’ is reflective of this historical dwelling which was once allegedly the largest house ever built in New Zealand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Alternative 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

15. **Road type:** ‘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. **Iwi Consultation:** All relevant local iwi were written to (via email) and invited to comment.

   Nga Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara deferred to whanaunga Ngati Whatua Orakei, who in turn did not respond.

   No other 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.
Approval for a new road name at 2-4 & 6 Budock Road, Hillsborough.

**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. The decision sought for this report does not trigger any significant policy and is not considered to have any immediate local impact beyond those outlined in this report.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

20. The naming of roads 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 publicly demonstrate Māori identity. To aid Local Board decision making, the ‘Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines’ includes:

- The Objective of recognising ancestral linkages to areas of land by engagement with mana whenua and the allocation of road names as appropriate and a Principle that Māori road names are actively encouraged, and;

- An agreed process to enable mana whenua to provide timely feedback on all proposed road names in a manner they consider appropriate.

21. The road names proposed in this report have been provided to all mana whenua for consideration through council’s central facilitator. Where feedback has been received, this has been indicated.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

22. 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 whakamaaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

23. 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**

24. Approved road names are notified to Land Information New Zealand which records them on its New Zealand wide land information database which includes street addresses issued by local councils.
Approval for a new road name at 2 - 4 & 6 Budock Road, Hillsborough.
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Approval for a new road name at 2 - 4 & 6 Budock Road, Hillsborough.
Approval for a new road name at 2 - 4 & 6 Budock Road, Hillsborough.
Approval for a new road name at 2 - 4 & 6 Budock Road, Hillsborough.
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To update the Puketāpapa Local Board on Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku) activities within the local board area and the region for the six months from 1 August 2019 to 31 January 2020.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Panuku is charged with balancing financial and non-financial outcomes in order to create and manage sustainable and resilient places where people want to live, work, invest, learn and visit. The activities of Panuku cover four broad areas:
   - redevelopment of urban locations, leveraging off council owned land assets, mostly within existing suburbs
   - review of, and where appropriate, redevelopment of council non-service property
   - management of council property assets including commercial, residential, and marina infrastructure
   - other property related services such as redevelopment incorporating a service delivery function, strategic property advice, acquisitions and disposals.
3. Panuku currently manages one commercial interest in the Puketāpapa Local Board area.
4. One property is currently under review as part of our rationalisation process.
5. One property was purchased in the Puketāpapa Local Board area during the six months reporting period.
6. No properties were sold in the Puketāpapa Local Board area during the six months reporting period.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
   a) receive the Panuku Development Auckland Six Monthly Local Board Report for 1 August 2019 to 31 January 2020.

Horopaki
Context
7. Panuku helps to rejuvenate parts of Auckland, from small projects that refresh a site or building, to major transformations of town centres or neighbourhoods.
8. The Auckland Plan is the roadmap to deliver on Auckland’s vision to be a world class city, Panuku plays a significant role in achieving the ‘Homes and Places’ and ‘Belonging and Participation’ outcomes.


10. Panuku manages around $3 billion of council’s non-service property portfolio, which is continuously reviewed to find smart ways to generate income for the region, grow the portfolio, or release land or property that can be better used by others. “Non-service properties” are Council owned properties that are not used to deliver Council, or CCO, services.

11. As at 31 December 2019, the Panuku managed regional property portfolio comprises 1674 properties, containing 1035 leases. This includes vacant land, industrial buildings, warehouses, retail shops, cafes, offices, medical centres, and a large portfolio of residential rental homes.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

12. Panuku is contributing commercial input into approximately 50 region-wide council-driven renewal and housing supply initiatives.

13. Panuku works with partners and stakeholders over the course of a project. It also champions best practice project delivery, to achieve best value outcomes within defined cost, time and quality parameters.

14. Below is a high-level update on activities in the Puketāpapa Local Board area:

Properties managed in the Puketāpapa Local Board Area

15. Panuku currently manages one commercial interest within the Puketāpapa Local Board area.

Portfolio strategy

Optimisation

16. Optimisation is a self-funding development approach, targeting sub-optimal service assets approved in 2015. The process requires agreement between Community Facilities, Panuku and local boards and is led by Panuku. It is designed to equal or enhance levels of service to the local community in a reconfigured form while delivering on strategic outcomes, such as housing or urban regeneration while not impacting on council rates.

17. Using optimisation, underperforming assets will have increased lower maintenance and operating costs, improved service delivery, while benefiting from co-location of other complimentary services or commercial activities. Optimisation frees up undercapitalised development opportunities such as air space, full sites, or part sites.

18. Using optimisation as a redevelopment and funding tool, the Local Board can maximise efficiencies from service assets while maintaining levels of service through the release of some, or all, of that property for sale or development.

19. Local boards are allocated decision making for the disposal of local service property and reinvestment of sale proceeds in accordance with the service property optimisation approach.
20. Panuku is required to undertake ongoing rationalisation of the council’s non-service assets. This includes identifying properties from within the council’s portfolio that may be suitable for potential sale and/or development if appropriate. Panuku has a focus on achieving housing and urban regeneration outcomes.

21. Identifying potential sale properties contributes to the Auckland Plan focus of accommodating the significant growth projected for the region over the coming decades, through a more efficient use of resources to achieve its activities and projects.

**Performance**

22. Panuku works closely with Auckland Council and Auckland Transport to identify potential surplus properties to help achieve disposal targets.

23. Target for July 2018 to June 2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review</td>
<td>$30 million disposal 'recommendations'</td>
<td>$30.4 million disposal recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**July 2019 to June 2021 Target**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Review</td>
<td>$45m disposal recommendations.</td>
<td>$20 million disposal recommendations as at 28 February 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Process**

24. Once identified as no longer delivering the council service use for which it was acquired, a property is taken through a multi-stage rationalisation process. The agreed process includes engagement with council departments and CCOs, the local board and mana whenua. This is followed by Panuku board approval, engagement with the local ward councillors, the Independent Māori Statutory Board and finally, a Governing Body decision.

**Under review**

25. Properties currently under review in the Puketāpapa Local Board area are listed below. The list includes any properties that may have recently been approved for sale or development and sale by the governing body.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plantation Reserve (119A) May Road, Mt Roskill</td>
<td>Plantation Reserve is a long narrow site that was vested with the former Mount Roskill Borough Council upon subdivision in 1952. The site is subject to right of way easements for a number of adjoining residential properties. Plantation Reserve is a recreation reserve subject to the Reserves Act 1977. Due to its configuration and limited open space values it was subject to rationalisation. In 2019 Council departments and CCOs confirmed no alternate public work requirement or planned and funded future strategic need to retain Plantation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 14

Reserve.
Panuku Local Board consultation occurred in 2015, 2019 and 2020.
Panuku is addressing concerns raised by the board and will report back in 2020 for a formal position on a proposed disposal.

Acquisitions and disposals

26. Panuku manages the acquisition and disposal of property on behalf of Auckland Council.
Panuku purchases property for development, roads, infrastructure projects and other services. These properties may be sold with or without contractual requirements for development.

Acquisitions

27. Panuku does not decide which properties to buy in a local board area. Instead, it is asked to negotiate the terms and conditions of a purchase on behalf of the council.
28. Panuku has purchased 8 properties for open space across Auckland in the time period between 01 August 2019 and 31 January 2020 at a cost of $28.2 million.
29. One property has been purchased in the Puketāpapa Local Board area during the reporting period for open space.
30. All land acquisition committee resolutions contain a confidentiality clause due to the commercially sensitive nature of ongoing transactions, and thus cannot be reported on while in process.

Disposals

31. In the reporting period between 01 August 2019 and 31 January 2020, the Panuku disposals team has entered into five sale and purchase agreements, with an estimated value of $3.6 million of unconditional net sales proceeds.
32. Panuku 2019/20 disposals target is $24 million for the year. The disposals target is agreed with the council and is reviewed on an annual basis.
33. No property has been sold in the Puketāpapa Local Board area during the reporting period.

Under review

34. No properties are currently under review in the Puketāpapa Local Board area.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

35. The Panuku Priority Location programmes support regeneration of existing town centres, developing underutilised sites within the urban area, close to transport links. Increasing the density of housing results in reduced carbon emissions through improved utilisation of existing infrastructure and transit-oriented development. The provision of easy, safe and attractive walking and cycling routes reduces reliance on private motor vehicles and enables low carbon lifestyles. Panuku has adopted a minimum standard of a Homestar 6 rating for all homes, resulting in warmer, drier and more energy efficient buildings.
36. Climate change increases the probability of hotter temperatures and more frequent flooding and drought in the Puketāpapa Local Board Area. Panuku seeks to future-proof our communities by:
   a) specifying adaptation and resilience in the design of buildings and spaces.
b) specifying that infrastructure and developments are designed to cope with warmer temperatures and extreme weather events.

c) use of green infrastructure and water sensitive design for increased flood resilience, ecological and biodiversity benefits

d) provision of increased shade and shelter for storm events and hotter days.

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

37. The views of the council group are incorporated on a project by project basis.

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

38. Any local or sub-regional impacts related to local activities are considered on a project by project basis.

39. Panuku requests that all feedback and/or queries relating to a property in the local board area be directed in the first instance to localboard@developmentauckland.co.nz.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement**

40. Panuku works collaboratively with mana whenua on a range of projects including potential property disposals, development sites in the rohe and commercial opportunities. Engagement can be on specific individual properties and projects at an operational level with kaitiaki representatives, or with the Panuku Mana Whenua Governance Forum who have a broader mandate.

41. Panuku will continue to partner with Māori on opportunities which enhance Māori social and economic wellbeing.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications**

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

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

43. There are no risks associated with receiving this report.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri Next steps**

44. The next six-monthly update is scheduled for September 2020.

**Ngā tāpirihanga Attachments**

There are no attachments for this report.
Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Lisa Gooding - Senior Engagement Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki &amp; Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To adopt the Puketāpapa 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 Puketāpapa Grants Programme 2020/2021 for adoption as provided in Attachment A to this report).

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) adopt the Puketāpapa Grants Programme 2020/2021, with two local and one quick response grant round.

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 Puketāpapa 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 prioritising of projects which:
   - support community resilience and recovery, in response to the COVID-19 crisis and
     - demonstrate how a project will proceed at each COVID-19 alert level
     - demonstrate how a group will reach the more vulnerable in our community

11. The local board has also requested further advice on options to vary the number of quick response grant rounds in the 2020/2021 grant programme. The options are outlined in the table below, with accompanying benefits and disadvantages for each option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Grant rounds</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status Quo Two local Two quick response</td>
<td>The community is familiar with the grant rounds that were previously available, so they plan their projects accordingly</td>
<td>The budget for 2020/2021 may not allow for two quick response grant rounds. The grant rounds are always oversubscribed and expectations would be raised that funding is available to cover the grant requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two local and one quick response round.</td>
<td>The ability to choose the right round for the size of the funding requested. It offers a good spread of rounds throughout the financial year.</td>
<td>With only one quick response round offered, smaller projects would only have one opportunity to apply. Applicants will be limited by the maximum amount of $1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Staff recommend that the grant programme for 2020/2021 is adopted with two local and one quick response round.

13. This would ensure good coverage of grant rounds over the financial year. It would also not raise expectations from the community on the ability of the local board to fund activities, due to the forecast of more constrained budgets in 2020/2021.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

14. 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
15. The grants programme has no identified impacts on council-controlled organisations and therefore their views are not required.
16. 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
17. 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
18. 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
19. 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
20. 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
21. 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>A</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Grants Programme 2020/2021</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Moumita Dutta - Senior Grants Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Marion Davies - Grants and Incentives Manager</td>
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Item 15
Puketāpapa Local Board – Local Grants Programme 2020/2021

Our Local Grants Programme aims to provide community grants to local communities through public and open grant rounds.

Outcomes sought by the Puketāpapa Local Board

Our grants programme will be targeted towards supporting the following outcomes, as outlined in our local board plan:

- Connected communities with a sense of belonging
- Improved wellbeing and safety
- Thriving local economy and good job opportunities
- Transport choices meet our varied travel needs
- Urban developments meet community needs
- Vibrant and popular parks and facilities
- Treasured and enhanced natural environment

Our priorities sought from grant applications

The Puketāpapa Local Board welcomes grant applications that align with the following local board plan priorities:

Note: these priorities relate to the local board initiatives as outlined in the local board plan:

- Our cultural diversity is valued and communities feel recognized and included
- People want to learn about and contribute to their neighbourhoods and society
- Neighbourhoods where people know each other and feel safe and valued
- Local character and heritage is widely celebrated and reflected through arts, culture and language
- Provisions and promotion of opportunities and services supporting healthy and active lifestyles
- The community has the skills and knowledge to protect the local environment

Higher priorities:

The Puketāpapa Local Board will prioritise projects which:

- support community resilience and recovery, in response to the COVID-19 crisis and
  - demonstrate how a project will proceed at each COVID-19 alert level
  - demonstrate how a group will reach the more vulnerable in our community
• demonstrate collaboration e.g. involves working with other like-minded organisations and/or different parts of the community
• seek other funding
• addresses two or more of the "Five ways of Wellbeing" outlined by the Mental Health Foundation NZ
• support and promote volunteerism
• can demonstrate community match funding (groups who demonstrate that 40% of project costs have already been met, including the approximate value provided by volunteers as a contribution to projects, events and/or initiatives)
• encourages people to engage with their wider community
• projects or events that align with the healthy environment principles of:
  ❖ water is the first choice
  ❖ good kai (food) for all
  ❖ smokefree, alcohol and drug free movement is encouraged
  ❖ promotes waste reduction initiatives

Lower Priorities:

The Puketāpapa Local Board has identified the following activities as lower priorities:

• entry fees for programmes or events
• projects or events that are outside the local board area
• air travel and overseas costs
• wages or operational costs with the exception of fees for professional and specialised services.
• transport costs unless there is strong evidence of the benefits to the community.
• catering
• gifts/prizes
• grants which support the purchase of assets and/or equipment with limited future use (single use)
• fundraising activities for a group or organization
• activities that primarily benefit a third party (e.g. activity to gain money for an organisation)

Eligibility

Refer to paragraphs 71, 72 and 73 of the Community Grants Policy:

Commercial entities may apply for grants only where there is a clear and direct benefit for the wider community. “Profit generated by a grant-funded project, event or activity may only be retained by the grant recipient if it is reinvested in a social, environmental or cultural mission.”

In addition to the eligibility criteria outlined in the Community Grants Policy, the Puketāpapa Local Board will not fund:

• projects and activities where funding is the responsibility of central government (e.g. core education, primary health care);
• schools, unless one of the following can be demonstrated:
  ❖ community need and benefit to the wider community
  ❖ accessibility to the public out of school hours
• applicants who have failed to complete or provide a satisfactory accountability form from previous grants
• individuals or sole traders or limited liability companies; unless the benefit to the wider
community can be demonstrated
- applications towards alcohol or liquor licenses.
- groups requesting funding below the minimum or over the maximum amount set.

Applicants can only apply for the same project or activity once every financial year.

Investment approach

The Puketāpapa Local Board grant rounds will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant name</th>
<th>Quick Response Grants</th>
<th>Local Project Grants</th>
<th>Strategic Relationships Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum and maximum amounts</td>
<td>Minimum amount per grant: $300</td>
<td>Minimum amount per grant: $1,000</td>
<td>Indicative amount per grant: $10,000 - $20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rounds per year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Small (quick response) grants to supplement other funding to ensure a project/event can take place.</td>
<td>Medium (local) sized grants</td>
<td>Large (strategic) grants to support organisations that are delivering on outcomes that are aligned with the board’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accountability measures for Local and Quick Response Grants:

The Puketāpapa Local Board requires that all successful applicants provide:
- photos of the activity
- invitations to the local board for any event or function funded, are requested
- public acknowledgement of local board funding including the use of the local board logo on any advertising materials
- meet council standard financial accountability requirement

Application and decision dates for 2020/2021 will be as follows:

a) Quick Response - choose one option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant round</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One (proposed)</td>
<td>28 September 2020</td>
<td>23 October 2020</td>
<td>10 December 2020</td>
<td>11 December 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One (proposed)</td>
<td>12 April 2021</td>
<td>7 May 2021</td>
<td>17 June 2021</td>
<td>1 July 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Local Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>17 September 2020</td>
<td>1 October 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>8 February 2021</td>
<td>19 March 2021</td>
<td>20 May 2021</td>
<td>1 June 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-board funding

The Puketāpapa Local Board welcomes multi-board funding applications. However, the activity or initiative will need to clearly benefit the Puketāpapa community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiboard grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Grant Round One</td>
<td>15 June 2020</td>
<td>7 August 2020</td>
<td>17 September 2020</td>
<td>1 October 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Grant Round Two</td>
<td>18 January 2021</td>
<td>19 March 2021</td>
<td>20 May 2021</td>
<td>1 June 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Puketāpapa Local Board funding opportunities:

c) Neighbours Day 2021

Applications will be open for Neighbours Day in February 2021, for events around the national Neighbours Day Aotearoa.

Please contact the Puketāpapa Local Board office at the Fickling Centre, 546 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings or phone (09) 367 4301

d) Strategic Relationships Grant 2021/2022

Applications for the Strategic Relationships Grant will be available in 2020/2021 for projects in 2021/2022. For further information, please refer to the Strategic Relationships Grant Terms of Reference or check the Auckland Council website.
Puketāpapa Local Grants and Multiboard Round Two 2019/2020 and Puketāpapa Quick Response Round Two 2019/2020 grant allocations

File No.: CP2020/05852

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To fund, part-fund or decline the applications received for Puketāpapa Local Grants Round Two 2019/2020 including multiboard applications and Puketāpapa Quick Response Round Two 2019/2020.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report presents applications received in Puketāpapa Local Grants Round Two 2019/2020 (refer Attachment B) including multiboard applications (Attachment C) and Puketāpapa Quick Response Round Two 2019/2020 (Attachment D).
4. The local board has set a total community grants budget of $75,640 for the 2019/2020 financial year. A total of $37,755.85 was allocated in previous grant rounds, this leaves a total of $37,884.15 to be allocated to one local grants and one quick response round including one multiboard round.
5. Eight applications were received for Local Grants Round Two 2019/2020, requesting a total of $29,894 and sixteen multiboard applications were also received requesting a total of $43,573.02.
6. Two applications were received for Puketāpapa Quick Response, Round Two 2019/2020, requesting a total of $1,999.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
a) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application received in Puketāpapa Round Two, listed in Table One.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-202</td>
<td>St John's Presbyterian Church (Mt. Roskill)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of new chairs, a commercial fridge and renovating &quot;St John's Presbyterian Church's Community Hall's&quot; toilet and kitchen facilities.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Main focus</td>
<td>Requesting funding for</td>
<td>Amount requested</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-203</td>
<td>Basava Samithi of Australasia (NZ Chapter) Inc</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of venue hire and volunteer and facilitator costs for the &quot;Community Development&quot; programme.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-204</td>
<td>Auckland Sexual Abuse Help Foundation Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards resources, transport and operating costs to deliver the &quot;We Can Keep Safe&quot; preschool programme.</td>
<td>$2,111.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-206</td>
<td>Roopa Aur Aap Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs to provide counseling services and victim support services to victims of family violence.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-207</td>
<td>Bhartiya Samaj Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of running an elderly support programme, specifically venue hire and transport to celebrate the organisation's Silver Jubilee Anniversary.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-208</td>
<td>Blue Light Ventures Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the cost of tickets to &quot;Rainbows End&quot; for 150 youth from the Puketapapa local board area.</td>
<td>$3,783.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-209</td>
<td>Youthline Auckland Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the supervision and triage support staff wages.</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2015-201</td>
<td>Rise 2020</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of exercise gear.</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$29,894.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Grant Reference</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>MB1920-2100</td>
<td>The Kids for Kids Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the National Young Leaders Day and the &quot;Kids for Kids&quot; mass choir event, including venue hire from 8 to 11 November 2020.</td>
<td>2,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MB1920-2115</td>
<td>The Operating Theatre Trust, trading as Tim Bray Theatre Company</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the 'Gift a Seat' outreach programme to enable children from low decile schools to experience live children’s theatre from 21 September to 18 December 2020.</td>
<td>3,160.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MB1920-2122</td>
<td>Action Education Incorporated</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the annual cost of office rent from 1 June 2020 to 31 May 2021.</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MB1920-203</td>
<td>Epsom Chinese Association Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards venue hire (Fickling Centre), marketing, performers fee and workshop materials for a community day on 25 July 2020.</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MB1920-206</td>
<td>KidsCan Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards programme items food, raincoats, shoes and socks for children attending KidsCan low decile partner schools within the Auckland region.</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MB1920-240</td>
<td>Recreate NZ</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs of volunteers’ expenses, facilitator fees and activity expenses to run 'Urban Youth&quot; events between May 2020 till April 2021.</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MB1920-243</td>
<td>Anxiety New Zealand Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards venue hire, psychologist fees, printed resources and administration costs to deliver a series of community workshops from June 2020 to May 2021.</td>
<td>1,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MB1920-294</td>
<td>OUTLine New Zealand Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards a portion of general operating expenses including telephone and internet costs, printing, insurance, clinical supervision wages, training fees and volunteer</td>
<td>1,050.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-2110</td>
<td>Social Enterprise Auckland Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards a zoom webinar, venue hire, food and drink, administration, donations, project management, video editing and contractor costs.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-2106</td>
<td>PHAB Association (Auckland) Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards operational costs, including youth worker wages, activity costs, administration and coordination fees from May to April 2021.</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-2109</td>
<td>LifeKidz Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards play equipment and support worker wages.</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-2111</td>
<td>Deaf Wellbeing Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the fortnightly zero waste workshops at the Melville Cricket Pavilion from 6 August 2020 to 24 June 2021.</td>
<td>$2,345.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-216</td>
<td>The ReCreators</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards online workshop costs including materials, webinar costs, tool usage, design, advertising, registration and preparation for the events</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-278</td>
<td>New Zealand Eid Day Trust Board</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs of security, audio-visual equipment, sound, and cleaning to host New Zealand Eid Day 2020 - Eid-ul-Adha.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB1920-257</td>
<td>Auckland United Softball Association Incorporated</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards operational costs and wages for the United Softball Association</td>
<td>$2,117.92</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$43,573.02</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application in Puketāpapa Quick Response Round Two 2019/2020, listed in Table Two below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QR2015-201</td>
<td>Genealogical Computing Group of New Zealand Society of Genealogist</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Towards printing programme brochures for the Auckland Family History Expo.</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Horopaki Context

7. The local board allocates grants to groups and organisations delivering projects, activities and services that benefit Aucklanders and contribute to the vision of being a world class city.

8. Auckland Council Community Grants Policy supports each local board to adopt a grants programme.

9. The local board grants programme sets out:
   - local board priorities
   - lower priorities for funding
   - exclusions
   - grant types, the number of grant rounds and when these will open and close
   - any additional accountability requirements.


11. The community grant programmes have been extensively advertised through the council grants webpage, local board webpages, local board e-newsletters, Facebook pages, council publications, radio, and community networks.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

12. 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. All applications have been assessed utilising the Community Grants Policy and the local board grant programme criteria. The eligibility of each application is identified in the report recommendations.

13. Due to the current COVID-19 crisis, staff have also assessed each application according to which alert level the proposed activity is able to proceed.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi

Climate impact statement

14. The Local Board Grants Programme aims to respond to Auckland Council’s commitment to address climate change by providing grants to individuals and groups for projects that support and enable community climate action. Community climate action involves reducing or responding to climate change by local residents in a locally relevant way. Local board grants can contribute to expanding climate action by supporting projects that reduce carbon emissions and increase community resilience to climate impacts. Examples of projects include local food production and food waste reduction; increasing access to single-
occupancy transport options; home energy efficiency and community renewable energy generation; local tree planting and streamside revegetation; and educating about sustainable lifestyle choices that reduce carbon footprints.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

15. Based on the main focus of an application, a subject matter expert from the relevant department will provide input and advice. The main focus of an application is identified as arts, community, events, sport and recreation, environment or heritage.

16. The grants programme has no identified impacts on council-controlled organisations and therefore their views are not required.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

17. Local boards are responsible for the decision-making and allocation of local board community grants. The Devonport-Takapuna Local Board is required to fund, part-fund or decline these grant applications in accordance with its priorities identified in the local board grant programme.

18. The local board is requested to note that section 48 of the Community Grants Policy states “We will also provide feedback to unsuccessful grant applicants about why they have been declined, so they will know what they can do to increase their chances of success next time”.

19. A summary of each application received through Puketāpapa Local Grants, Round Two 2019/2020, multi-board and Puketāpapa Quick Response, Round Two 2019/2020 is provided in Attachment B, Attachment C and Attachment D.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

20. The local board grants programme aims to respond to Auckland Council’s commitment to improving Māori wellbeing by providing grants to individuals and groups who deliver positive outcomes for Māori. Auckland Council’s Māori Responsiveness Unit has provided input and support towards the development of the community grant processes.

21. Two applicants applying to Puketāpapa Local Grants Round Two, eleven applicants applying to Multiboard Grants Round Two and two applicants applying to Quick Response Round Two indicate projects that target Māori or Māori outcomes.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

22. The allocation of grants to community groups is within the adopted Long-Term Plan 2018-2028 and local board agreements.

23. The local board has set a total community grants budget of $75,640 for the 2019/2020 financial year. A total of $37,755.85 was allocated in previous grant rounds, this leaves a total of $37,884.15 to be allocated to one local grants and one quick response round including one multiboard round.

24. Eight applications were received for Local Grants Round Two 2019/2020, requesting a total of $29,894 and sixteen multiboard applications were also received requesting a total of $43,573.02.

25. Two applications were received for Puketāpapa Quick Response, Round Two 2019/2020, requesting a total of $1,999.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

26. The allocation of grants occurs within the guidelines and criteria of the Community Grants Policy and the local board grants programme. The assessment process has identified a low risk associated with funding the applications in this round.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

27. Following the Puketāpapa Local Board allocation of funding for the local grants and multiboard round two, and quick response round two the grants staff will notify the applicants of the local board’s decision.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A↑</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board Grants Programme 2019-2020</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B⇨</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Grants Round Two 2019/2020 applications <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C⇨</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Multiboard Round Two 2019/2020 applications <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D⇨</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Quick Response Round Two 2019/2020 applications <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Moumita Dutta - Senior Grants Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Marion Davies - Grants and Incentives Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki &amp; Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Puketāpapa Local Board – Local Grants Programme 2019/2020

Our Local Grants Programme aims to provide community grants to local communities through public and open grant rounds.

Outcomes sought by the Puketāpapa Local Board

Our grants programme will be targeted towards supporting the following outcomes, as outlined in our local board plan:

- Connected communities with a sense of belonging
- Improved wellbeing and safety
- Thriving local economy and good job opportunities
- Transport choices meet our varied travel needs
- Urban developments meet community needs
- Vibrant and popular parks ad facilities
- Treasured and enhanced natural environment

Our priorities sought from grant applications

The Puketāpapa Local Board welcomes grant applications that align with the following local board plan priorities:

**Note:** these priorities relate to the local board initiatives as outlined in the local board plan:

- Our cultural diversity is valued and communities feel recognized and included
- People want to learn about and contribute to their neighbourhoods and society
- Neighbourhoods where people know each other and feel safe and valued
- Local character and heritage is widely celebrated and reflected through arts, culture and language
- Provisions and promotion of opportunities and services supporting healthy and active lifestyles
- The community has the skills and knowledge to protect the local environment

Higher priorities:

The Puketāpapa Local Board will **prioritise** projects which:

- demonstrate collaboration e.g. involves working with other like-minded organisations and/or different parts of the community
- also seeking other funding
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addresses two or more of the "Five ways of Wellbeing" outlined by the Mental Health Foundation NZ

- support and promote volunteerism
- can demonstrate community match funding (groups who demonstrate that 40% of project costs have already been met, including the approximate value provided by volunteers as a contribution to projects, events and/or initiatives)
- encourages people to engage with their wider community
- projects or events that align with the healthy environment principles of:
  - water is the first choice
  - good kai (food) for all
  - smokefree, alcohol and drug free movement is encouraged
  - promotes waste reduction initiatives

Lower Priorities:

The Puketāpapa Local Board has identified the following activities as lower priorities:

- entry fees for programmes or events
- projects or events that are outside the local board area
- air travel and overseas costs
- wages or operational costs
- catering
- gifts/prizes
- grants which support the purchase of assets and/or equipment with limited future use (single use)

Eligibility

Refer to paragraphs 71, 72 and 73 of the Community Grants Policy:

Commercial entities may apply for grants only where there is a clear and direct benefit for the wider community. "Profit generated by a grant-funded project, event or activity may only be retained by the grant recipient if it is reinvested in a social, environmental or cultural mission".

In addition to the eligibility criteria outlined in the Community Grants Policy, the Puketāpapa Local Board will not fund:

- projects and activities where funding is the responsibility of central government (e.g. core education, primary health care);
- schools, unless one of the following can be demonstrated:
  - community need and benefit to the wider community
  - accessibility to the public out of school hours

- applicants who have failed to complete or provide a satisfactory accountability form from previous grants
- individuals or sole traders or limited liability companies; unless the benefit to the wider community can be demonstrated

Applicants can only apply for the same project or activity once every financial year.
Investment approach

The Puketāpapa Local Board grant rounds will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant name</th>
<th>Quick Response Grants</th>
<th>Local Project Grants</th>
<th>Strategic Relationships Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum and maximum amounts</td>
<td>Minimum amount per grant: $300</td>
<td>Minimum amount per grant: $1,000</td>
<td>Indicative amount per grant: $10,000-20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum amount per grant: $1,000</td>
<td>Maximum amount per grant: $5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rounds per year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Small (quick response) grants to supplement other funding to ensure a project/ event can take place. Simplified application process</td>
<td>Medium (local) sized grants</td>
<td>Large (strategic) grants to support organisations that are delivering on outcomes that are aligned with the board’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accountability measures for Local and Quick Response Grants:

The Puketāpapa Local Board requires that all successful applicants provide:
- photos of the activity
- invitations to the local board for any event or function funded, are requested
- public acknowledgement of local board funding including the use of the local board logo on any advertising materials
- meet council standard financial accountability requirement

Application and decision dates for 2019/2020 will be as follows:

a) Quick Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019/2020 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>3 June 2019</td>
<td>28 June 2019</td>
<td>15 August 2019</td>
<td>1 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two</td>
<td>3 February 2020</td>
<td>13 March 2020</td>
<td>21 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Local Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019/2020 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>3 June 2019</td>
<td>12 July 2019</td>
<td>15 August 2019</td>
<td>1 September 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multi-board funding

The Puketāpapa Local Board welcomes multi-board funding applications. However, the activity or initiative will need to clearly benefit the Puketāpapa community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiboard grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Grant Round One</td>
<td>3 June 2019</td>
<td>19 July 2019</td>
<td>15 August 2019</td>
<td>1 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Grant Round Two</td>
<td>20 January 2020</td>
<td>13 March 2020</td>
<td>21 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Puketāpapa Local Board funding opportunities:

c) Neighbours Day 2020

Applications will be open for Neighbours Day in February 2020, for events around the national Neighbours Day Aotearoa.

Please contact the Puketāpapa Local Board office at the Fickling Centre, 546 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings or phone (09) 367 4301

d) Strategic Relationships Grant 2020/2021

Applications for the Strategic Relationships Grant will be available in 2019/2020 for projects in 2020/2021. For further information, please refer to the Strategic Relationships Grant Terms of Reference or check the Auckland Council website.
Local board feedback for inclusion in Auckland Council submissions

File No.: CP2020/05869

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To recommend that the Puketāpapa 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 when external parties set submission deadlines that don’t allow formal input to be obtained from a local board business meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Puketāpapa 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Local board input approved at a business meeting</strong></td>
<td>• Decision is made and adopted in a public meeting (transparency of decision making).</td>
<td>• Local board meeting schedules and agenda deadlines often don’t align with external agency deadlines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All local board members have the opportunity to make the formal decision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Local board input</strong></td>
<td>• Provides a mechanism for local</td>
<td>• Extraordinary meeting needs to be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Local board feedback for inclusion in Auckland Council submissions

## Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>approved at an extraordinary meeting of the local board</td>
<td>boards to provide their formal views where submission deadlines do not align with local board meeting schedules.</td>
<td>called by a resolution (requires anticipation by the local board) or requisition in writing delivered to the Chief Executive. The process usually requires a minimum of three clear working days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decision is made and adopted in a public meeting (transparency of decision making).</td>
<td>• There are additional costs incurred to run an unscheduled meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All local board members have the opportunity to make the formal decision.</td>
<td>• It may be difficult to schedule a time when enough local board members can attend to achieve a quorum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Local board input approved using urgent decision mechanism (staff recommend this option)</td>
<td>• It provides a mechanism for local boards to provide their formal views where submission deadlines do not align with local board meeting schedules.</td>
<td>• The decision is not made in a public meeting. It may be perceived as non-transparent decision-making because it is not made by the full local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local board input can be submitted once the Chair, Deputy Chair and Relationship Manager have received the report providing the local board views and input.</td>
<td>• Chair and deputy may not have time to properly consult and ascertain view of the full local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The urgent decision needs the sign-off from two local board members (ie the Chair and Deputy Chair), rather than just one.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Local board input approved by the chair who has been delegated authority from the local board (staff recommend this option where local boards choose not to use the urgent decision process)</td>
<td>• It provides a mechanism for local boards to provide their formal views where submission deadlines do not align with local board meeting schedules and local boards don’t want to use the urgent decision process.</td>
<td>• Decision is not made in a public meeting. It may be perceived as non-transparent decision-making because it is not made by the full local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local board input can be submitted as soon as possible after the local board views and input have been collated and discussed by the local board members.</td>
<td>• The chair who has the delegated authority may not have time to properly consult and ascertain views of the full local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Local board input submitted and ratified at a later date</td>
<td>• Local board informal input can be submitted as soon as possible after the local board views and input have been collated and discussed by the local board members.</td>
<td>• Local board input submitted is considered to be the informal views of the local board until they are approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Local board input can be challenged or changed at ratification or approval stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Decision to ratify informal views, even if made in a public meeting, is unable to be changed in the council submission (can be perceived as non-transparent decision-making).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inclusion of informal views in the Auckland Council submission will be at the discretion of the Governing Body. These may be included with caveats noting the views have not been ratified by the local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If the local board changes its views,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 17

<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 whakaaweawe āhuarangi

**Climate impact statement**

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

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

**Council group impacts and views**

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

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

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

21. Any local board member who is delegated responsibilities should ensure that they represent the wider local board views and preferences on each matter before them.

#### Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

**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>
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<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>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki &amp; Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency Innovating Streets for People pilot fund
File No.: CP2020/05910

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide local boards with an overview of the Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi) Innovating Streets for People pilot fund (ISPF).
2. To request feedback on projects within your local board area that have been proposed by staff across Auckland Transport (AT), Auckland Council, and Panuku for inclusion in Auckland Council's application to the ISPF.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
3. Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi) announced a pilot fund in April 2020 that supports pilot projects and interim improvements for safe active transport. The Innovating Streets Pilot Fund (ISPF) is intended to help councils create more people-friendly spaces through the application of tactical urbanism techniques such as pilots, pop ups and interim projects. While the fund is intended to support pilots that can be rolled out rapidly and at relatively low cost, projects should also be able to demonstrate a pathway to more permanent status, should they prove successful.
4. Local boards have previously been invited to contribute localised strategic direction and guidance regarding projects that may be suitable to submit for funding. This guidance has been incorporated into the development of a list of potential projects that will be circulated to local boards by 25 May 2020.
5. Local boards are now invited to provide formal feedback on the list of potential projects within their local area, including their view of which projects are the highest priority.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
a) provide feedback on the list of local projects proposed as suitable for inclusion in Auckland Council’s application to the Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi) Innovating Streets Pilot Fund (ISPF) by 12pm on 29 May 2020.
Or
a) delegate authority to <member> to provide feedback on the list of local projects proposed as suitable for inclusion in Auckland Council’s application to the Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi) Innovating Streets Pilot Fund (ISPF) by 12pm on 29 May 2020.

Horopaki
Context
6. On 3 April 2020, Waka Kotahi announced the ISPF, which supports council projects that aim to transition streets to be safer and more liveable spaces. The fund encourages the use of ‘tactical urbanism’ techniques, such as pilots and pop ups - interim treatments that can be delivered within a short timeframe to test and help demonstrate the value of future
permanent street changes that make walking and cycling easier. Projects that Waka Kotahi aims to support include:

- temporary, or semi-permanent, physical changes to streets
- improvements that test a permanent fix and prototype a street design
- activations that help communities re-imagine their streets.

7. There are two application rounds for the ISPF:

- The first round opened on 3 April and closed on 8 May 2020. Successful applicants are expected to be announced in June 2020.
- The second round opens on 8 June and closes on 3 July 2020 with successful applicants to be announced by the end of July 2020.

8. Qualifying projects are expected to be delivered by June 2021.

9. In addition to the two funding rounds, Waka Kotahi is offering support for interventions that specifically relate to Covid-19. Auckland Transport (AT) is leading an emergency response programme in conjunction with Auckland Council and are applying for a funding subsidy for the costs associated with Covid-19 measures which are already being implemented across Auckland.

10. The selection process for round one was led by AT. Due to tight timeframes for submission, consultation was not possible. Twelve projects were submitted to Waka Kotahi for consideration. All these projects come from existing programmes previously approved by Auckland Council and align well with Governing Body and local board strategic transport priorities.

11. If these projects are awarded funding from Waka Kotahi, comprehensive stakeholder engagement will occur throughout the planning and delivery of each project, as per Waka Kotahi’s selection criteria.

12. For round two ISPF funding, a project team has been established across Auckland Council, AT and Panuku and a process developed to identify potential projects and take them through to a finished application.

13. On 8 May 2020, local boards were invited to contribute localised strategic direction and guidance regarding projects that may be suitable to submit for funding. This guidance has been incorporated into the development of a list of potential projects circulated to local boards on or before 25 May 2020.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

14. The ISPF provides an opportunity for Auckland Council and AT to catalyse positive change across Auckland in line with Auckland Council’s strategic goals of improving walking and cycling options and creating more people-friendly spaces.

15. The techniques of tactical urbanism supported by the pilot fund represent an innovative change to the typical way in which projects are engaged upon, designed and delivered. Tactical urbanism entails piloting and testing key project elements on a temporary basis, that can generally be rolled out rapidly and at low cost. This constitutes a form of ‘engagement by doing’ and enables the relative success of ideas to be assessed before they are committed to more permanently.

Criteria for the assessment and prioritisation of projects

16. When providing feedback on the list of potential projects, local boards should keep the following criteria in mind, which will be used by the project team to finalise the list of projects to recommend to the Emergency Committee.

17. Prioritised projects will:
• improve transport choices and liveability of a place
• help mitigate a clear safety issue (related to Deaths and Serious Injuries at a specific location)
• be effective at:
  o reducing vehicle speed (to 30km/hr or less), and/or
  o creating more space for people on our streets, and/or
  o making walking and cycling more attractive
• use temporary pilots, pop ups or treatments as a pathway to permanent change in the future
• contribute to more equitable access to opportunities and essential services, particularly in areas with low levels of travel choice
• support mode shift to low-carbon modes
• support Māori outcomes, i.e.:
  o adopt a design or project approach founded on Māori principles
  o help advance Māori wellbeing, e.g. active Māori participation, improved access to marae, kura, kohanga, papakāinga, employment
• test key elements or is designed to generate community support for the 'parent' project
• be part of an existing planned and budgeted project (AC projects only)
• demonstrate the importance of the project within the current AT work programme (AT projects only)
• demonstrate ability to deliver
• demonstrate strong likelihood of project delivery by June 2021
• demonstrate co-design approach involving key stakeholders and community, including:
  o support from the relevant local board(s) and stakeholders
  o support from local community/stakeholders (e.g. business association)
• display clear process, including milestones, cost, monitoring and evaluation, and identification of risks and mitigation
• demonstrate value for money
• demonstrate opportunity to improve efficiency, or reduce risks associated with future permanent upgrades.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement
18. The transport sector is the largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions in the Auckland region with around 40 per cent of Auckland’s total emissions. Increased support and prioritisation of ‘no and low’ emissions modes of transport such as active transport, micro-mobility modes and public transport, will help reduce these emissions.
19. The interventions supported by the Innovating Streets for People pilot fund enable a reduction of transport emissions, which would support Auckland Council’s ability to achieve its climate goals and is well aligned with the draft Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework, and with the in-principle changes to this framework endorsed by the Environment and Climate Change Committee (resolution number ECC/2020/12).
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

20. Auckland Council and AT are following an aligned approach for the ISPF submission and are working together to develop joint application packages.

21. Relevant parts of the council, including Ngā Mātārae; the Auckland Design Office; the Development Programme Office; Libraries; the Southern Initiative; Arts, Community and Events; Parks, Sports and Recreation; Plans and Places, and Panuku, have been engaged to prepare and collate funding proposals for the second round.

22. If a project application is successful, there will be a need to implement, coordinate and monitor the outcomes of projects that are funded by the ISPF. This would be jointly coordinated by AT and staff from across the Auckland Council family.

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

23. Staff captured informal local board views earlier this month by inviting local boards to contribute localised strategic direction and guidance regarding projects that may be suitable to submit for funding. This guidance has been incorporated into the development of the list of potential projects.

24. The types of projects that Waka Kotahi seek to promote through this fund will have positive impacts on local communities in terms of the outcomes that are reflected in the assessment criteria.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

25. Māori are likely to benefit from interventions that support safer and more accessible active transport in Auckland. This is because Māori are over-represented in pedestrian-related crashes and tend to live in parts of Auckland where travel choice is poorest. To ensure these interventions benefit Māori equitably, they need to be complemented by meaningful access to active modes such as bicycles and micro-mobility devices, as well as supporting infrastructure such as secure bicycle parking outside main destinations.

26. The Innovating Streets fund encourages community-led interventions to transform urban spaces into safe and liveable spaces for people. There are opportunities to tap into the creativity and local knowledge of Māori communities in Tāmaki Makaurau to create urban interventions that address community needs and provide a strong sense of place.

27. Ngā Mātārae, the Southern Initiative and the Independent Māori Statutory Board have been approached for their input into the proposed project list.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

28. The proposed high levels of funding assistance from Waka Kotahi (up to 90 per cent of a project’s value) will potentially result in savings for both Auckland Council and AT on any projects that may already have been planned and funded prior to the pilot fund application.

29. The funding provided by Waka Kotahi for piloting or testing of temporary interventions is likely to reduce design time and increase financial security for permanent improvements in the future. Trialling of real-life options for more permanent activities can also reduce or avoid potential costs associated with the redesign of interventions in case desired outcomes could not be achieved.

30. There are no financial implications for local boards arising from providing feedback on the list of potential projects, except for those projects proposed by local boards, and which they have proposed to fund themselves.
31. Local boards that submit an expression of interest for a project need to demonstrate both the ability to fund the temporary project and, if the project does not link to an existing AT, Auckland Council or Panuku funded permanent project, that the local board is able to completely fund the permanent project as well.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

32. There is a risk that Auckland Council may not be able to afford the local share of 10 per cent of the project cost needed to implement interventions under the ISPF, particularly given the present circumstances and the need to significantly amend the draft Annual Plan 2020/21. Note that while successful projects will require 10 per cent funding from council, they will bring the benefit of additional funding into Auckland. Similar financial constraints may also apply to AT and Panuku who are also potentially funding projects.

33. Another risk is the possibility that the implementation of successful Auckland Council projects under the pilot fund will not lead to the desired outcomes for Auckland. To mitigate this risk, staff have developed a set of assessment criteria for projects (see paragraph 17) to ensure strategic alignment with Auckland Council objectives before projects are submitted to Waka Kotahi.

34. Waka Kotahi’s Criteria 2: Ability to Deliver requires a co-design approach with community and key stakeholders in the development and delivery of projects. The possibility that unified community support for local interventions cannot be achieved through the co-design process within the required timeframe poses an additional risk.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

35. Local boards are requested to provide feedback on the list of local projects proposed as suitable for inclusion in Auckland Council’s application to the ISPF by 12pm (midday) on 29 May 2020.

36. Each project will then be assessed against the criteria described above, and the project team will produce quality advice for endorsement from an Auckland Council committee.

37. AT projects will be presented to the AT Board on 3 June 2020 for endorsement.

38. All projects will be presented to an Auckland Council committee in early June 2020 following which, all interested parties will be notified whether their proposed project has been selected to proceed to an ISPF application.

39. Following this decision, further work will be undertaken to develop, prepare, and review each project that has been selected for submission to Waka Kotahi.

40. Completed applications will be submitted to Waka Kotahi prior to the closing date of 3 July 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kat Ashmead – Senior Policy Advisor – Local Board Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Megan Tyler – Chief of Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki &amp; Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Puketāpapa Local Board feedback on New Zealand Transport Agency's Accessible Streets Consultation

File No.: CP2020/04818

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide members with the board’s formal feedback from Member Turner on the New Zealand Transport Agency’s Accessible Streets Consultation.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. At the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting on the 19 March 2020 a report was presented seeking delegation for a member to provide input into Auckland Council’s submission on the New Zealand Transport Agency’s Accessible Streets Consultation. Member Turner was delegated to provide feedback per resolution PKTPP2020/38.

3. The board held two workshops 09 April 2020 and 16 April 2020 where members had the opportunity to consider the feedback.

4. Member Turner submitted this feedback so it would be attached to the Auckland Council submission.

5. A copy of the board’s submitted feedback has been attached to this report.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) note the board’s formal feedback attached to the Auckland Council’s submission on the New Zealand Transport Agency’s Accessibility Street consultation is attached.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Feedback on Auckland Council's submission on the NZ Transport Agency's Accessible Streets Consultation</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketāpapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki &amp; Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback on:
The Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency Accessible Streets Regulatory Package (2020)
15 April

Context
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency has released an Accessible Streets Regulatory Package. This is a collection of rule changes 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.

The package intends to 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.

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.

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
Submissions on the package close on 22 April 2020.

Relevance to the Local board
Local boards are a key part of the governance of Auckland Council. Local boards have responsibilities set out in the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, specifically:

- identifying and communicating the interests and preferences of the people in its local board area in relation to the content of the strategies, policies, plans, and bylaws of the Auckland Council

Local boards provide important local input into region-wide strategies/plans and can also represent the views of their communities to other agencies, including those of central government.

Puketāpapa Local Board feedback:

**Proposal 1A: Pedestrians and powered wheelchair users**

a) 1. Do you agree that powered wheelchairs should be treated as pedestrians? Why/why not?
   b) • The Board is supportive of this proposal.
   • Powered wheelchairs are important mobility device for those who require them. It is important that they be legally allowed to use the most appropriate surface / lane for their device.

**Proposal 1B: Changing wheeled recreational devices**

2. Do you agree with the proposal to replace wheeled recreational devices with new categories for unpowered and powered transport devices? Why/why not?
   • The Board is supportive of this proposal, subject to changes.
   • The rise of micro-mobility devices such as electric scooters, electric skateboards and bicycles means that footpaths will be increasingly used by non-pedestrians, and a framework is required to ensure the safety of all users, especially pedestrians.
   • We believe all micro-mobility devices should be able to use footpaths at low speed.
   • It is essential that speed limits are defined for non-pedestrian users. We believe a 10km/h speed should be implemented when near pedestrians as this allows for pedestrian safety and ensures device users are not out of control.

3. What steps should the Transport Agency take before declaring a vehicle not to be a motor vehicle?
   No comment

4. If the Transport Agency declares a vehicle not to 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 Transport Agency should consider the creation of a new category “Micro Motor Vehicle” into which any powered transport device falls. This would allow
   • These devices could then be able to use footpaths at speeds of under 15kph.

5. We propose to clarify that:
   c) • 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
d) b. these vehicles are also not allowed on the road under current rules, because they do not meet motor vehicle standards
e) 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).
f) Do you agree with this proposed clarification? Why/why not?

- The Board is not supportive of this proposal, unless as per point (c) the Transport Agency declares them to be powered transport devices.
- Without point (c), this clarification effectively bans e-skateboards etc from both the footpath and the road, rendering them useless as transport devices.

Proposal 1C: Clarifying cycles and e-bikes

6. Do you agree with the proposal that:
   g) • Small-wheeled cycles that are propelled by cranks be defined as cycles, and
   h) • Small-wheeled cycles that are not propelled by cranks, such as balance bikes, be defined as transport devices?
   i) Why/why not?

- The Board is supportive of this proposal.
- It will enable smaller bikes to use a range of surfaces and lanes.

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 is supportive of this proposal.
- As the most vulnerable road users, it's important to protect pedestrians and enforcing these give way provisions are critical.

8. Do you think there will be any safety or access-related problems with mobility devices operating in different spaces? Please explain.
   j) Given that they are required by those with mobility issues, it is important that they be legally allowed to use the most appropriate surface / lane for their device.
   - There could potentially be issues around footpath width, particularly in areas with legacy footpaths that are below standard.

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

- When reviewing the mobility device category, keep it to powered wheelchairs and mobility scooters which have strict standards. Escooters, segways (see page 21 about the segway ruling), ebikes and other devices should not be considered a mobility device.

Alternative proposal

10. We have outlined an option to not change vehicle definitions. This means we would make changes at a later date instead. Do you prefer this option to our proposal to change vehicle definitions now (see proposals 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D for more details)? Why/why not?

- The Board is supportive of changing definitions now.
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?

   i) The Board is supportive of this proposal.
   ii) It is important that low-speed, low-risk cycling/riding is legally allowed on footpaths, to allow parents to ride with children, and for cyclists/riders to avoid high-risk roads that have poor cycling facilities.
   iii) Some roads are simply not safe to cycle on for both young and older, but if following the feedback given in Proposal 1B, footpaths should be safe for all users and they can negotiate those spaces.

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?

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

   a) The Board would not support an age limit.
   b) Ability and confidence is not linked to age in every situation, and older riders may not feel comfortable on certain roads.

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?

   a) The Board is supportive of this proposal.
   b) It is important for local authorities to control this, particularly in busy urban areas.
   c) Problems will be where the road is very dangerous (double lane roads with no strip median, cars in and out of carparking, etc) but the footpath is very narrow, in a bad condition and/or obstructed by plants. In which case the local authority will probably need to deem the footpath not safe for cycling. We believe that if a footpath is deemed unsafe for cycling there needs to be provision for cyclists made, either through protected cycle lane or creating a shared path.

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?

   a) No Comment

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?

   a) The Board is generally supportive of this proposal with the following reservation:
   b) The proposal would require a longer timeframe (consultation etc) meaning that there may be delay in actioning urgent issues.

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?

   a) A new framework is required, to ensure the most vulnerable road users are protected. Pedestrians must not be put at risk by these changes.

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?
   ee) The Board is supportive of this proposal.
   • Pedestrians are the most vulnerable road corridor users and must be protected.

19. This proposal sets out three behavioural requirements; that footpath users will:
   ff) • operate vehicles in a courteous and considerate manner,
   gg) • travel in a way that isn’t dangerous, and
   hh) • give right of way to pedestrians.
   ii) Do you agree with these three requirements? Are there any others we should consider?
   • The Board is supportive of this proposal.

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?
   jj) The Board is supportive of the standard speed limit being 15kph on footpaths as this is a good level to get the benefits of micro-mobility devices while keeping pedestrians safe. Anything higher would lead to an increase in accidents, permanently lower would dissuade people from using these devices. We support the speed limit, with the caveat that users drop their speed when around pedestrians.

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?
   li) The Board is supportive of this proposal.
   • Local authorities need to be able to act quickly and independently to solve local issues.

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

22. Are there other ways, that you can think of, to improve footpath safety? Please explain.
   • Improving footpath safety, for low walkability neighbourhoods, with bad quality footpaths, widening footpaths for better use and potential shared use should be considered.
   • There is a need to focus on footpath maintenance and ensure this is well funded.
   • There are guidelines that NZTA should publish for local authorities such as gentle signalling (such as a bell) when coming up behind or passing as good practice. Give way to all pedestrians. Slower mode on left hand side as guideline for local authorities to promote

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?
   nn) The Board is supportive of this proposal.
   • A standard width bicycle trailer is under 600mm wide, so 750mm seems adequate for parents who wish to ride on the footpath while their children are in a trailer.

24. Do you use a mobility device? If yes, what is the width of your device? Would the proposed width restriction impact you?
   • No comments.

25. Should the maximum width limit apply to mobility devices? Why/why not?
   • In general yes, but with future technology there may be a need to change this as new devices come onto the market to deal with different health needs.
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:

pp) a. mobility devices purchased before the rule changes could be automatically exempt from the width limit.

qq) 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

rr) c. Apply a separate width limit to mobility devices.

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

- Option B is preferred.

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 is supportive of this proposal.
- Local authorities need to be empowered to make changes that are appropriate to their populace and urban form.

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 is supportive of this proposal.
- The user priority table is appropriate and should be implemented.

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

- The Board is supportive of this proposal.
- Pedestrians are the most vulnerable corridor users and must be protected.

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 is supportive of this proposal.
- Local authorities need to be empowered to make changes that are appropriate to their populace and urban form.

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 is tentatively supportive of this proposal, with the proviso that acknowledgement is made that different areas: rural and urban require different rules.
- Local authorities need to be empowered to make changes that are appropriate to their populace and urban form.

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 is supportive of this proposal.
- The rise of micro-mobility devices means that more cycle lanes and shared paths are required, and these devices must be able to use them legally.
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 is not supportive of this proposal.
   - The increased variety of devices may lead to fragmentation of the definitions of powered / non-powered devices. The identification of each may also become difficult.

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 is supportive of this proposal.
   - We agree that a front-facing light and a rear-facing light are required at night.

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? Why/why not?
   - Many powered transport devices will already have front and rear facing lights.
   - Front facing lights are relatively easy to attach to handlebars.
   - Rear facing lights may be more difficult to attach e.g. on an e-scooter
   - Reflectors may not be able to be attached to devices where there are limited or thin surface areas.
   - It is important that a requirement be made of sellers to ensure devices meet this criteria.

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?
   - If they are travelling on the road, then they must have lights.

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 is supportive of this proposal.
   - It is safer for users to stay in the left lane to go straight ahead.

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 is supportive of this proposal.
   - Cyclists are often able to move at a higher average speed than peak traffic, and removing that ability disincentives the use of bicycles.

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 is supportive of this proposal.
   - Road users going straight ahead, including cyclists and pedestrians, should have priority over all turning traffic, as it is safer and ensures turning traffic travels at a safer speed.
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?

- The Board is supportive of this proposal.
- Education for all road users is an important part of these changes, and traffic control devices can aid this.

41. Should the definition of a separated lane include the distance between the lane and the road? Why/why not?

- No Comment

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 is supportive of this proposal.
- Road users going straight ahead, including cyclists and pedestrians, should have priority over all turning traffic, as it is safer and ensures turning traffic travels at a safer speed.
- It is very important that a period of education takes place before the law change to ensure drivers are aware of the rule change.

43. Do you think that the proposed minimum markings are appropriate?

- Yes, the proposed markings are appropriate.

44. We are proposing future guidance for additional treatments. Is there any guidance that you would like to see or recommend?

- No comment

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 is supportive of this proposal, with one important change.
- 1.5 metres should be the minimum at all speeds. Having two different minimums adds to confusion and doesn’t make anything safer for non-motorists.

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?

- The Board is partially supportive of this proposal.
- It is important for local authorities to enforce their own streets without relying on central government. We foresee an increase in enforcement required to police this and will result in increased costs to councils.
- In general, the board does not support berm parking at all as it causes damage and creates safety issues. However, we acknowledge that there are streets which have access issues with on-street parking. These streets could be defined by council as areas where berm parking is permitted.
The finer details of how this will work needs to be managed. We would be willing to have a 'trial' of the register in Puketāpapa as we have live examples of places with a culture of berm parking and local advocates both for and against berm parking.

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? 
fff)
No Comment

Item 19

Proposal 9: Give buses priority when exiting bus stops

ggg)
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 is supportive of this proposal.
• Increasing efficiency of public transport is a high priority for the Auckland region.
• The proposed change provides certainty for all road users.

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?

• Buses should have right of way over all other vehicles (except emergency vehicles).
• It is important that bus drivers take the safety of all other road users to mind and are educated about how they interact with others on the road.

Conclusion

The board has made its position clear on the proposals and largely supports the changes being made. We applaud the focus on making streets a better place for all users. We emphasise the need for education before these changes are made, similar to when the give way rules changed in 2012. As this is a large suite of changes it is important that all of Aotearoa is familiar with the changes before they are set into law.

End.
Puketāpapa Local Board feedback on the draft 2021 government policy statement on land transport

File No.: CP2020/05872

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide members with the board’s formal feedback from Deputy Chair J Fairey and Member J Turner on the Draft 2021 Government Policy Statement on Land Transport.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Government’s Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) sets out the government’s priorities for expenditure from the National Land Transport Fund (NLTF) over the next 10 years. It is open for public submission from 19 March with a closing date extended to 11 May 2020.

3. The Government Policy Statement is of high importance to Auckland Council both at the local and regional level, as it determines the Government’s priorities for co-investment in regional and local transport initiatives via the NLTF.

4. Auckland Council staff prepared a submission on behalf of the organisation to be adopted by Council’s Emergency Management Committee on 30 April 2020 with final feedback being appended to the Auckland Council submission.

5. At the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting on 19 March 2020 a report was presented seeking delegation for a member to provide input, on behalf of the local board Deputy Chair J Fairey was delegated to provide input: PKTPP/2020/37.

6. The board held workshops on Thursday, 16 April and 07 May 2020 where feedback was coordinated.

7. Deputy Chair J Fairey and Member J Turner jointly wrote this feedback and it was submitted to be attached to the Auckland Council submission. A copy of the board’s submitted feedback is attached to this report.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) note the board’s formal feedback on the draft 2021 Government Policy Statement on Land Transport attached to the Auckland Council submission.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board feedback on the draft 2021 government policy statement on land transport</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketāpapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki &amp; Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback on:
The Draft 2021 Government Policy Statement on Land Transport
8 May 2020

Context
The Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) sets out the government’s priorities for expenditure from the National Land Transport Fund (NLTF) over the next 10 years.
The GPS is of high importance to Auckland Council, both at the local and regional level, as it determines the Government’s priorities for co-investment in regional and local transport initiatives via the NLTF. It will also substantially inform the development of the 2021 Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP), which effectively determines which transport activities will be allocated budget through council’s Long-term Plan to progress over the next three-year period (2021-2024).
Auckland Council staff are currently preparing a submission on behalf of the organisation, which is anticipated to be adopted by council’s Emergency Management Committee on 30 April. This feedback will be appended to that submission.

Relevance to the Local board
Local boards are a key part of the governance of Auckland Council. Local boards have responsibilities set out in the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, specifically:
- identifying and communicating the interests and preferences of the people in its local board area in relation to the content of the strategies, policies, plans, and bylaws of the Auckland Council

Local boards provide important local input into region-wide strategies/plans and can also represent the views of their communities to other agencies, including those of central government.

Puketāpapa Local Board feedback:
The Puketāpapa Local Board welcomes the opportunity to give feedback on the Draft GPS and supports in principle its general approach, with the following comments.
The Puketāpapa Local Board agrees in principle with the main principles underpinning the draft GPS, in particular the strategic directions focusing on safety and climate change, as it sees these as critical regional (also national, and global) issues. The local board also supports the emphasis on transport options and efficient movement of freight as these issues are of significant local relevance also.

Strategic Priority 1 – Safety

1. The Puketāpapa Local Board strongly supports the inclusion of safety as a strategic priority. The safety of the transport system is also a very high priority for the communities of the Puketāpapa.
2. The Puketāpapa Local Board supports the government’s Road to Zero strategy and endorses the inclusion of safety as a strategic direction. However, the local board notes that Approved Organisations have chosen to take a narrow, technical definition of safety that has focused only on vehicular safety. We encourage a focus on affected communities.

3. The Puketāpapa Local Board hopes that the Transport Agency will support and encourage Approved Organisations in their obligation to listen to local communities and take localised safety concerns seriously.

**Strategic Priority 2 – Better Travel Options**

4. The Puketāpapa Local Board supports the inclusion of better travel options as a strategic priority. Auckland is unique within New Zealand in terms of physical size and population. The provision of better travel options is of particular importance here and this is definitely an issue in Puketāpapa, where communities have varying degrees of access to safe, low-cost and efficient transport options that allow access to destinations across the city. We encourage a focus on behaviour change to encourage uptake of new travel options.

5. The Puketāpapa Local Board would like to see the GPS be more explicit about the fact that Auckland requires particular attention in this area (and the others). While some of our communities are well-served, other parts of the community are restricted to a few safe modes of transport.

6. It is essential that progress is made on the Dominion Road light-rail corridor and that a decision is made around this project soon. The project offers many benefits for residents of Puketāpapa, and the indecision around the project has led to an indefinite pause in business activity along this main corridor. We advocate for light rail to be built along the former tram route, and believe there is room for cycleways as part of the redesign. We expect a high level of community involvement in the design of this project.

7. The Puketāpapa Local Board area has mostly good travel choices by bus, especially for residents on main arterial routes. We note that many of our residents have access to high-frequency public transport routes and advocate for these to be retained and increased. We support a review of the public transport operating model (PTOM) to ensure that we have a modern, efficient transport system.

8. The Puketāpapa Local Board notes a strong desire for faster progress in implementation of walking and cycling connections in the community. We have heard this repeatedly from our communities and will do what we can locally, but the local board hopes that this GPS will support completion and expansion of the Auckland Cycle Network.

**Strategic Priority 3 – Improving Freight Connections**

9. The Puketāpapa Local Board supports the inclusion of improving freight connections as a strategic priority.

10. The Puketāpapa Local Board also supports the increased use of rail and sea freight to take pressure off Auckland’s roading network and reduce carbon emissions.

11. Although we do not currently have rail connections, we note the provision of land for the Avondale-Southdown link and note that this may become an important freight connection in the future.

**Strategic Priority 4 – Climate Change**

12. The Puketāpapa Local Board strongly supports the inclusion of climate change as a strategic priority. The local board strongly supports increased provision of safe walking and cycling
infrastructure to encourage uptake of active modes. It also welcomes innovation, including micro-mobility options and demand management tools.

13. It is clear that good environmental management or kaitiakitanga, and working to meet the challenges of climate change, are huge priorities for the people of Puketāpapa, as evidenced in local board consultation. The local board sees reducing the emissions associated with the transport system as being of the highest priority and applauds the Transport Agency for making climate change a strategic direction. We believe there is a need to focus on how projects affect the environment and to move beyond mitigation to creating a ‘better’ outcome.

14. However, the local board would urge the Transport Agency to take a more directive approach in implementing this strategic direction to ensure that Approved Organisations actively seek to implement projects and initiatives in this space, noting that in spite of the move to a mode-neutral approach with more emphasis on safety and emissions-reduction in the 2018 GPS, these changes have been slow to take hold at an organisational level throughout the relevant agencies. The local board hopes that a more radical cultural shift will result from this draft GPS.
Albert-Eden Roskill Ward Councillor Update

File No.: CP2020/05794

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To enable the Albert-Eden Roskill Ward Councillors to verbally update the Local Board.

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

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

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

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketāpapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki &amp; Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairperson's Report

File No.: CP2020/05795

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

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

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:
   a) receive Chair Harry Doig’s report for 05 March - 06 May 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>H Doig report period 05 March - 06 May 2020</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketāpapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki &amp; Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Puketāpapa Local Board
Business meeting date – 21 May 2020

Harry Doig Board Member Report
Period from 05 March to 06 May 2020

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

Council meetings / events attended
05 March Puketāpapa Local Board (PLB) Workshop
05 March AT Capital Fund meeting
05 Mar Community Forum – HYS Annual Budget and CCO Review
06 Mar Kura Kāwana induction - Conflicts of interest and the code of conduct
07 Mar PLB plan engagement – Kai Festival Te Kura Kaupapa Maori o Maungarongo
09 Mar Local Board Chairs Forum – Chairs only session
09 Mar Local Board Chairs Forum
10 Mar Joint Liaison Body Meeting - JWAT/Auckland Council
11 Mar Chair and Deputy Chair meeting with Snr Advisor about HPAP Governance
11 Mar Chair/ Deputy Chair catch up
11 Mar Members’ forum presentation preparation with Deputy Chair
11 Mar Chair / Deputy Chair / Snr Advisor catch up
12 Mar Puketāpapa Local Board (PLB) Workshop
13 Mar LGNZ Auckland Zone meeting
13 Mar Kura Kāwana Induction - Obligations to Maori and co-governance
16 Mar Attend and present at Local Board Members’ Forum with Deputy Chair Fairey and Member Turner
16 Mar PA/ Chair catchup
16 Mar PLB Agenda run through
16 Mar Puketapapa Local Board Citizenship Ceremony with Deputy Chair Fairey and member Kumar – abbreviated because of Covid 19
17 Mar PLB plan engagement Mt Roskill Library with member Kumar
18 Mar Phone call with Director - Executive Programmes about Gilletta Rd issues
18 Mar Chair/ Deputy Chair catch up
18 Mar Catch-up by phone with LBS GM
18 Mar Chair / Deputy Chair / RM / Snr Advisor catch up
18 Mar Meet re PLB draft Business meeting minutes
19 Mar Puketāpapa Local Board Business Meeting
19 Mar Meeting re Potential amendments to FY20 work programme because of Covid19
19 Mar Puketāpapa Local Board (PLB) Workshop – trial meeting remotely
20 Mar Monthly Comms meeting with Deputy Chair Fairey and Comms Advisor
23 Mar Covid19 Level 3
25 Mar Chair/ Deputy Chair catch up by phone
25 Mar Chair / Deputy Chair / Snr Advisor catch up (by Skype)
26 Mar Covid19 Level 4
26 Mar Puketāpapa Local Board (PLB) Workshop (by Skype)(part)
26 Mar Local Board Chairs weekly COVID-19 operational briefing (by Skype)
26 Mar Integrated Area Plan working group (by Skype)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Mar</td>
<td>Catch-up with Cr Casey and Albert Eden Chair (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 April</td>
<td>Chair/Deputy Chair catch up (by phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 Apr</td>
<td>Chair/Deputy Chair / RM / Snr Advisor catch up (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Apr</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board (PLB) Workshop (by Skype) (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Apr</td>
<td>Local Board Chairs weekly COVID-19 operational briefing (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 Apr</td>
<td>Meet with Albert – Eden chair and Albert Eden Puketāpapa ward councillor re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“shovel-ready” projects (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Apr</td>
<td>Catch-up with AE chair and AEP councillor (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 Apr</td>
<td>Chair/Deputy Chair catch up (by phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 Apr</td>
<td>Chair / Deputy Chair / Snr Advisor catch up (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 Apr</td>
<td>Meet with Albert – Eden chair and Albert Eden Puketāpapa ward councillor re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“shovel-ready” projects (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 Apr</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board (PLB) Workshop (by Skype)(part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 Apr</td>
<td>Local Board Chairs weekly COVID-19 operational briefing (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Apr</td>
<td>Chair/Deputy Chair catch up (by phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Apr</td>
<td>Chair / Deputy Chair / RM / Snr Advisor catch up (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Apr</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board (PLB) Workshop (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Apr</td>
<td>Local Board Chairs weekly COVID-19 operational briefing (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Apr</td>
<td>Monthly Comms meeting with Deputy Chair, and Comms Advisor &amp; Snr Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Apr</td>
<td>Chair / Deputy Chair / RM / Snr Advisor catch up (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Apr</td>
<td>Catch-up with AE chair and AEP councillor (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Apr</td>
<td>Chair/Deputy Chair catch up (by phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Apr</td>
<td>Chair / Deputy Chair / RM / Snr Advisor catch up (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Apr</td>
<td>Local Board Chairs weekly COVID-19 operational briefing (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Apr</td>
<td>Covid 19 level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Apr</td>
<td>Local Board Chairs' Briefing with Chair and Deputy Chair of the Finance &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Committee (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Apr</td>
<td>Chair/Deputy Chair catch up (by phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Apr</td>
<td>Chair / Deputy Chair / RM / Snr Advisor catch up (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Apr</td>
<td>Catch-up with AE chair and AEP councillor (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Apr</td>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board (PLB) Workshop (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Apr</td>
<td>Integrated Area Plan workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 May</td>
<td>Phone call with JWAT officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 May</td>
<td>Chair / Deputy Chair / RM / Snr Advisor catch up (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 May</td>
<td>PLB Agenda Run through for Extra Ordinary meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 May</td>
<td>Catch-up with AE chair and AEP councillor (by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 May</td>
<td>Attend by Skype Finance and Performance workshop – Annual Budget 2020/2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other relevant meetings attended
06 Mar Catch-up with Roskill Together
10 Mar Catch-up with South Epsom Planning Group
12 Mar With Community Constable meet with constituent about Gilletta Rd issues
15 Mar Attend Memorial Prayer Service for the Martyrs of 15 March 2019
19 Mar Meet with Ministers’ Association representative
20 Mar Meet with Chair of NZ Ethnic Women’s Trust

Issues

Disclosures

As recorded in Council’s declaration of interest register

Recommendation

That this report be received.
Board Member Reports

File No.: CP2020/05796

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

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

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

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ella Kumar board member report 01 March - 30 April 2020</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Bobby Shen board member report period 20 February 2020 - 19 March 2020</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bobby Shen board member report period 19 March 2020 - 16 April 2020</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bobby Shen board member report 16 April 2020 - 21 May 2020</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Jon Turner board member report 06 March 2020 - 07 May 2020</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketāpapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki &amp; Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Puketapapa Local Board

Business Meeting 21st May 2020

Board Member Ella Kumar Report from March 1st to April 30th 2020

Roles assigned by the local board

Delegations in the fourth term (2019-2022)

- Landowner consents AND filming AND events
  - Julie Fairey Lead and Ella Kumar Alternate
- Liquor licenses AND notification of resource consents AND board views on notified consents
  - Harry Doig Lead and member Ella Kumar Alternate

Appointments in the fourth term (2019-2022)

- Aircraft Noise Community Consultative Group – Ella Kumar Lead and Bobby Shen Alternate
- Pah Homestead Joint Liaison Body – Chair Lead and Ella Kumar Alternate
- Manukau Harbour Forum - Jon Turner Lead and Ella Kumar Alternate
- Integrated Area Plan PWP – all members, but a quorum of three

Board key contact people for the fourth term (2019-2022)

- Parks and Environment: Primary contact Julie, Secondary contact Ella
- Community: Primary contact Harry, Secondary contact Fiona
- Transport: Primary contact Julie, Secondary contact Jon
- Planning: Primary contact Ella, Secondary contact Bobby

Delegations in the fourth term (2019-2022)

- Landowner consents AND filming AND events
  - Julie Fairey Lead and Ella Kumar Alternate
- Liquor licenses AND notification of resource consents AND board views on notified consents
  - Harry Doig Lead and member Ella Kumar Alternate

Appointments in the fourth term (2019-2022)

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

- Parks and Environment: Primary contact Julie, Secondary contact Ella
- Community: Primary contact Harry, Secondary contact Fiona
- Transport: Primary contact Julie, Secondary contact Jon
- Planning: Primary contact Ella, Secondary contact Bobby

Meetings / events attended
1st March Music in the park
2nd March Mt Roskill Grammar School PLB Draft Plan Consultation
5th March Local Board Workshop
   1.0 Workshop Program Update 2020
   2.0 LB Work Programme 2021
   3.0 Park Sports and Rec Programme
   4.0 Alcohol licensing
   5.0 Panuku Introduction
   6.0 Panuku
5th March Community Forum Lynfield
7th March Te Kura kai Festival PLB draft plan consultation
9th March Dominion Road Primary School PLB draft plan consultation
9th March Air Noise meeting
12th March Local Board Workshop
   1.0 LB Plan
   2.0 Monte Cecilia Park potential artwork
   3.0 Local Board Plan
   4.0 Auckland Climate Change Action Plan feedback
   5.0 Low Carbon overview
   6.0 Liston Village OLI
1st March to 16th March completed Community Creative Arts assessments.
14th March PLB Have Your Say PLB draft plan consultation
16th March Agenda Run through
16th March Citizenship Ceremony
17th March Have Your Say PLB draft plan consultation
18th March Mt Roskill Primary School PLB draft plan consultation
19th March PLB Business meeting
19th March Local Board Workshop

Community Facilities
1.0 AIMS update
2.0 Walmsley Underwood
3.0 Asset Risk Assessment
4.0 Keith Hay Park
5.0 Operational Maintenance Update

Community Empowerment

26th March

Local Board Workshop

1.0 Local Board Plan
2.0 AT Local Board Transport Capital Fund
3.0 AT Connected Communities
4.0 Local Board Plan
5.0 Grant programme for 2021

Integrated Plan Workshop

2nd April

Local Board Workshop

1.0 April Board meeting
2.0 Local Board Business meeting
3.0 Local Board Plan
4.0 TOR Grant Programme members only
5.0 Local Board Plan

9th April

Local Board Workshop

1.0 Technical Check in
2.0 Terms of Reference Grants Programme
3.0 3.0 Run through of reporting problems through website
4.0 AT Footpath maintenance programme
5.0 Local Board Capital Fund -finalist list of scoping
6.0 Council Submission to the Waka Kotahi:NZ Transport Agency’s Accessible package

16th April

Local Board Workshop

1.0 Technical check
2.0 Introduction Sam new local board advisor
3.0 Waka Kotahi NZ
   Transport agency, Accessible streets
4.0 Member update
5.0 Launching Nexus plan

Recess Week 20th April to 24th April

30th April

Local Board Workshop

1.0 Workshop 4 consultation Feedback part 1
2.0 Finance Briefing
3.0 Te Kete Rukuruku
4.0 FY 21 Community Grants TOR

Integrated Plan Workshop

19th March onwards we have been in lockdown, continue to workshop through Skype and online.

Disclosures

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

Roskill Together Committee Member

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

Recommendation

That this report be received.

Signatories

| Author | Ella Kumar |
Bobby Shen Board Member Report
Reporting 20 February 2020 to 19 March 2020.

Community Engagement for Local Board Plan

During this period, the Puketāpapa Local Board has been engaging with the community in different formats about their Local Board Plan. Whether it be different age groups, ethnicities or community groups, we have covered off a good range of our community. In most cases, we have gone to where the community are, to make it easier for people to talk to us and see our draft plan.

With the emergence of COVID-19 and the immediate threat to those most vulnerable, we have been reviewing our engagement on a daily basis and although this will impact on our engagement activities, we have already captured a lot of the community’s thoughts and ideas. Thank you for being a part of our plan making!

Safety in our neighbourhoods

Some of the issues I have seen from constituents include anecdotal reports of increased anti-social activity in some of our neighbourhoods, including vehicle crime. There is a report reviewing the planned housing development at Addison, where crime prevention through environmental design was a feature and police data research also gave some insights. Communal surveillance and sightlines were identified as better for a safer feeling street which in older neighbourhoods is harder to achieve since developments are planned around topography (curvy streets) and have lots of planting and fences. For our newer developments, these sightlines will be doubly important to encourage safer streets.

It was great to celebrate the gifting of the Mt Roskill Community Patrol's patrol vehicle, donated by a local resident. Working with the NZ Police, the community patrol are a key part of keeping Puketāpapa safe and are all volunteers – do see what they are all about at https://mtroskillcp.org.nz/
Roles assigned by the local board
- Planning contact person
- Airport Noise Community Consultative Group
- Member of the Integrated Area Plan Working Group

General / assigned roles update
- As a part of the planning contact person role, resource consents flagged to us by officers are reviewed.
- Read report by RIMU Research and Evaluation Unit (Auckland Council) “Living in Addison: An Investigation into the lived experience of a master planned housing development in Auckland.” This research is relevant to the higher density housing developments occurring or already realised in Puketāpapa but also there is a section about vehicle crime which is relevant to anecdotal reports of increased vehicle crime in Puketāpapa, particularly in Lynfield.

Meetings / events attended
Note Local Board workshops were full day workshops and were attended in full unless otherwise noted. Refer to Workshop Notes attached to the agenda for more information.
- 13 February 2020: Took a phonecall from a Three Kings constituent, provided update to a local issue enquiry.
- 13 February 2020: Had a phonecall with a Three Kings constituent, provided update to a local issue enquiry.
- 15 February 2020: Met with a Hillsborough constituent
- 20 February 2020: Local Board Business Meeting and workshop
- 23 February 2020: Met with a teacher who used to teach at Mt Roskill Primary School
- 23 February 2020: Attended Cojam presentations at AUT University about how to improve the migrant experience in New Zealand
- 25 February 2020: Attended Mt Roskill Community Patrol celebration with Members Kumar and Liu for receiving a donated patrol car
- 25 February 2020: Visited Ranfurly Retirement Village with Chair Doig to talk to residents about the Local Board Plan consultation
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- 27 February 2020: Local Board workshop
- 28 February 2020: Attended Kura Kawana training session on “Treaty of Waitangi Historical Overview”
- 28 February 2020: Attended Community Volunteer Day with Chair Doig helping May Road School and Waikowhai Primary School
- 1 March 2020: Attended Music in Parks at Walmsley Park with Chair Doig and Members Tumer, Kumar and Lai
- 1 March 2020: Attended Mt Roskill MP Michael Wood’s Community Forum at the Fickling Centre
- 4 March 2020: Took a phone call with a three Kings constituent
- 4 March 2020: Attended Hillsborough, Lynfield and Mount Roskill Rotary Club meeting with Chair Doig and Member Lai to speak to members about the Local Board Plan consultation
- 5 March 2020: Local Board workshop
- 5 March 2020: Hosted a Community Forum at Lynfield Recreation Centre with the other Puketapapa Board Members talking about the Local Board Plan consultation and the Integrated Area Plan
- 6 March 2020: Attended Kura Kawana training session on “Conflicts of Interest and the Code of Conduct” with Chair Doig, Members Fairey, Tumer and Lai
- 9 March 2020: Visited Dominion Road Primary School to talk about the Puketapapa Local Board and the Local Board Plan consultation with Members Fairey, Kumar and Lai
- 11 March 2020: Visited Gracedale Hospital and Rest Home to talk to residents about the Local Board Plan consultation
- 12 March 2020: Local Board workshop
- 14 March 2020: Met with a Mt Roskill constituent
- 14 March 2020: Visited Al Manar Trust Open Day in Mt Roskill
- 14 March 2020: Held a drop-in stall at Mt Roskill Library with Members Fairey and Lai talking to visitors about the Local Board Plan consultation
- 14 March 2020: Attended Kainga Ora Community Day with Member Kumar
- 14 March 2020: Spoke at Building Bridges Community Hui hosted by Migrant Action Trust, ARCC and others with Chair Watson from Albert-Eden Local Board

Figure 6 Local Music in Parks event at Walmsley Park
Figure 7 Volunteering at Mt Roskill
Figure 8 Local Board Plan engagement at Mt Roskill Library
Figure 9 Kainga Ora Community Day
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- 15 March 2020: Volunteered at the Tupuna Maunga Authority Community Work Day at Pukewiwi/Mt Roskill with Cr Casey
- 15 March 2020: Spoke at a local Christchurch Memorial event at Mt Roskill War Memorial with Mayor Phil Goff and Chair Doig
- 16 March 2020: Attended Local Board Forum talking about the “Three Horizons Model to Decision Making”
- 16 March 2020: Local Board Business Meeting agenda run-through

Conferences / member development
- 28 February 2020: Attended Kura Kawana training session on “Treaty of Waitangi Historical Overview”
- 6 March 2020: Attended Kura Kawana training session on “Conflicts of Interest and the Code of Conduct”
- 16 March 2020: Attended Local Board Forum talking about the “Three Horizons Model to Decision Making”

Disclosures
- I have been a member of the leadership team for Roskill Chinese Group since its conception in March 2019, supporting this group grow and serve our community. I have declared my conflict of interest to decisions related to the Roskill Chinese Group.
- I am a member of the Body Corporation Committee for the Obsidian Apartments and will raise this interest if there is a potential conflict.
- I am an active volunteer in Puketāpapa and will raise any conflict of interest I might have when on a meeting agenda.

Recommendation
That this report be received.
Bobby Shen Board Member Report
Reporting 19 March 2020 to 16 April 2020.

COVID-19 Situation

Much of the Local Board community engagements have been cancelled during this period of lockdown and precautions. I have seen our community working together very well, supporting one another in our neighbourhoods and online. People in my vicinity have been respecting the rules and behaving well in the supermarkets despite all the tensions.

I have been actively promoting the Three Kings Heritage walk to local residents as a good way to explore their neighbourhood during their lockdown walks. Also of interest is the addressing graffiti on the Three Kings Reservoir and the effects of Fletcher development to Western Reserve.

The Local Board has been continuing its work via video calling, particularly around the Local Board Plan and responding to any COVID-19 related challenges and opportunities. If you think of anything we can do in our local advocacy role in these challenging times, please do get in contact with us.

Increased density in our neighbourhoods

As a part of my planning role on the Local Board, I try to keep on top of any material that may help in our local situation. I read the "Medium Density: Lessons learned from recent Auckland mid-rise apartment developments" report from 2019. Combined with my professional background as an architectural designer and my ongoing interest in urban planning and design, I hope this will assist advocate for better outcomes in our newer neighbourhoods.

One of the more popular typologies springing up in our area is medium density developments. These are either rows of townhouses, or low-rise apartment blocks. It is not a completely new typology - there is already a large apartment block on Keystone Avenue behind the Roskill Shops and new apartments and townhouses have been popping up in Three Kings. Some are aged-care developments - examples include the Rymans development in Lynfield and the ongoing development at Ranfurly, Three Kings.

Some key points:

- Different types of housing provides better choices for people at different stages of life.
- "Design excellence" should be strived for in new developments of any sort, but this may look different in different places.
- It is not only the buildings themselves, but the surrounding area also needs to work in with the development and wider area. Shared open space is a good bonus for the community.
- Car parking is a requirement of the Unitary Plan but they shouldn't make it a feature. Hide it, or make it pleasant and safe.
Roles assigned by the local board
- Planning contact person
- Airport Noise Community Consultative Group
- Member of the Integrated Area Plan Working Group

General / assigned roles update
- As a part of the planning contact person role, resource consents flagged to us by officers are reviewed. One resource consent about some infrastructure was flagged for further information to analyse its effect on the surrounding school and residential community.

Board Member Activities

Note Local Board workshops were mostly full day workshops and were attended in full unless otherwise noted. Refer to Workshop Notes attached to the agenda for more information. Due to COVID-19, the local board met over Skype and the April Business Meeting was cancelled as statutory requirements over working digitally were still being addressed.

- 19 March 2020: Local Board Business Meeting and workshop.
- 22 March 2020: Phone call with young constituent.
- 26 March 2020: Local Board workshop
- 29 March 2020: Email correspondence with Hillsborough constituent about car parking issues.
- 30 March 2020: Met with Mt Roskill constituent over video call.
- 2 April 2020: Local Board workshop
- 2 April 2020: Met with Three Kings constituent over video call.
- 2 April 2020: Corresponded with a Mt Roskill constituent about the lockdown and working from home arrangements.
- 5 April 2020: Organised catch up with members of the LGNZ Young Elected Representatives network.
- 6 April 2020: Email with a Mt Roskill constituent about a transport issue.
- 7 April 2020: Attended NZIA “Managing in uncertain times” webinar.
- 9 April 2020: Local Board workshop
- 9 April 2020: Provided feedback to Member Turner’s proposed Notice of Motion.
- 9 April 2020: Provided feedback to the Office of Ethnic Communities about the effects of COVID-19 on Puketāpapa’s ethnic groups.
- 10 April 2020: Corresponded with Lynfield constituent about the lockdown situation.
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- 10 April 2020: Followed up on a Three Kings constituent report of graffiti at Big King Reserve during the lockdown.
- 11 April 2020: Correspondence with Three Kings constituent about a COVID-19 related query and a potential idea.
- 12 April 2020: Organised catch up with members of the LGNZ Young Elected Representatives network.
- 13 April 2020: Provided feedback toward the Local Board feedback for the Accessible Streets package.
- 13 April 2020: Watched LGNZ webinar on “Your role in emergency management”
- 16 April 2020: Local Board Workshop

Conferences / member development

- 7 April 2020: Attended NZIA “Managing in uncertain times” webinar talking about managing businesses during COVID-19 and other difficult times such as recessions.
- 9 April 2020: Received training from Customer Services team about how the public can use “report a problem” tools effectively.
- 13 April 2020: Watched LGNZ webinar on “Your role in emergency management”

Disclosures

- I have been a member of the leadership team for Roskill Chinese Group since its conception in March 2019, supporting this group grow and address social isolation in our community. I have declared my conflict of interest to decisions related to the Roskill Chinese Group.
- I am a member of the Body Corporate Committee for the Obsidian Apartments and will raise this interest if there is a potential conflict.
- I am an active volunteer in Puketāpapa and will raise any conflict of interest I might have when on a meeting agenda.

Recommendation

That this report be received.
Bobby Shen Board Member Report
Reporting 16 April March 2020 to 21 May 2020

COVID-19 Situation

The work of the Puketāpapa Local Board carries on digitally but with the looming decisions around COVID-19 effects. We are proceeding with that in mind at every step and will see how we can support our communities during this difficult period.

As we proceed to Alert Level 3, we are seeing our local businesses starting to mobilise again which is great to see. Online there is a lot of chatter about people’s favourite local shops and eateries which is wonderful.

Construction activities across the country are also resuming, with many Auckland Council, Auckland Transport and Watercare works starting up again. They still have to observe COVID-19 safe practices and I attended an interesting webinar about the effects on how construction will work during Level 3 and beyond. A lot is being done with physical distancing and contact tracing.

Roles assigned by the local board

- Planning contact person
- Airport Noise Community Consultative Group
- Member of the Integrated Area Plan Working Group

General / assigned roles update

- Reviewed resource consents week to week. Observing there are far fewer resource consents for Puketāpapa recently.
- Integrated Area Plan Working Group: A part of a smaller group made up of Member Kumar and Maskill reviewing the maps for legibility before going to the wider group.
- The working group also reviewed the engagement plan going forward into the engagement phase mid this year.
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Board Member Activities

Note Local Board workshops were mostly full day workshops and were attended in full unless otherwise noted. Refer to Workshop Notes attached to the agenda for more information. Due to COVID-19, the local board met over Skype.

- 19 April 2020: Reviewed ‘Development Opportunities’ and ‘Business, Community’ maps for the Integrated Area Plan
- 19 April 2020: Met with some members of the LGNZ Young Elected Representatives Network online
- 20 April 2020: Checked up on elderly Mt Roskill constituent via email
- 21 April 2020: Watched “Building Industry at Level Three” Webinar
- 21 April 2020: Attended Roskill Community Network meeting digitally
- 24 April 2020: Met with some members of the LGNZ Young Elected Representatives Network online
- 24 April 2020: Responded to a Three Kings constituent, alerted them to the provisions Auckland Council had made to extend construction working hours.
- 25 April 2020: ANZAC Day, attended Stand at Dawn and MP Michael Wood’s Mt Roskill Remembrance meeting via Zoom with Chair Doig
- 25 April 2020: Corresponded with a Mt Roskill business owner
- 26 April 2020: Met with some members of the LGNZ Young Elected Representatives Network online
- 29 April 2020: Attended Puketāpapa Youth Board meeting with MP Michael Wood and Member Turner
- 30 April 2020: Local Board Workshop and Integrated Area Plan Working Group meeting
- 4 May 2020: Local Board Agenda run through meeting
- 4 May 2020: Migrant Action Trust Hui online
- 6 May 2020: Responded to a Mt Roskill constituent about local board funding
- 7 May 2020: Special Business Meeting and Local Board Workshop
Puketāpapa Local Board
Thursday 21 May 2020

Conferences / member development
- 21 April 2020: Watched “Building Industry at Level Three” Webinar
- Watching various Local Government NZ webinars

Disclosures
- I have been a member of the leadership team for Roskill Chinese Group since its conception in March 2019, supporting this group grow and address social isolation in our community. I have declared my conflict of interest to decisions related to the Roskill Chinese Group.
- I am an active volunteer in Puketāpapa and will raise any conflict of interest I might have when on a meeting agenda.

Recommendation
That this report be received.
Jonathan Turner Board Member Report
6th March 2020 – 7th May 2020

As I began this report, we had a full calendar of engagements booked to consult with our communities on the Local Board plan and the Annual Budget. However, with the onset of Covid-19 and the effect it has had on Aotearoa many things have changed. We have shifted our meetings to be online and the majority of my work has been via email and phone. I have also been participating in a range of webinars relevant to my role with a focus on sustainability and improving transport. A big task for me over the last month was putting together the board’s submission on the Government’s Accessible Streets law reform package.

My thanks go out to our community who have pulled together and worked hard to eradicate Coronavirus from our shores and I look forward to getting out amongst you all soon.

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

General / assigned roles update
- Logged a variety of issues with council including:
  - Weeds in walkways between streets
  - Leak on Richardson Rd
  - Traffic light issues in Mt Roskill shops
  - Traffic light phasing issues at Maico Street/SH20.
  - Disused bus stop on Alex Boyd Link lacking signage indicating this.
  - A number of footpath issues.
  - A range of issues on Winstone Road. AT have indicated they will be looking at fixing the pedestrian crossing in a reasonable amount of time.

- Communicated with residents about a number of concerns:
  - Carlton Street upgrade concerns – residents worried that the bus route will not be put in place. BECA presented their safety audit of Carlton Street and confirmed that ‘minor’ risks currently exist and will not be exacerbated. We are now waiting for the next steps.
  - Commodore/Hillsborough/Margaret Griffin intersection – issues around parking and sightlines.
  - Safety of cycleways – witnessed an accident on the turnoff from the SW cycleway. I have proposed that a protected ramp onto the road be added here.
  - Weeds in a number of walkways. These have been reported to Auckland Council and will be dealt with.
  - Advocated for keeping the eastern interior gate of Hillsborough Cemetery locked after multiple reports of illegal activities and unwanted parties.
  - Communicated with members of the Epidemic Response Committee about clarifying the rules around bicycle shops and essential repairs under Level 4.
  - Pest plants such as Australian Wattle in the Hillsborough Cemetery/Belfast Reserve forest. Waiting to hear more from the parks team on this.
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- Residents wanting to allocate more of the road carriageway to pedestrians and cyclists in light of the Covid-19 outbreak. During the lockdown there have been more people out walking and our small footpaths have been highlighted as an area of concern. Focus areas include Hillsborough Road, Mount Roskill Shops, Stoddard Road and Littlejohn Street. At the previous business meeting I asked that pedestrian buttons be made automatic and this has occurred at a number of locations in the board area.
- Issues around noise of resurfacing works on Dominion Road.

Meetings / events attended

- 6th March - Kura Kāwana workshop on Conflicts of Interest
- 9th March - Monthly catch up with Auckland Transport with member Fairey
- 10th March - Meeting with AT, BECA, Councillor Fletcher, member Fairey and residents of Hillsborough to discuss the safety audit of Carlton Street
- 11th March - Exhibition openings at Pah Homestead, Monte Cecilia Park.
- 12th March - Local Board Workshop
- 13th March - Kura Kāwana workshop on Obligations to Māori and co-governance.
- 16th March - Local Board Members forum
- 16th March - Agenda Run through for Business meeting
- 17th March - Met with constituent to discuss issues with roads and parks in the Hillsborough area
- 19th March - Local Board Business meeting
- 19th March Local Board workshop
- 26th March - Local Board workshop over Skype
- 26th March - Integrated Area Planning workshop with Albert-Eden members
- 2nd April - Local Board Workshop over Skype
- 3rd April - Zoom discussion with members of Albert-Eden, Whau, Waitemata and Upper Harbour local Boards about ways to approach a potential continued water crisis.
- 4th April - Met with constituent to discuss stopgap measures to allow for greater pedestrian movement during Covid-19
- 6th April - Zoom discussion with Kainga ora and residents about the innovating streets fund.
- 9th April - Local Board workshop over Skype
- 15th April - Innovating Streets Webinar hosted by NZTA
- 16th April - Local Board workshop over Skype
- 17th April - Sustainability insights and opportunities in COVID 19 landscape webinar hosted by the sustainability society
- 20th April - Auckland Transport issues catchup
- 23rd April - Local Board workshop over Skype
- 24th April - How to talk about Urban Mobility webinar hosted by NZTA
- 25th April - ANZAC day commemorations – our area embraced the “Stand at Dawn” event and many households acknowledged the day in creative ways.
- 28th April - Innovating streets discussion with NZTA about improving the pedestrian experience on Littlejohn/Carlton Street.
- 29th April - Discussion with Kainga Ora representative about Innovating streets projects in Roskill South and Waikowhai.
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- 30th April - Local Board workshop over Skype.
- 30th April – Integrated Area Plan meeting with members from Albert/Eden Local Board.
- 7th May – Local Board workshop over Skype.

A local resident's display for ANZAC day.

Conferences / member development

- 6th March – Attended the Kura Kāwāna session on Conflicts of Interest with members Fairey, Doig, Lai and Shen. This was an interesting session that covered the different ways members can have a conflict of interest, while emphasising that having a conflict of interest is not a “bad” thing to have.
- 13th March Kura Kawana obligations to Māori seminar
- 16th March Local Board Member’s forum – attended by a wide range of Local Board members, discussing a large range of issues.
- 16th April – Innovating Streets Webinar hosted by NZTA
- 17th April - Sustainability insights and opportunities in COVID 19 landscape webinar hosted by the sustainability society
- 23rd April – Innovating Streets second Webinar focused on FAQ hosted by NZTA
- 24th April – How to talk about Urban Mobility webinar hosted by NZTA

Disclosures

Recommendation
That this report be received.
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To present the Puketāpapa Local Board with its updated governance forward work programme calendar (the calendar).

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

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

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

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) receive the governance forward work programme calendar for April and May 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>20200416 Governance Forward Work Programme</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>20200521 Governance Forward Work Programme</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Selina Powell - Democracy Advisor - Puketāpapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Nina Siers - Relationship Manager for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki &amp; Puketāpapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketapapa Local Board Governance Forward Work Programme - April 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>7 May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement Meeting Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting 21 May 2020</td>
<td>Item 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide a summary of Puketāpapa Local Board (the Board) workshop notes.

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

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20200312 Workshop Record</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20200319 Workshop Record</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20200326 Workshop Record</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>20200402 Workshop Record</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>20200409 Workshop Record</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>20200416 Workshop Record</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>20200430 Workshop Record</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>20200507 Workshop Record</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

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

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board office, 580 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings on Thursday, 12 March 2020 commencing at 9.25 am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Harry Doig left at 3.46 pm
Members: Julie Fairey
Elia Kumar arrived at 9.42 am
Fiona Lai
Bobby Shen
Jon Turner

Apologies:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>No interests recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Local Board Plan (content)</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>The officer presented on the local board consultation feedback to date and progressed the development of the 2020 Local Board Plan. Next steps: further workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hay</td>
<td>Senior Local Board Advisor - Puketāpapa Local Board Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Local Board Plan (engagement)</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>The officer updated the local board on the progress with engagement and asked members for their views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hay</td>
<td>Senior Local Board Advisor - Puketāpapa Local Board Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Monte Cecilia Park – potential artwork</td>
<td>Local initiative/specific decision</td>
<td>The officers presented the suitability of Monte Cecilia Park for a piece of public artwork. Next steps confirmation of the process for the public art work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichola Waugh</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Culture Project Manager Arts Community and Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netty Richards</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Placem Specialist Parks Sports and Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Culture Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Community and Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.0 Local Board Plan (content continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mary Hay</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Local Board Advisor - Puketāpapa Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting direction/priorities/budget</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer continued the conversation on consultation feedback and progressing the development of the 2020 Local Board Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.0 Auckland Climate Change Action Plan – Climate formal feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mary Hay</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Local Board Advisor - Puketāpapa Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input into regional decision making</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer presented on the Auckland Climate Change Framework noting the six beliefs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Belief in climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The need for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support for ACAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Immediate needs have greatest support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Role of the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Council performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next steps: the board to provide their formal feedback to the Puketāpapa Local Board Business Meeting 19 March 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.0 Low Carbon Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robbie Sutherland</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Carbon Specialist Environmental Services - Infra &amp; Env</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nick FitzHerbert</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Advisor Relationship Management Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liz Ross</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Carbon Specialist Environmental Services - Infra &amp; Env</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting direction/priorities/budget</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer presented an overview of the low carbon projects that the board are currently funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next steps a further workshop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 4.17 pm.
Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held in the Puketāpapa Local Board office, 560 Mt Albert Road, Three Kings, Thursday, 19 March 2020 commencing at 1.30 pm.

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

Apologies:

Also present: Nina Siers, Mary Hay and Priscila Firmo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>No interests recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Community Facilities Update</td>
<td>Jody Morley Area Operations Manager Community Facilities</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 AIM Services Update</td>
<td>Rod Sheridan General Manager Community Facilities</td>
<td>Apologies – item withdrawn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Walmsley/Underwood Park wayfinding signage</td>
<td>Amy Donovan Healthy Waters Specialist Nick FitzHerbert I&amp;ES Relationship Advisor Netty Richards Parks, Sports and Recreation Specialist</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Asset Risk Assessment Programme update</td>
<td>Jaquelma Maderlo Senior Programme Coordinator Ben Meadows Programme Manager Community Facilities</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Keith Hay Park</td>
<td>Kayleigh Hibberd Senior Project Manager Community Facilities</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.5 Operational Maintenance Update

**Justin Cash**  
Operational Management and Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 25   | Oversight and monitoring | The officer provided the board with an update on the following:  
* a) sports booking now closed temporarily  
* b) fire at Waikowhai  
* c) flags  
* d) toilet issue |

### 2.0 Community Empowerment Unit

**Juanita de Senna**  
Strategic Broker  
Arts Community & Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The officer introduced the team the following was discussed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylyn Braganza</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>ID 143 Build capacity: Support Roskill Community Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylyn Braganza</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>ID 146 Community-led placemaking: Support Neighbours Day Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylyn Braganza</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Increase diverse participation: ID 189 Seniors participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylyn Braganza</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>ID1286 Capacity building for delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylyn Braganza</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Strategic Relationship Grants 2020/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylyn Braganza</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Strategic Relationship Grants 2019/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa Va’aelu</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>ID144 Build capacity: Increase children’s participation in council decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa Va’aelu</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>ID143 Build Capacity: Youth Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunita Kashyap</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>ID149 Increase diverse participation: Social innovation and enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Cho</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>ID: 1277 Increase diverse community participation: Responsive programming for identified communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita de Senna</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>ID: 148 Apply the empowered communities approach – connection communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita de Senna</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>ID: 881 Build capacity: Maori Responsiveness – Responding to the key aspirations and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The workshop concluded at 3.45 pm
## Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held via SKYPE for Business on 26 March 2020 due to COVID19 alert level 4 commencing at 9.15 am.

**Present**
- Chairperson: Harry Doig
- Members: Julie Fairey, Ella Kumar, Fiona Lai, Bobby Shen, Jon Turner

**Apologies:**
- Nina Siers, Mary Hay, Selina Powell, Priscila Firmo
- Also present: Nina Siers, Mary Hay, Selina Powell, Priscila Firmo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Local Board Plan</td>
<td>Declaration of Interest</td>
<td>Ella Kumar – Grants Roskill Together for Item 5 Grants Programme Bobby Shen – Grants Chinese Group for Item 5 Grants Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Local Board Plan</td>
<td>Local initiatives/specific decisions</td>
<td>The officer presented on a further draft of the 2020 local board plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 AT Connected Communities</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The officer presented on AT Connected Communities the local board provided feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 AT Connected Bruce Thomas</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The officer presented on AT Connected communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 AT Connected Bruce Thomas</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The officer presented on AT Connected communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Local Board Plan (content continued)</td>
<td>Local initiatives/specific decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Grants Programme for 2021</td>
<td>Local initiatives/specific decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting closed at: 2.00 pm
**Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record**

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held via SKYPE for Business Thursday, 02 April 2020 due to COVID19 alert level 4 commencing at 1.00 pm.

**PRESENT**

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

**Apologies:**

**Also present:** Mary Hay and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Declarations of Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Member Kumar Roskill Chinese Group. Member Shen Roskill Chinese Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical sound check</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Members meeting was SKYPE enabled. All members SKYPED into the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mary Hay</strong></td>
<td><strong>Senior Local Board Advisor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Karakia and declarations of interest</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion on 16 April Puketāpapa Local Board Business Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair Doig delivered the karakia and asked members if they had any declarations of interest to declare for this meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mary Hay</strong></td>
<td><strong>Senior Local Board Advisor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nina Siers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Manager</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Local initiatives/specific decisions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On the Chair’s invitation the officer discussed with the local board the possibility of cancelling the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting scheduled for 16 April 2020. The local board members provided feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 **Local Board Plan**
Mary Hay
Senior Local Board Advisor

- **Local initiatives/specific decisions**

  The officer updated the local board on the workings of the draft local board plan.

4.0 **Members only time to discuss Terms for Reference for the Grants Programme**

  The members discussed the terms of reference for the Grants Programme.

5.0 **Local Board Plan (continued)**
Mary Hay
Senior Local Board Advisor

- **Local initiatives/specific decisions**

  The officer continued the discussion on the draft local board plan.

The workshop concluded at 3.30 pm.
Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held via SKYPE for Business on Thursday, 09 April 2020 due to COVID 19 alert level 4 commencing at 1.00 pm.

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

Apologies:

Also present: Nina Siers, Mary Hay, Sam Tan Rodrigo and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Technical Check In Karakia and declarations of Interest Mary Hay</td>
<td>Harry Doig Chair</td>
<td>Members all checked in via SKYPE the Karakia was given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Terms of Reference Grants Programme Moumita Dutta</td>
<td>Marion Davies Grant &amp; Incentives Manager Treasury Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>The officer presented on the review of the 2020/2021 grants programme, in the context of the COVID19 level 4 restrictions. Next steps: A further workshop and a report to be presented to the Puketāpapa Local Board business meeting 21 May 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Run through of report a problem website with local board members</td>
<td>Penny Newbigin Change Manager Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The officer presented the new tool on running through the report a problem website.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.0 AT Footpath maintenance programme

**Dylan Smith**  
Principal Project Manager - Waiarua  
Central Road Corridor Delivery

- **Setting direction/priorities/budget**

The officer provided the local board members with an update on the AT Footpath maintenance programme for their area. The local board members provided their feedback.

### 5.0 Local Board Capital Fund – final list for scoping

**Bruce Thomas**  
Elected Member  
Relationship Manager

- **Setting direction/priorities/budget**

The officer updated the local board members on the Local Board Capital Fund final list for scoping.  
Next steps: a report will be presented to the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting.

### 6.0 Waka Kotahi: NZ Transport Agency’s Accessible Streets Regulatory Package

**Jon Turner**  
Local Board Member

- **Input into regional decision making**

Local Board member Jon Turner updated members on the feedback being put forward on behalf of the board.  
Next steps: the feedback is to be submitted to the Auckland Council submission.

The workshop concluded at 5.00 pm.
Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held via SKYPE for Business, due to COVID19 alert level 4 on Thursday, 16 April 2020 commencing at 1.00 pm.

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

Apologies:

Also present: Nina Siers, Mary Hay, Sam Tan Rodrigo and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Item: Technical Check In, Karakia and declarations of interest</td>
<td>Harry Doig Chair</td>
<td>Members meeting was SKYPE enabled. All members SKYPED into the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Item: Introduction to the new Local Board Advisor Sam Tan Rodrigo</td>
<td>Mary Hay Senior Local Board Advisor</td>
<td>Th new local board advisor for the local board area was introduced to the local board members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Item: Waka Kotahi: NZ Transport Agency’s Accessible Streets Regulatory Package (cont)</td>
<td>Jon Turner Local Board Member</td>
<td>Feedback on the Waka Kotahi: NZ Transport Agency’s Accessible Streets Regulatory Package was considered. Next steps: feedback to be provided to the Transport Agency by 22 April 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Item: Member Only Time</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Member discussion time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.0 Launching Nexus Plans</th>
<th>The officer presented on where the electronic storage of board plans is now housed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hay</td>
<td>Senior Local Board Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 5.00 pm.
Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held via SKYPE for Business on Thursday, 30 April 2020 due to COVID-19 alert level 3 commencing at 1.00 pm.

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

Apologies:

Also present: Nina Siers, Mary Hay, Sam Tan Rodrigo and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Check In Karakia and declarations of interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Members meeting was SKYPE enabled. All members SKYPED into the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Local Board Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Doig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Workshop 4 Consultation Feedback part 1</td>
<td>Governance role: input into regional decision making.</td>
<td>The officer presented the consultation feedback to the board highlighting key areas of importance for the board where changes had occurred. Next steps: A report to be provided to the Extra Ordinary Business meeting on 07 May 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Tan Rodrigo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Rose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Financial Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Finance Briefing</td>
<td>Setting direction/priorities/budget</td>
<td>The officer presented the finance briefing. Next steps: a further workshop to discuss board priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina Siers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa – Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.0 Te Kete Rukuruku

**Pippa Sommerville**  
Principal Parks Advisor  
Parks Sports and Recreation  
Park Services  
**Julie Roulston**  
Te Kete Rukuruku Community Outreach Lead  
Parks Sports and Recreation  
Te Waka Tai-ranga-whenua

**Governance role: local initiatives/specific decisions**  
The officers presented on the Te Kete Rukuruku project. The officer advised 32 parks had been researched and Mana Whenua have been involved with the project.  
**Next steps: further information to be provided on the project.**

### 4.0 FY21 Community Grants

**Mary Hay**  
Senior Local Board Advisor

**The officer presented updated information on the grants programme 2021. The board provided feedback.**  
**Next steps a report to be presented to the Puketāpapa Local Board Business meeting 21 May 2020.**

---

**Meeting closed at: 3.20pm**  
The Integrated Area Plan Workshop followed the workshop.
Puketāpapa Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Puketāpapa Local Board held via SKYPE for Business on Thursday, 07 May 2020 due to COVID19 alert level 3 commencing at 11.00 am

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

Apologies:

Also present: Nina Siers, Mary Hay, Sam Tan Rodrigo and Selina Powell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Harry Doig</td>
<td>Members meeting was SKYPE enabled. All members SKYPED into the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Check In Karakia and declarations of Interest</td>
<td>Mary Hay</td>
<td>Senior Local Board Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Mary Hay</td>
<td>• Input into regional decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Agreement</td>
<td>Senior Local Board Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>The officer presented and asked the board to consider various matters relating to the FY21 Annual Budget/Local Board Agreement. Next steps a further workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Mary Hay</td>
<td>• Local initiatives/specific decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Plan</td>
<td>Senior Local Board Advisor Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>The officer presented to the board the peer review. Next steps a further workshop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 2.30pm.