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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 Rodney Local Board:
   a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Wednesday 18 March 2020 and the extraordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Wednesday 13 May 2020, as a true and correct record.

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 Rodney 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 three 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."
New community lease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust, 66 Main Road, Kumeu

File No.: CP2020/04627

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To grant a new community lease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust for land at 66 Main Road, Kumeu for the purposes of Plunket rooms.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Royal New Zealand Plunket Society Incorporated has a community lease for land at 66 Main Road Kumeu. The lease commenced 1 April 2001 and provided for one term of 19 years, which expired on 31 March 2020.
3. In 2017, all leases for existing Plunket sites were assigned in the new name for Plunket, being the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust.
4. The Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust has formally applied to council for a new community lease for the land it occupies 66 Main Road, Kumeu.
5. This report recommends that the Rodney Local Board grant Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust a new community lease for land it occupies at 66 Main Road, Kumeu.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:

a) grant Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust a new community lease for 85.2 square metres of land legally described as Lot 7 Deposited Plan 59377 at 66 Main Road, Kumeu (Attachment A to the agenda report) subject to the following terms and conditions:
   i) term – 10 years with one 10 year right of renewal commencing 1 June 2020
   ii) rent – one dollar ($1.00) plus GST per annum (if demanded)
   iii) the Community Outcomes Plan will be attached as a schedule to the lease agreement.

b) approve the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust Community Outcomes Plan (Attachment B to the agenda report) which will be appended to the lease agreement.

c) note that all other terms and conditions will be in accordance with the Auckland Council Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012.

Horopaki
Context
6. This report considers community leasing matters with respect to the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust (Plunket) occupation of part of the land at 66 Main Road, Kumeu.
7. The Rodney Local Board is the allocated authority relating to local, recreation, sport and community facilities, including community leasing matters.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Land, building, current and proposed new community lease

8. Plunket occupies a portion of the land at 66 Main Road Kumeu, which is legally described as Lot 7 Deposited Plan 59377 and held in fee simple by council. Lot 7 DP 59377 is classified as local purpose (Utility) reserve and is subject to the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977.

9. Plunket own and maintain its building which is utilised as a clinic for Kumeu and the surrounding areas. The building comprises a waiting room, two 'clinic' rooms, toilet and small kitchenette/office.

10. The Royal New Zealand Plunket Society Incorporated has a community ground lease for its area occupied at 66 Main Road Kumeu originally entered into with the former Rodney District Council. The lease commenced 1 April 2001, provided for one term of 19 years and expired 31 March 2020.

11. The expired lease agreement is currently holding over on a month-to-month basis on its existing terms and conditions. Plunket has formally applied to council for a new community lease for the land it occupies 66 Main Road, Kumeu.

12. The land classification legally supports the proposed new community lease to Plunket. As such, public notification was not required. Staff has engaged with mana whenua on the matter at which time no specific concerns were raised.

Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust

13. Plunket is a national not-for-profit organisation and New Zealand’s largest provider of support services for the development, health and wellbeing of tamariki and whānau.

14. Plunket is committed to providing universal access to services for all children and families regardless of ethnicity or location through its Well Child Tamariki Ora service and a range of community services offered to families. This is at the heart of Plunket and is essential to provide a positive environment for parents.

15. The Kumeu clinic holds Plunket Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursdays and the Before School Team use the clinic on Mondays and Saturdays. PlunketLine support line is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week to provide guidance and advice to parents and caregivers.

16. Council staff have worked alongside Plunket to negotiate a community outcomes plan that identifies the benefit to the community (Attachment B). Subject to the Rodney Local Board granting a new community lease and approving the plan, it will be appended as a schedule to the new community lease agreement.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

17. The designated impact level of the recommended decision on green-house gas emissions falls within the “no impact” category because the proposal continues an existing activity and does not introduce new sources of emissions.

18. The land at 66 Main Road Kumeu is on a flood plain (Attachment C to the agenda report), however any flooding events are mitigated through design as the Plunket building and the associated concrete path are situated well above ground level.

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

19. Staff from council’s community empowerment unit and service strategy and integration team support the proposed new community lease to Plunket.
Local impacts and local board views

20. A proposed new community lease to the trust is contained within the list of community leasing projects (line item 1359) on the 2019/2020 Community Facilities, Community Leasing Work Programme as approved by the Rodney Local Board at its business meeting of 20 June 2019 (resolution number RD/2019/71).

21. The recommendations in this report support the Rodney Local Board Plan 2017 outcome of ‘communities are influential and empowered’.

Māori impact statement

22. Staff prepared a power point document containing detail on the lease renewal for presentation (via Skype) to mana whenua representatives in attendance at the north west mana whenua forum scheduled to have been held in Orewa on Wednesday 1 April 2020. Unfortunately, the forum was cancelled.

23. Staff subsequently circulated the presentation to mana whenua representatives via email. Staff received feedback from the Kaitiaki for Ngāi Tai - Taiaomaurikura to the effect that the iwi does not require any engagement and have no objection to the proposal. Additionally, that for the most part the proposal is not within its operational rohe and as such, anticipate other local iwi may comment further. Staff has not received any further feedback on the matter.

24. The PlunketLine call centre provides nurses fluent in te reo Māori for whānau wishing to communicate in Māori.

Financial implications

25. There is no direct cost to council with this new community lease proposal.

Risks and mitigations

26. Should the Rodney Local Board resolve not to grant the proposed new community lease this decision may:

- preclude Plunket from undertaking its core responsibilities including the provision of advice and guidance on health, safety and wellbeing and well child checks from birth to six years of age
- increase Auckland Council’s maintenance requirements in terms of maintaining and renewing Plunket’s improvements.

Next steps

27. Subject to the Rodney Local Board granting a new community lease to the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust, staff will work with Plunket to finalise the deeds.
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Attachment A

GIS aerial view showing the lease area to the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust (Kumeu Branch) outlined in red on the parcel of land at 66 Main Road, Kumeu legally described as Lot 7 DP 59377
**COMMUNITY OUTCOMES PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Group</th>
<th>Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust - Kumeu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Area</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed Annual Report Due Date</td>
<td>1 July, annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Board Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whakaotanga: He whai tikanga, he whai mana hoki te hapori (Outcome: Communities are influential and empowered)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are many different communities in Rodney – some grouped together around the geography of towns and villages, others sharing common pastimes, interests or backgrounds. Every community has something to contribute. We want to build and maintain relationships with as many as possible, so their unique voices and points of view are heard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List the organisations Plunket works in partnership with to deliver services to the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic operation hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver to a number of children aged 0-5 years support services for development, health and well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plunket clinic also provide additional information to community of other services Plunket supply in the wider area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide and co-ordinate staff to manage the facility; Provide paid staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinate volunteer staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lists provided at clinic, websites and home visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours to be maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain numbers of children cared for by the Plunket system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services available in the greater Kumeu area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain current levels of services as a minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual report
### Māori

| Whakaotinga: He whai tikanga, he whai mana hoki te hāpori (Outcome: Communities are influential and empowered) | PlunketLine nurses fluent in te reo Māori are available for whānau wishing to communicate in Māori | Ensure there are adequate nurses who are fluent in te reo Māori | Annual report |

### Environment

| Whakaotinga: Kei te tiakina, āraita me te whai ora o tātou ākau, awa me te taiao (Outcome: Our harbours, waterways and environment are cared for, protected and healthy) | Users of Plunket rooms encouraged to recycle | Provide bins | Annual report |
Attachment C
GIS aerial view from Auckland Council’s Hazard Viewer showing the lease area to the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust (Kumeu Branch) at 66 Main Road, Kumeu within a flood plain.
New community lease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust, 49 Commercial Road, Helensville

File No.: CP2020/04637

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To grant a new community lease to Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust for the area it occupies within the Helensville War Memorial Hall complex at 49 Commercial Road, Helensville for the purposes of Plunket rooms.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Royal New Zealand Plunket Society Incorporated has a community lease for the area it occupies within the Helensville War Memorial Hall complex. The lease commenced 1 November 1996 and provided for one term of 19 years, expiring 31 October 2015. The lease agreement is currently holding over on a month-to-month basis on its existing terms and conditions.

3. In 2017, all leases for existing Plunket sites were assigned in the new name for Plunket being the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust.

4. Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust has formally applied to council for a new community lease for the area it occupies.

5. This report recommends that the Rodney Local Board grant the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust a new community lease for the area it occupies within the Helensville War Memorial Hall complex at 49 Commercial Road, Helensville.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:

a) grant Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust a new community lease for the area it occupies within the Helensville War Memorial Hall complex (33.4 square metres) on land legally described as Lot 28 DP 4614 and Lot 29 DP 4614 at 49 Commercial Road, Helensville (Attachment A to the agenda report) subject to the following terms and conditions:
   i) term – five years with one five year right of renewal commencing 1 June 2020
   ii) rent – one dollar ($1.00) plus GST per annum (if demanded)
   iii) operational charge - $835.00 plus GST per annum
   iv) the community outcomes plan will be attached as a schedule to the lease agreement.

b) approve the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust Community Outcomes Plan (Attachment B to the agenda report).

c) note that all other terms and conditions will be in accordance with the Auckland Council Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012.
Horopaki
Context
6. This report considers community leasing matters with respect to the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust occupation of part of the land at 49 Commercial Road, Helensville.
7. The Rodney Local Board is the allocated authority relating to local, recreation, sport and community facilities, including community leasing matters.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Land, building, current and proposed new community lease
8. The Royal New Zealand Plunket Society Incorporated (Plunket) has a community lease for the area it occupies within the Helensville War Memorial Hall complex at 49 Commercial Road, Helensville. The underlying land is legally described as Lot 28 DP 4614 and Lot 29 DP 4614 and is held in fee simple by Auckland Council under the Local Government Act 2002.
9. Plunket originally entered into its community lease agreement with the former Rodney District Council. The lease commenced 1 November 1996, provided for one term of 19 years and expired 31 October 2015. The expired lease agreement is currently holding over on a month-to-month basis on its existing terms and conditions.
10. Plunket has formally applied to council for a new community lease for the area it occupies within the Helensville War Memorial Hall complex at 49 Commercial Road, Helensville.

Operational charge
11. In accordance with the Auckland Council Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012, community groups occupying rooms within larger council buildings are required to pay an operational charge for the space occupied.
12. The amount charged to groups is calculated on the square metreage of space multiplied by $25 per annum. Additionally, the amount charged is based purely upon recovery of the direct costs to council of providing the premises.
13. Operational charges comprise the following components:
   • building insurance
   • share of overheads incurred (e.g. electricity and water charges)
   • maintenance provided by council as outlined in the terms of the occupancy agreement.

Public notification
14. As the underlying land at 49 Commercial Road Helensville is subject to the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002, public notification is usually required pursuant to section 138 of the Act. Section 138(1) provides that council must consult with the public on any proposal to dispose of a park or part of a park.
15. In terms of a lease, section 138(2) defines disposal as the grant of a lease on a park for a term in excess of six months providing that the lease has the effect of excluding or substantially interfering with the public’s access to the park.
16. The proposed new community lease to Plunket for rooms comprising 33.4 square metres of purpose designed space situated to the north exterior of the Helensville War Memorial Hall complex does not substantially interfere with or exclude the public’s access. As such, public notification of the lease was neither legally required, nor undertaken.
17. In accordance with section 81 of the Act, staff engaged with mana whenua on the matter at which time, no specific concerns were raised.

Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust
18. Plunket is a national not-for-profit organisation and New Zealand's largest provider of support services for the development, health and wellbeing of tamariki and whānau.
19. Plunket is committed to providing universal access to services for all children and families regardless of ethnicity or location through its Well Child Tamariki Ora service and the range of community services offered to families. This is at the heart of Plunket and is essential to provide a positive environment for parents.
20. The Helensville clinic is open on Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays. Justice of the Peace services are offered from the facility on weekends. PlunketLine support line is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week to provide guidance and advice to parents and caregivers.
21. Council staff has worked alongside Plunket to negotiate a community outcomes plan that identifies the benefit to the community (Attachment B). Subject to the Rodney Local Board granting a new community lease and approving the plan, it will be appended as a schedule to the new community lease agreement.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement
22. The designated impact level of the recommended decision on green-house gas emissions falls within the "no impact" category because the proposal continues an existing activity and does not introduce new sources of emissions.
23. The proposed new lease to Plunket does not sit directly within a flood plain or flooding zone of a 1-in-100 years rainstorm event by river or surface flooding (Attachment C to the agenda report).

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
24. Staff from council’s community empowerment unit and service strategy and integration team support the proposed new community lease to Plunket.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
25. A proposed new community lease to the trust is contained within the list of community leasing projects (line item 1358) on the 2019/2020 Community Facilities, Community Leasing Work Programme as approved by the Rodney Local Board at its business meeting of 20 June 2019 (resolution number RD/2019/71).
26. The recommendations in this report support the Rodney Local Board Plan 2017 outcome of ‘communities are influential and empowered’.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
27. Staff prepared a power point document containing detail on the lease renewal for presentation (via Skype) to mana whenua representatives in attendance at the north west mana whenua forum scheduled to have been held in Orewa on Wednesday 1 April 2020. Unfortunately, the forum was cancelled.
28. Staff subsequently circulated the presentation to mana whenua representatives via email. Staff received feedback from the Kaitiaki for Ngāi Tai - Taiomaurikura to the effect that the iwi not require any engagement and have no objection to the proposal. Additionally, that for
the most part the proposal is not within its operational rohe and as such, anticipate other local iwi may comment further. Staff has not received any further feedback on the matter.

29. The PlunketLine call centre provides nurses fluent in te reo Māori for whānau wishing to communicate in Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
30. There is no direct cost to council with this new community lease proposal.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
31. Should the Rodney Local Board resolve not to grant a new community lease this decision may:
   - preclude Plunket from undertaking its core responsibilities including the provision of advice and guidance on health, safety and wellbeing and well child checks from birth to six years of age.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
32. Subject to the Rodney Local Board granting a new community lease to the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust, staff will work with Plunket to finalise the deeds.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
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<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesley Jenkins - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment A
GIS aerial view of part of the Helensville War Memorial Hall complex at 49 Commercial Road, Helensville showing the lease area to the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust outlined in red on land legally described as Lot 28 DP 4614 and Lot 29 DP 4614
# COMMUNITY OUTCOMES PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Group</th>
<th>Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust - Helensville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49 Commercial Road, Helensville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Area</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed Annual Report Due Date</td>
<td>1 July, annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board Outcome</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakaotanga: He whai tikanga, he whai mana hoki te haporan (Outcome: Communities are influential and empowered)</td>
<td>List the organisations Plunket works in partnership with to deliver services to the community</td>
<td>Lists provided at clinic, websites and home visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinic operation hours</td>
<td>Hours to be maintained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliver to a number of children aged 0-5 years support services for development, health and well-being</td>
<td>Maintain numbers of children cared for by the Plunket system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plunket clinic also provide additional information to community of other services Plunket supply in the wider area</td>
<td>Services available in the greater Helensville area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide and co-ordinate staff to manage the facility: Provide paid staff</td>
<td>Maintain current levels of services as a minimum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-ordinate volunteer staff</td>
<td>Annual report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Māori

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whakaotinga: He whai tikanga, he whai mana hoki te hapori (Outcome: Communities are influential and empowered)</th>
<th>PlunketLine nurses fluent in te reo Māori are available for whānau wishing to communicate in Māori</th>
<th>Ensure there are adequate nurses who are fluent in te reo Māori</th>
<th>Annual report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whakaotinga: Kei te tiakina, aroha me te whai ora o tātou ākau, awhi me te taiaro (Outcome: Our harbours, waterways and environment are cared for, protected and healthy)</th>
<th>Users of Plunket rooms encouraged to recycle</th>
<th>Provide bins</th>
<th>Annual report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Attachment C
GIS aerial view from Auckland Council’s Hazard Viewer showing the location of the lease to the Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust (Helensville Branch) at 49 Commercial Road, Helensville in relation to flood plains.
Endorsing the Business Improvement District (BID) Programme targeted rates 2020/2021

File No.: CP2020/05122

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To seek local board endorsement to recommend that the Governing Body set the targeted rates for the North West Country Business Improvement District programme for the 2020/2021 financial year.

Whakarāpopototangata matua
Executive summary

2. Business Improvement Districts are areas within Tāmaki Makaurau where local business and property owners have agreed to work together to improve their business environment and attract new businesses and customers.

3. Auckland Council supports business associations operating Business Improvement District programmes by collecting a targeted rate from commercial properties within a defined geographic area. The funds from the targeted rate are then provided by way of a BID grant to the relevant business association.

4. Under the Auckland Council shared governance arrangements, local boards are allocated several decision-making responsibilities in relation to Business Improvement Districts. One of these is to annually recommend Business Improvement District targeted rates to the Governing Body.

5. Each business association operating a Business Improvement District programme sets the BID grant amount at its 2019 Annual General Meeting when members vote to approve an operational budget for the following financial year. This budget funds the implementation of a business plan that delivers programmes based on each Business Improvement District’s strategic priorities.

6. With the support of their members and based on approved business plans, North West Country Business Improvement District -operating business associations members supported a 2.8% ($5,000) increase to $185,000 for the 2020/2021 financial year.

7. In the wake of COVID-19 disruption, North West Country business association rescinded their AGM decision to increase their Business Improvement District levies agreed at their 2019 AGM. Instead, North West Country will keep its Business Improvement District grant amount at $180,000.

8. The business associations operating Business Improvement District programmes are incorporated societies that are independent of council. To sustain public trust and confidence in the council, however, there must be a balance between the independence of the business association and the accountability for monies collected by a public sector organisation.

9. For the council to be confident that the funds provided to the Business Improvement Districts are being used appropriately, the council requires the Business Improvement Districts to comply with the Business Improvement District Policy (2016) (Hōtaka ā-Rohe Whakapiki Pakihi).

10. The council staff regularly monitor compliance with the Business Improvement Districts Policy and this report is part of an active risk management programme to minimise inappropriate use of funds.
11. Staff are satisfied the North West Country business association has sufficiently comply with the BID Policy.

12. Staff propose the Rodney Local Board receives this report and recommends to the Governing Body the setting of the Business Improvement District targeted rates sought by the business association.

13. After the Annual Budget is approved, the council collects the targeted rate funds and distributes them in quarterly Business Improvement District grant payments, effective from 1 July 2020, to allow the business associations to implement programmes that improve the local business environment – and reflect the economic aspirations of the Rodney Local Board Plan.

14. Like all Business Improvement District operating business associations, North West Country Business Improvement District will continue to play an important role in supporting their members facing two global challenges. Firstly, helping local businesses throughout the COVID-19 lockdown stages and, secondly, responding to the world’s climate change emergency with an increased focus on sustainability.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:

a) recommends to the Governing Body the setting of the targeted rates for inclusion in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 for the following Business Improvement programmes:

i. $180,000 for North West Country Business Association Incorporated.

Horopaki
Context

Business Improvement District programmes promote economic well-being and collaboration with the council

15. Tāmaki Makaurau is growing fast and is projected to include another one million people in the next 30 years. This level of population growth will present challenges and opportunities for Auckland town centres and commercial precincts.

16. Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) are areas within Auckland where local business and property owners have agreed to work together, with support from the council, to improve their business environment and attract new businesses and customers.

17. BID programmes provide the opportunity for the council family to partner with business associations, including North West Country Business Association (NWCBA) to seize on the opportunities from Auckland’s growth and respond locally to changing economic conditions.

18. BID programmes encourage collaboration to achieve greater local outcomes. They provide a mechanism to enable local boards to engage with the business sector in local town centres and commercial precincts in a co-ordinated way.

BIDs provide essential support in the economic recovery from COVID-19

19. The economy has been heavily impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and related lockdown, including both retail-based town centres and industrial precincts.

20. BID-programme operating business associations will now, more than ever, provide the local business leadership required to help businesses recover from the economic shock and transition to a viable future state.
BIDs are funded by a targeted rate on business ratepayers within a set area

21. BID programmes are funded by a targeted rate applied to all commercially rated properties within a designated area around a town centre or commercial precinct.

22. Auckland Council supports business associations operating BID programmes by collecting the targeted rates and providing these funds, in their entirety, by way of a BID grant to the relevant business association.

23. This revenue is paid to the business associations every quarter to provide a regular and sustainable income stream to implement an agreed work programme.

The BID Policy is the mechanism to ensure accountability for BID targeted rates


25. The policy outlines the principles behind the council’s BID programme; creates the process for establishing, expanding, amalgamating and disestablishing BIDs; determines rating mechanisms; prescribes operating standards and guidelines; and sets accountability requirements.

Diagram A: From calculation to approval, how the BID targeted rate is set.

The business association sets the BID grant amount to deliver its work programme

26. Each business association operating a BID programme prepares an annual business plan for the following financial year that will deliver programmes based on the BID’s strategic priorities.

27. The cost of implementing that business plan is set out in an annual budget that the BID’s board (executive committee) agrees will be recommended for approval by the business association membership.

28. The 2019 Annual General Meeting (AGM) provides the forum when members vote to approve the operational budget and, in doing so, set the requisite BID grant amount for the following financial year.

Local boards are responsible for recommending the targeted rate if a BID complies with the BID Policy

29. Under the Auckland Council shared governance arrangements, local boards are allocated several decision-making responsibilities in relation to BIDs. One of these is to annually recommend BID targeted rates to the Governing Body. The local board should recommend the setting of the targeted rate if it is satisfied that the BID is substantially complying with the BID Policy.
30. The NWCBA submitted their annual report to the local board at its 13 May 2020 business meeting to update members on the progress towards achieving their respective BID’s business and strategic plans.

31. The Rodney Local Board approved a similar recommendation for the BID programmes last year (resolution number RD/2019/48), as did 17 other local boards that have BID programmes operating in their role.

**Governing Body sets the targeted rate when it approves the Annual Budget**

32. The recommendation in this report is put into effect with the Governing Body’s approval of the Annual Budget 2020/2021 and its setting (striking) of the targeted rates.

33. In accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 and the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Governing Body is authorised to make the final decisions on what BID programme targeted rates, if any, to set in any particular year or property (in terms of the amount and the geographic area to be rated).

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

34. BID programmes are operated by independent business associations, and their programmes and services are provided according to their members’ stated priorities. In recognition of their independent status, the BID Policy does not prescribe standards for programme effectiveness. That is a matter for the business association members to determine. Staff, therefore, cannot base recommendations on these factors, but only on the policy’s express requirements.

**North West Country comply with the BID Policy**

35. Staff are satisfied the North West Country Business Association has sufficiently complied with the BID Policy.

36. Staff require BID-operating business associations to provide to the council the following documents, and stay in touch with their local board at least once a year:

- current strategic plan – evidence of achievable medium to long-term opportunities.
- audited accounts – assurance that the BID-operating business association is managing its members’ BID targeted rates funds responsibly.
- annual report on the year just completed – evidence that programmes are addressing priority issues that benefit BID targeted ratepayers.
- business plan for the coming year – detailed one-year programme, based on the strategic plan, to be achieved and resourced.
- indicative budget for the following year – Auckland Council’s Annual Budget requires targeted rates to be identified a year in advance to inform the Annual Budget process which sets all rates.
- Board Charter – establishes guidelines for effective board governance and positive relationships between the association and its members.
- Annual Accountability Agreement – certification that these requirements have been met.
- Programme Agreement – a good faith agreement between each BID-operating business association and council that sets basic parameters of the council-business association relationship.
- AGM minutes - in addition to the above, council receives the provisional minutes of each business association’s 2019 AGM meetings which contain the resolution, voted on by members, confirming the BID grant amount for the following financial year.
36. In addition, BID-operating business associations must inform the council of progress with other compliance requirements, including:

- Incorporated Society registration – a current registration of the business association and all required documents up to date.
- key initiatives – activities identified to be advanced in the next financial year.
- resolving problems or issues, if any – problems or issues that have an impact on the governance or operation of the BID programme.

37. The BID Policy sets an annual compliance deadline of 10 March for the information to be forwarded to the council. The table below summarises the above requirements for the North West Country BID within the Rodney Local Board area as of 10 March 2020

Table 1: Business associations’ compliance with BID Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>FY 2018/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>2020-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audited financials</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative budget</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Charter</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Accountability Agreement</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual meeting w/ local board</td>
<td>Postponed due to COVID-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Agreement</td>
<td>✓ valid to June 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc. society registration</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key initiatives</td>
<td>Shop local and reprioritised to COVID-19 recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 AGM minutes (prov)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving problems, issues</td>
<td>Nothing to record</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. As the North West Country business association has sufficiently complied with the BID Policy, staff advise the local board to recommend to the Governing Body the setting of the targeted rates.
North West Country increases BID grant
39. As shown in Table 2 below, North West Country BID-operating business association proposes an increase to its BID targeted rates for the 2020/2021 financial year. The increased revenue, supported by members at their AGM, will fund a range of initiatives and service level improvements as indicated in Table 1 (key initiatives).

40. At its 2019 AGM, North West Country Business Association members supported a 2.8% ($5,000) increase to $185,000 for the 2020/2021 financial year. This decision was later rescinded in the wake of the COVID-19 caused economic downturn. North West Country will instead keep its BID grant amount at $180,000 for 2020/2021.

41. Of Tāmaki Makaurau’s 48 BID-operating business associations, most BIDs increased their targeted rates, ranging from 1.2% to 14.4%.

Table 2: Targeted rate comparisons: 2020/2021 c.f. 2019/2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BID</th>
<th>2020/2021</th>
<th>2019/2020</th>
<th>Increase / %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NorthWest Country</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No increase since establishing in 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement
42. Through targeted rate-funded advocacy and activities, BID-operating business associations promote and often facilitate environmental sustainability programmes.

43. From running carbon-reducing ‘shop local’ campaigns to transitioning to energy-efficient lighting and championing waste reduction and recovery programmes, there are many and increasing examples of BIDs within this role and beyond responding to the climate change emergency.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
44. Advocacy is a key service provided by business associations and those with BID programme-funded personnel are at an advantage. The BIDs ensure the views and ambitions of their members are provided to the council group, including CCOs, on those plans, policies and programmes that impact them.

45. The BIDs work closely with Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development (ATEED) on local economic development initiatives, events and sustainability programmes.

46. The BIDs also work constructively with both Panuku and Auckland Transport on often controversial proposals and projects.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
47. The local board’s views are most frequently expressed by its appointed representative on the board (executive committee) of each BID-operating business association. This liaison board member can attend BID board meetings to ensure there is a direct link between the council and the operation of the BID programme.
48. NWCBA values its strong and enduring governance-to-governance relationship with the Rodney Local Board. The contributions by the local board’s ‘BID representatives’ (and alternates) have, for many years, promoted mutual understanding, collaboration and aligned economic outcomes.

**Visions, plans aligned**
49. NWCBA and the local board share an interest in their area and are ambitious for its future and its people. They also share goals that include economic prosperity, community identity, placemaking and pride.

50. The NWCBA programme tangibly support the aspirations of the Rodney Local Board Plan 2017, specifically Outcome: *Communities are influential and empowered*. From their constitutions to their activities, the BIDs exist to enhance their business districts grow Auckland’s GDP and sustain the economic viability of their targeted ratepaying members.

**Local role, local funding, local benefit**
51. Recommending that the Governing Body strikes the targeted rates for the North West Country Business Association means that this BID programme will continue to be funded from targeted rates on commercial properties in their districts and provide services in accordance with their members’ priorities as stated in their strategic plans.

52. Several local boards, including Rodney may provide additional funding to local business associations, however accountability for those grants is set by funding agreements between the local board and the business association. Those contractual obligations are apart from the requirements of the BID Policy and are not covered in this report.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**
53. At the 2018 Census, Māori make up more than 11.4% of the population living in the Rodney Local Board area, compared to 11.5% of Auckland. Individual business associations may, through operating their BID programme, identify opportunities for niche support or development of any Māori business sector in their role.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**
54. There are no financial implications for the local board. Targeted rates for BID-operating business associations are raised directly from commercial ratepayers in the district and used by the business association for improvements within that role. The council’s financial role is to collect the BID targeted rates and pass them directly to the association every quarter.

55. The targeted rate is payable by the owners of the commercial properties within the geographic area of the individual BID programmes. In practice, this cost is often passed on to the business owners who occupy these properties. This cost may be harder to meet at a time when businesses are financially impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Council may be considering extending the rates remission policy to commercial property owners as part of the 2020/2021 annual plan. If approved, this would help mitigate impact of the targeted rate on rate-payers who are struggling financially.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**
56. There are no direct financial risks to the local board or council that could result from this recommendation to endorse the BID targeted rate for this business association.

57. To sustain public trust and confidence in the council, there should be a balance between the independence of the business association and the accountability for monies collected by a public sector organisation.
58. The rules and obligations of the BID Policy are intended to help minimise the potential for BIDs to misuse funds, by requiring each BID to plan for the intended use of those funds, report on its activities to its members and to have its accounts audited.

59. The council staff regularly monitor compliance with the BID Policy and this report is part of an active risk management programme to minimise inappropriate use of funds.

60. The economic impact created by the COVID-19 global pandemic are being felt everywhere, including Auckland’s town centres and business precincts. The BID programme is an internationally proven approach to engage and empower local businesses. The two BID programmes in this local board area will, through business resilience and recovery initiatives, help to mitigate some of the economic effects of the pandemic.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

61. If the local board supports this report, it will recommend to the Governing Body that the BID targeted rates be set as part of the Annual Budget 2020/2021.

62. After the Annual Budget is approved, the council collects the targeted rate funds and distributes them in quarterly BID grant payments, effective from 1 July 2020. This will enable North West Country BID to implement programmes that improve the local business environment, support businesses to recover from the COVID-19 pandemic and help address the climate change emergency.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Claire Siddens - BID Partnership Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Alastair Cameron - Manager - CCO Governance &amp; External Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesley Jenkins - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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Auckland Transport’s proposed revisions to the seal extension programme.

File No.: CP2020/05779

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To update the Rodney Local Board on Auckland Transport’s proposed revisions to the seal extension programme.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. After discussions with Rodney Ward Councillor Greg Sayers and the Rodney Local Board, Auckland Transport is proposing revisions to the seal extension programme.
3. There is an opportunity to broaden the use of Auckland Transport’s ‘Seal Extension’ budget so that additional roads may benefit from the unsealed roads improvements programme.
4. It is proposed to increase expenditure over the next three years and make budget available for a wider range of ‘Unsealed Road Improvements’ such as road widening, safety improvements, pavement strengthening, and seal extensions. This will result in a much more extensive programme of unsealed road improvements, addressing issues on a greater number of roads over a wider geographical area.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:
a) endorse the proposed revisions to the seal extension programme as follows:
   i) increase the rate of expenditure over the next three years, and even out the spend over the remaining years of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 (and the following Long-term Plan 2021-2031)
   ii) broaden the use of the existing ‘Seal Extension’ budget to make it available for a wider range of ‘Unsealed Road Improvements’ including road widening, safety improvements, pavement strengthening, and seal extensions
   iii) Auckland Transport develop a three-year rolling forward programme of unsealed road improvements (comprising carriageway widening, safety improvements, pavement strengthening, and seal extensions)
   iv) Auckland Transport develop an “Unsealed Road Improvement Framework” defining quantitative criteria for selection of unsealed road improvement treatments.

Horopaki
Context
5. Auckland has 7,300 kilometres of legal road, of which approximately 868km (12%) is unsealed. 678km (78%) of the unsealed road network is in Rodney, with the remaining 190km located mainly in Franklin, Hauraki Gulf Islands, and Waitakere.
6. The Regional Land Transport Plan 2018 – 2028 provides approximately $121m over the ten-year period to deliver seal extensions to the region’s highest priority unsealed roads.

7. Auckland Transport (AT) staff have made previous presentations to both the local board and Cr Sayers on its unsealed roads’ strengthening programme, which has provided for road widening, shaping, pavement strengthening and drainage improvements on several roads in the Rodney Local Board area. However, funding for this unsealed roads strengthening programme is limited.

8. AT staff provided information (Attachment A to the agenda report) and attended a joint workshop with local board members and Cr Sayers to discuss a possible change in the use of AT’s Unsealed Roads budget so that additional roads may benefit from the unsealed roads improvements programme.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

9. The current approach to seal extension means that very few roads are provided seal extension every three years (council Long-term Plan (LTP) funding period) across Auckland. This approach needs to be revisited with a strategic lens to consider value for money and value for our customers, including determining an appropriate length of programme and funding envelope.

10. There is an opportunity to broaden the use of the existing ‘Seal Extension’ budget to make it available for a wider range of ‘Unsealed Road Improvements’ such as road widening, safety improvements, pavement strengthening, pavement drainage, surfacing improvements and seal extensions. This will require better consideration of the broader criteria on which unsealed roads are considered for seal extension or other improvement or treatment.

11. AT is proposing to develop an “Unsealed Road Improvement Framework” defining quantitative criteria for selection of unsealed road improvement treatments.

12. Quantitative criteria will consider several aspects including (1) road classification, economic value of the road to Auckland and/or whether the roads fall within the AT strategic roading network, (2) safety / public health impacts, (3) natural environment impacts. A clear qualitative decision-making process will be established to define roads that need seal extension or other ‘Unsealed Road Improvements’ such as road widening, safety improvements, pavement strengthening, drainage and surfacing improvements, and defining the weight afforded to the various considerations.

13. At the same time AT is proposing to increase the rate of expenditure and broaden the use of the existing ‘Seal Extension’ budget to make it available for a wider range of ‘Unsealed Road Improvements’ such as road widening, safety improvements, pavement strengthening, drainage and surfacing improvements. This will result in a much more extensive programme of unsealed road improvements, addressing issues on a greater number of roads over a wider geographical area.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

14. Climate impacts will be assessed as the unsealed road improvement framework is developed.

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

15. Auckland Transport supports this proposed initiative and the recommendations in this report.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

16. Rodney Local Board Chairperson Phelan Pirrie and Cr Greg Sayers met with AT staff on 6 March 2020 to discuss this proposed initiative. The proposed initiative and recommendations were then presented by AT and discussed with the Rodney Local Board at a workshop on 1 April 2020. At this meeting the Rodney Local Board were unanimous in their support for the proposed recommendations and requested that the proposal be reported to the next available local board meeting for a formal decision.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

17. Engagement with Mana Whenua will be undertaken as the unsealed road improvement framework is developed.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

18. The proposed recommendations are included in the existing Auckland Transport Regional Long-term Plan (RLTP) budget. The proposal is to increase the rate of expenditure over the next three years, and even out the spend over the remaining years of the RLTP.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

19. The proposed actions will result in a reduction in risks through improved road safety, improved water quality outcomes, improved public health outcomes.

20. A risk register will be produced per the PPM 038 Project Risk Register template. The risk register will be updated as the project progresses. The key risks are as follows:
   - Programme: Scope creep and time constraints hindering quality of outputs
   - Resourcing: internally within AT
   - Resourcing: externally, with contractors to undertake the work.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

21. Endorsement of the proposed revisions to the seal extension programme by the Rodney Local Board and Cr Sayers.

22. AT to establish an Unsealed Roads Improvement Framework which considers a wider range of ‘Unsealed Road Improvements’ such as road widening, safety improvements, pavement strengthening, and seal extension.

23. On the basis of the Unsealed Roads Improvement Framework, develop a three-year rolling forward programme of unsealed road improvements for discussion with the Rodney Local Board.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Unsealed Road Improvement Programme presentation</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Auckland Transport’s proposed revisions to the seal extension programme.
Recommendations

1. To broaden the use of the existing ‘Seal Extension’ budget to make it available for a wider range of ‘Unsealed Road Improvements’ such as road widening, safety improvements, pavement strengthening, and pavement sealing.

2. To accelerate expenditure of the budget, and even out the spend over the remaining years of the LTP.

3. That AT develop a 3-year forward programme of unsealed road improvements (comprising carriageway widening, geometric safety improvements, pavement strengthening, seal extensions, etc) for discussion with the Local Board on an annual basis.
Unsealed Road Improvements: Range of Treatment Options

Safety Improvements
(Road Widening, Curve Easing, Shaping, etc)

Before: Road width 2.5m
After: Road width 6m

Constable Road Muriwai
Unsealed Road Improvements: Range of Treatment Options
Pavement Improvements
(Pavement strengthening, Drainage improvements, etc)

Before: low strength pavement and poor drainage

After: Strengthened pavement and side drainage improvements

Drury Lane Dairy Flat
Unsealed Road Improvements: Range of Treatment Options

Surfacing Improvements
(Two coat chipseal, MAP 40, Otta seal, Notta seal, etc)

Auckland Transport (AT) is trialling 5 different pavement compositions along Old Woodcocks Road, Kaipara Flats, as part of our investigation into dust mitigation strategies for unsealed roads throughout the northern Auckland region.
Accelerated Expenditure on Unsealed Road Improvements

Planned Expenditure on Unsealed Road Improvements

Proposed Accelerated Expenditure on Unsealed Road Improvements

Auckland Transport’s proposed revisions to the seal extension programme.
Local board feedback on Plan Change 22 and Plan Modification 12 – additions of places of significance to Mana Whenua

File No.: CP2020/05770

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To request the views of the local board on:
   - Plan Change 22 to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part)
   - Plan Modification 12 to the Auckland Council District Plan – Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2018 (Inner Islands)

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. In 2014, in collaboration with 19 Mana Whenua entities, Auckland Council initiated the Māori Cultural Heritage Programme to improve the understanding and protection of Māori cultural heritage across the Auckland region.

3. As part of the implementation of the findings of the Māori Cultural Heritage Programme, the council has proposed two plan changes in order to appropriately recognise and protect culturally significant sites within both the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) and Auckland Council District Plan – Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2018 (Inner Islands). These two plan changes form tranche one of what is intended to be a series of future plan changes to progressively identify and protect culturally significant sites.

4. Eleven Mana Whenua entities have completed assessments for sites in these plan changes. Thirty-three sites are proposed for scheduling: 30 sites in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) and four in the Auckland Council District Plan – Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2018 (Inner Islands).

5. Note that one site, Te Rangihoua (Te Putiki o Kahumatamomoe), is included in both the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) and Auckland Council District Plan – Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2018 (Inner Islands) to represent its landward and coastal extents.

6. On 21 March 2019, Plan Change 22 and Plan Modification 12 were originally notified. Following submissions and after further analysis, on 26 September 2019 a minor correction was made to Plan Change 22 to remove an incorrect reference. Due to technical and procedural issues, on 24 October 2019 a second amendment to withdraw the Te Wairoa River site was notified. On 11 February 2020, the plan changes were then re-notified to a limited number of directly affected parties.

7. The details of the sites related to the local board are listed in Attachment A to the agenda report.

8. Key themes of the submissions received are to:
   - support Plan Change 22 as notified
   - support Plan Change 22 with a minor amendment to Schedule 14.1 and a site description in Schedule 12
   - oppose Plan Change 22 due to potential effects on houseboat activities
   - support Plan Modification 12 as notified
• support Plan Modification 12 and apply the same approach to other reserves on Waiheke Island
• oppose Plan Modification 12 for various other reasons.

9. On 8 August 2019, the Regulatory Committee appointed three independent hearing commissioners to hear and make decisions on Plan Change 22 and Plan Modification 12 (REG/2019/49). This included at least two independent commissioners with expertise in planning and tikanga Māori.

10. This report is the mechanism for the local board to provide its formal views on Plan Change 22 and Plan Modification 12 prior to the public hearing. Any comments received will be included in the planner’s hearing report and considered by the independent commissioners. Any local board views provided should be that of the local board, therefore no technical recommendations are made in this report.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Rodney Local Board:

a) provides local board views on Plan Change 22 and Plan Modification 12

b) appoint a local board member to speak on behalf of the local board at the hearing on the Plan Change 22 and Plan Modification 12

c) delegate authority to the chairperson of the local board to make a replacement appointment in the event the local board member appointed in Resolution b) is unable to attend the plan change hearing.

Horopaki

Context

Decision-making authority

11. Each local board is responsible for communicating the interests and preferences of people in its area regarding the content of the council’s strategies, policies, plans, and bylaws. Local boards provide their views on the content of these documents.

12. In 2014, the council initiated a Māori Cultural Heritage Programme (MCHP) in collaboration with 19 Mana Whenua entities in the Auckland region with the purpose of improving the understanding and protection of Māori cultural heritage and to identify the best management options that recognise and protect the cultural values of these sites. To date 400 such sites of have been nominated by Mana Whenua for consideration.

13. The Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP) currently contains 75 scheduled Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua. There are no Māori Heritage sites currently identified in the Auckland Council District Plan – Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2018 (Inner Islands) (HGI) Plan.

14. The Auckland Council’s Planning Committee resolution (PLA/2017/39) approved engagement with Mana Whenua and landowners in order to develop draft plan changes to add qualifying sites to the AUP and the HGI plan. The criteria to identify and evaluate these sites are contained within the Auckland Regional Policy Statement section of the AUP.

15. On 27 November 2018, the Planning Committee resolved to approve the proposed plan changes for notification (PLA/2018/128).
16. The plan changes propose:
   i) The addition of 30 sites to the AUP’s Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua Overlay, as identified in Chapter L Schedule 12. There are also consequential changes to Schedule 6 (Outstanding Natural Features) and Schedule 14.1 (Historic Heritage Overlay) to reflect the cultural significance of the identified sites.
   
   ii) The addition of four sites to the HGI Plan. There are also changes to the explanatory text of the plan to clarify the criteria by which sites are identified and evaluated.

17. If the local board chooses to provide its views, the reporting planner will include those views in the hearing report for these plan changes. Local board views will be included in the analysis of the plan changes and submissions received.

18. If the local board chooses to provide its views, a local board member will be invited to present the local board’s views at the hearing to commissioners, who make the decision on the plan changes.

19. This report provides an overview of Plan Change 22 (PC22) and Plan Modification 12 (PM12) and gives a summary of the key themes which have arisen through submissions. This report does not include a recommendation. The planner cannot advise the local board as to what its views should be, and then evaluate those views.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Plan change overview

20. The Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) and the Hauraki Gulf Islands (HGI) plans contain objectives, policies, and rules to manage and protect both Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua (AUP), and Māori Heritage sites (HGI). The proposed plan changes do not alter any of the existing objectives, policies, rules or resource consent assessment criteria set out in the two plans.

21. PC22 proposes the following changes:
   • the addition of 30 Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua (SSMW) to Schedule 12 of AUP.
   • the addition of a ‘significance of the site to Mana Whenua’ evaluation criterion (criterion k) to eight sites already listed in Schedule 6 – Outstanding Natural Features Overlay of the AUP.
   • the addition of a ‘significance of the site to Mana Whenua’ evaluation criterion (criterion k) to eight sites already listed in Schedule 6 – Outstanding Natural Features Overlay of the AUP.
   • the addition of the ‘significance of the site to Mana Whenua’ evaluation criterion (criterion c) to five sites already listed in Schedule 14.1 - Schedule of Historic Heritage Overlay of the AUP(OiP).
   • the addition of the sites to the AUP viewer (the online tool to view the AUP maps).

22. PM12 proposes the following changes:
   • the addition of four Māori Heritage Sites (MHS) to Appendix 1f of the HGI.
   • the addition of explanatory text to Appendix 1f, Appendix 4 and Part 7.13 of the HGI – Māori heritage to include references to the criteria for the identification and evaluation of MHS.
   • the addition of the sites to the HGI planning maps.
Further discussion

23. There are 33 sites proposed across both PC22 and PM12. These sites cover a wide range of zones including open space, coastal marine area, and transport corridor zones.


25. By scheduling the sites, there will be greater awareness and weight placed on existing objectives, policies and methods within the plans for protecting cultural heritage when considering applications for resource consent, private plan changes, designations and policy development in both plans.

26. In the AUP, scheduling introduces more restrictions on activities within the sites with respect to disturbance in the coastal marine area, temporary activities, new buildings and structures, new alterations and additions to existing buildings, and subdivision.

27. In the HGI, scheduling will remove permitted levels of ground disturbance within scheduled sites, making all ground disturbance activities require a resource consent. Resource consent will also be required for establishing toilets and changing facilities within scheduled sites.

Themes from submissions received

28. On 21 March 2019, PC22 and PM12 were originally notified. Following submissions and after further analysis, on 26 September 2019 a minor correction was made to PC22 to remove an incorrect reference. Due to technical and procedural issues, on 24 October 2019 a second amendment to withdraw the Te Wairoa River site was notified. On 11 February 2020, the plan changes were then re-notified to a limited number of directly affected parties.

29. Following the processes outlined above, a total of seven primary submissions and two further submissions have been received for PC22. Six primary submissions and three further submissions have been received for PM12. The following key themes have been identified in the submissions received:
   - support PC22 as notified
   - support PC22 with minor amendments to Schedule 14.1 and a site description in Schedule 12
   - oppose PC22 due to potential effects on houseboat activities
   - support PM12 as notified
   - support PM12 and apply the same approach to other reserves on Waiheke Island
   - oppose PM12 for various other reasons.

30. Minor amendments identify a technical error in the plan change where an evaluation criterion has been omitted from one of the schedules. They also propose additional wording to one of the site descriptions to include reference to bird roosting/gathering sites.

31. Effects on existing houseboat activities in Putiki Bay (Waiheke Island) are of concern to two houseboat owners. Heritage scheduling which is outside the proposed plan change area is of concern to one submitter opposing PM12.

32. One submitter is opposing the scheduling of Rangihoua Park / Onetangi Sports Field on Waiheke Island as part of PM12 on the basis that they feel the scheduling would place unrealistic conditions on the continued use and development of these activities. This was supported by one further submission with 92 co-signatories.

33. On 26 March 2020, the latest summary of the decisions requested by submitters on PC22 was notified and is available on the council’s website at the following link:
   https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plans-

34. On 26 March 2020, the latest summary of the decisions requested by submitters on PM12 was notified and is available on the council’s website at the following link:

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement
35. The decision whether to provide local board views:
   • will not lead to increased greenhouse gas emissions and negatively affect the approach to reduce emissions
   • will not be impacted by a climate that changes over the lifetime of that decision.
36. This is because the plan changes do not promote new activities within the sites and, by their nature of protecting Māori cultural heritage, are unlikely to encourage a greater intensity of development.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
37. As mentioned previously, the 33 sites covered by these two plan changes cover a range of environments. These include roads, carparks, publicly owned parks and lakes, rivers and streams. They are also subject to a number of designations.
38. During the development of the plan changes, relevant council departments and Council Controlled Organisations (CCO) were consulted. With respect to council internal departments, the sites have particular relevance to the council’s Customer and Community Services Department. This department includes the Community Facilities, Parks, Sports and Recreation, and Service Strategy and Integration teams.
39. Many of the proposed sites contain leases which are managed by the above department. The strategic management of public open spaces is also managed by these teams through the use of reserve management plans as well as other open space and recreation planning tools.
40. The Customer and Community Services Department has been actively involved in the plan changes during their development and notification. None of these teams have raised opposition to the proposed scheduling.
41. From a CCO perspective, Auckland Transport has been involved in the development of the plan changes as they apply to public roads and parking infrastructure. Auckland Transport is not opposed to the plan changes.
42. One of the sites, Te Puna Wai a Hape (Site 091), schedules land currently owned by Watercare Services Limited. Watercare has been involved during the development of the plan changes and is not opposed to the scheduling.
43. No CCO has made a submission or further submission on PC22 or PM12.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
44. Further detail such as a map showing the location of the sites relevant to the local board and previous involvement by the local board are in Attachment A.
45. The main impact of PC22 and PM12 is to place greater recognition on the cultural significance of identified sites. This is likely to increase the need for consultation with
affected Mana Whenua when considering activities within the sites. The scheduling places greater restrictions on some land use activities and coastal activities as outlined previously.

46. A summary here of what local board engagement was undertaken during the development of this plan change is included in Attachment A.

47. Factors the local board may wish to consider in formulating its view are as follows: interests and preferences of people in the local board area; well-being of communities within the local board area; local board documents, such as the local plan and local board agreement; responsibilities and operation of the local board.

48. This report is the mechanism for obtaining formal local board views so the decision-makers on PC22 and PM12 can consider those views.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

49. This report addresses matters that relate to two plan changes to protect and manage new nominated sites and places of cultural significance to Mana Whenua. All Mana Whenua entities have been invited to participate in this process and 11 Mana Whenua entities have actively contributed to these plan changes.

50. Recognising and protecting Mana Whenua cultural heritage is identified as an issue of regional significance in the Auckland Unitary Plan Regional Policy Statement (RPS). Policies in the RPS specifically provide for the identification, protection and enhancement of the tangible and intangible values of identified Mana Whenua cultural heritage.

51. In November 2018, a governance hui was conducted where staff briefed all 19 Mana Whenua entities on the feedback received from the 14 affected local boards and of the landowner engagement. The IMSB has also been kept informed of these plan changes and has participated in their approval for notification.

52. Some iwi authorities have made submissions in support of these plan changes.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

53. The local board is not exposed to any financial risk from providing its views.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

54. The power to provide local board views regarding the content of a plan change cannot be delegated to individual local board member(s). This report enables the whole local board to decide whether to provide its views and, if so, to determine what matters those views should include.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

55. Any views provided by the local board will be included in the planner’s hearing report. The local board will be informed of the hearing date and invited to speak at the hearing in support of its views. The planner will advise the local board of the decision on the plan change by memorandum.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sites related to local board</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Matthew Gouge – Principal Planner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>John Duguid - General Manager - Plans and Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesley Jenkins - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachment A: Rodney Local Board

1. Of the 33 sites proposed to be scheduled, four nominated sites are located within the Rodney Local Board area¹. Council officers met with local board members on 24 October 2018 to brief the board on the scope and provisions of the plan change and sites proposed to be scheduled within the local board area.

2. Maps of the sites within the Rodney Local Board area are included below.

Figure 1: Site 102 - Te Kīiapā-pārāoa

¹ Note that three of what was seven originally nominated sites were withdrawn by iwi prior to notification
Figure 3: Site 103 - Motururu Urupā Omaha
Previous involvement of Rodney Local Board in PC22


4. On 18 October 2018, the local board made the below resolution. This feedback was included within reporting to the Planning Committee seeking approval for notification and was also included within the s32 Planners Evaluation Report which supported the plan change at notification.

RD/2018/138 Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua – Tranche 1: Plan Changes to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) and Auckland Council District Plan - Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2018

FILE REF CP2018/19547

AGENDA ITEM NO. C1
C1 Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua – Tranche 1: Plan Changes to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) and Auckland Council District Plan - Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2018

Resolution number RD/2018/138

MOVED by Chairperson B Houlbrooke, seconded by Member B Bailey:

That the Rodney Local Board:

a) provide the following feedback on the draft plan change, and, in particular on the seven sites located within the local board area:

i) generally supports the proposed draft plan changes to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) and the Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua Overlay (the Overlay), with the exception of Murray Jones Reserve, and notes the specific points of feedback below:

_Taurangatira (Murray Jones Reserve, Riverhead)_

a) note that Murray Jones Reserve was originally gifted to Scouts Association New Zealand before transferring to Council

b) notes the existing use of the Murray Jones Reserve, Riverhead, by the Scout Association of New Zealand, and their proposal to further develop their leased site in the future with a purpose built facility

c) expresses concern that, while there is no intention to adversely affect the Scouts’ planned development, council officers could not guarantee that the introduction of the Overlay will not impact the Scouts in ways that are currently unforeseen

d) in light of the above do not support the introduction of the Overlay for the Murray Jones Reserve given the unknown future impact on the Scouts, subject to council taking all necessary steps to ensure, as far as possible, that the Scouts will not be restricted from developing their facility in the future as a result of the Overlay

_Te Kohuroa (Mathesons Bay, Leigh)_

e) notes that the site at Mathesons Bay is in the general location of a walking track maintained by the community, and which may be expanded in the future

f) supports the introduction of the Overlay at Te Kohuroa, Mathesons Bay, noting that any effort to expand or alter the walking track is subject to the existing overlays in the area, and the introduction of the Overlay will not materially impact the track

_Te Kiri-patu-paraoa (Pakiri Regional Park)_

g) supports the introduction of the Overlay at Te Kiri-patu-paraoa, Pakiri Regional Park, but notes that the site includes an unformed legal road which may be required to become a formed road in the future.

_Matururu Urupa Omaha (Access Road, Omaha)_
h) supports the introduction of the Overlay at Matururu Urupa Omaha

Manukapua

i) supports the introduction of the Overlay at Manukapua Whangaroa Pa (Shegadeen Road, Warehine)

j) supports the introduction of the Overlay at Whangaroa Pa, Shegadeen Road, Warehine

Whakahuranga Pa (Journeys End Road, Taparapora)

k) supports the introduction of the Overlay at Whakahuranga Pa, Journeys End Road, Taparapora

Restatement

b) agree that there be no restatement of the report, resolutions and the feedback until the plan change is publicly notified.
Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency Innovating Streets for People pilot fund

File No.: CP2020/05890

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.
2. To request feedback on projects within your local board area that have been proposed by staff across Auckland Transport, Auckland Council, and Panuku for inclusion in Auckland Council’s application to the Innovating Streets Pilot Fund.

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 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 Rodney 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 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 by 12pm on 29 May 2020.

Horopaki

Context

6. On 3 April 2020, Waka Kotahi announced the Innovating Streets Pilot Fund (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
Item 16

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 a-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
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Local board feedback for inclusion in Auckland Council submissions
File No.: CP2020/03955

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To recommend that the Rodney Local Board delegate authority to the local board chairperson 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 provided when external parties set submission deadlines that don’t allow formal input to be obtained from a local board business meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|         |      | - Inclusion of informal views in the Auckland Council submission will be at the discretion of the Governing Body. These may be included with caveats noting the views have not been ratified by the local board.  
- If the local board changes its views, there is a reputational risk for the council. |

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
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Urgent Decision – Rodney Local Board submission on the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021

File No.: CP2020/06113

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To inform the Rodney Local Board that an urgent decision was made and approved under delegation to the chairperson and deputy chairperson to submit feedback on the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. At the 20 November 2019 Rodney Local Board meeting the board considered the urgent decision-making process and passed resolution RD/2019/147:

   That the Rodney Local Board:
   a) adopt the urgent decision-making process for matters that require a decision where it is not practical to call the full board together and meet the requirement of a quorum
   b) delegate authority to the chairperson and deputy chairperson, or any person acting in these roles, to make urgent decisions on behalf of the local board
   c) agree that the relationship manager, chairperson and deputy chairperson (or any person/s acting in these roles) will authorise the urgent decision-making process by signing off the authorisation memo
   d) note that all urgent decisions will be reported to the next ordinary meeting of the local board. CARRIED

3. Local boards have a role in representing the views of their communities on issues of local importance, such as proving feedback on the local effects of central government proposals in Auckland Council submissions.

4. As a result of local board feedback being due prior to the next business meeting an urgent decision was required.

5. The Government released a draft of the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport for 2021/22–2030/31 for review and feedback. The Government Policy Statement 2021 sets out the Government’s priorities for expenditure from the National Land Transport Fund over the next 10 years. It guides the allocation of about $4 billion a year from the National Land Transport Fund by the New Zealand Transport Agency, setting out how funding is allocated between high-level activities such as road safety policing, state highways, local roads, public transport and other modes of transport. It is not locally specific. Council’s Long-term Plan and the Regional Land Transport Plan are where locally specific decisions will be made and where local boards input into these decisions.

6. A decision on behalf of the Rodney Local Board was approved under delegated authority of the chairperson and deputy chairperson to provide feedback on the Government Policy Statement (Attachment A to the agenda report).

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:

a) notes the local board’s feedback, which was to be attached to Auckland Council’s submission on the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021 (Attachment A).

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Rodney Local Board feedback on the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Submission on the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021 (GPS 2021)

From: Rodney Local Board
Date: 8 May 2020

Introduction
The Rodney Local Board’s feedback on the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021 (GPS 2021) is submitted below.

The Rodney Local Board submits the following:

Background
Local council and transport agencies should be encouraged through the Government Policy Statement (GPS) and through Funding Assistance Rates (FAR), to consider improved safety outcomes on unsealed roads, and adequate safety measures and design in rural road corridors to allow safe walking, cycling and horse riding.

Growing rural subdivisions means increases in lifestyle blocks and activity on our rural roads. The safety of pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and other rural road users is not clearly recognised in the draft Government Policy Statement.

There is also not specific recognition of ‘rurban’ (rural/urban) areas which are growing significantly in cities like Auckland. These see increases in traffic on the unsealed road network, and increases in pedestrians and cycling.

There is no recognition in the GPS that increasing visitor numbers to rural areas through tourism means more activity on our unsealed road network. Drivers unfamiliar with gravel roads and cyclists unprepared for narrow roads that are not designed to accommodate the variety of road users tourism brings increase the risk of deaths and injuries on our roads.

Specific feedback
1. The draft GPS does not give adequate reference to the needs of rural communities, especially those on the perimeter of expanding urban settlements. There are considerable gaps in infrastructure where developers avoid providing an urban level of transport amenity and transport agencies are inadequately funded to provide improvements to old infrastructure and links to new subdivisions within the rural urban boundaries (RUB).

2. Improvements to unsealed roads provide important safety outcomes and this is not clearly mentioned in the draft GPS. Consideration should be given to supporting, through Funding Assistance Rates (FAR), safety improvements to rural roads including rehabilitation and seal extensions. This should be explicitly stated in the GPS; currently it is not.

3. Footpaths, cycleways and walkways are just as important in rural areas as they are in urban. Safe, active travel will improve wellbeing and liveability. This needs to be considered as important in the rural context as it is in urban areas. While in rural areas a walkway or cycleway may not be required to reach the same degree of engineering as it might in an urban area, ensuring there are wider road shoulders and smoother berm areas would provide amenity for safe walking and cycling. This should be clearly identified in the GPS as it would direct future road improvements in rural areas to take these simple measures into consideration when roads are being designed and rehabilitated during renewal programs.
4. There is currently inadequate recognition of the impact of tourism on our rural roads in the GPS. The increasing numbers of tourists who are inexperienced on gravel roads increases the risk of accidents. High-volume tourist areas are often serviced by unsealed roads. This should be explicitly mentioned in the GPS.

**Authorisation**

This feedback is authorised in accordance with:

**17 Urgent decision-making process**
Resolution number RD/2019/147

**That the Rodney Local Board:**
b) delegate authority to the chairperson and deputy chairperson, or any person acting in these roles, to make urgent decisions on behalf of the local board.

________________________________________

Phelan Pirrie  
Chairperson  
Rodney Local Board

________________________________________

Beth Houlbrooke  
Deputy Chairperson  
Rodney Local Board

Date: 8 May 2020

**Contact Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Rodney Local Board, Auckland Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Postal Address: | Lesley Jenkins, Relationship Manager  
Rodney Local Board  
Auckland Council, Orewa Service Centre  
Private Bag 92300 Auckland |
| Phone number: | Lesley Jenkins, Relationship Manager, 021 566 826 |
| Email contact: | lesley.jenkins@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz |
New road name in the Fulton Hogan Land Development Limited subdivision at 17 Old Pine Valley Road, Pine Valley

File No.: CP2020/03913

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve road names for six new public roads, one private road and the extension of one existing road in the Fulton Hogan Land Development Limited subdivision (Milldale Stage 3) at 17 Old Pine Valley Road, Pine Valley.

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

3. The applicant, Fulton Hogan Land Development Limited, has submitted the following names for the new roads serving Stage 3 of the Milldale subdivision at 17 Old Pine Valley Road, Pine Valley.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spark Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuinga Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houpuni Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ora Nui Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haupa Nui Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kete Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruxton Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. No alternative names were provided. As with the process for Milldale Stages 1 and 2, the applicant has spent a lot of time researching the history of the area and tying the road names to events or people relevant to that land. He does not want other names considered which would not have the same specific relevance as the preferred names.

5. Approval is also sought to name the extension of the following existing road with the same name.

- Argent Lane

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:

a) approve the road names for six new public roads, one private road and the extension of one existing road for the Fulton Hogan Land Development Limited subdivision (Milldale Stage 3) at 17 Old Pine Valley Road, Pine Valley, in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974 and as referenced in Attachment A, B and C to the agenda report.
Horopaki

Context

6. The staged subdivision at Silverdale has been approved and the council reference is BUN60322544.

7. A condition of the subdivision consent was to suggest to council names for the new roads.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

8. 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 names for the local board’s approval.

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

10. The applicant has submitted the following names for consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spark Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuinga Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houpuni Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ora Nui Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haupa Nui Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kete Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruxton Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. The meaning or significance of each name is set out in the ‘Milldale Road Naming - Overview’ in Attachment C.

12. The area is in an undulating valley between the Orewa and Weiti Rivers that was once covered in dense forest, milled extensively, then cleared for orchards and dairy farming.

13. All communication with Iwi has been with Fiona McKenzie of the Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust. Notes to this effect are included in the ‘Milldale Road Naming – Overview’.

14. This communication is in combination with extensive research and reference to Robin Grover’s books: “The story of Silverdale “Alias the Wade” and "Why the Hibiscus” - as referenced in the first submission for Stage 1 and Warren Frogley’s presentation to the local board in 2018.

15. The officer acknowledges that where possible the use of Maori names is encouraged in the Auckland Plan.

16. Land Information New Zealand has confirmed that the road names are unique and acceptable, although some similar names occur in some southern suburbs of Auckland. LINZ considers that the significant distance apart, having different road types, and being in separate suburbs ensures there will be no confusion.

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

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

20. The decision sought for this report does not trigger the significance policy and is not considered to have any immediate impacts on the community.

21. The applicant has written to Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust, who support the applicant’s choice.

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

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.

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 councils.
# Ngā kaihaina

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Bruce Angove – Subdivision Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Trevor Cullen - Team Leader Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesley Jenkins - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Milldale Road Naming

Overview

The naming of roads within the Milldale residential development has taken a similar approach to that of its neighbouring Millwater. There is a wealth of history to draw upon, beginning with the Maori, then early pioneers and European settlers, on to the families, activities and events that shape the community it has become today.

As such, historical information has been sought and collated with the aid of the Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust representing iwi and early Maori activity, The Wainui Historical Society, Robin Grover and her many books, local land owners and families of significance.

With regards to geology, the area is an undulating valley, or dale, between the Orewa and Waiuku Rivers that was once covered in dense forest, milled extensively, then cleared for orchards and dairy farming.

A large part of its early history centred around the sawyer gangs who’s presence generated sufficient activity to form a trading post, the Wade, benefiting from river access and close proximity to a growing Auckland. It is in this activity that Milldale finds its roots, drawing upon significant individuals, their families and activities for road names.

All names proposed have been checked for compliance with LINZ, within the Auckland region with specific attention to the Rodney district. As is often the case, many of the names put forward are either very common or significant elsewhere, so have been used already and therefore unavailable for Milldale. However, where possible, names of significance are used in some form or another.

It is also worth noting that Highgate (commercial zone between Millwater and the Northern Motorway) used few of the landowner names that it shares with Milldale stage 1 & 3, now split by State Highway 1.
Milldale Road Naming

Note: The strategy with road naming through stages 1, 2 and 3 are as follows:

- All 3 stages are wrapped by the Maori name given to the area as viewed from the east. (via consultation with the Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust)
- Within stage 1 & 2, significant landowners, sawyers or milling gangs form the majority of the road names. Stage 1 being Maurice Kelly and associates, Stage 2 being John Fair and associates.
- Within stage 3, road names reference the Maori activity that took place in the tributaries of the Weiti River, the location of this stage.

Stage 3 - Milldale

*Please refer to the attached stage plan for location of roads for naming*

ARGENT LANE  - extension of existing road to the north
LINZ – not applicable
This road forms part of the realignment that connects Pine Valley Rd and the Silverdale Interchange through to Wainui Rd.

RUXTON ROAD
LINZ – no duplicate in Auckland region
Ann Ruxton’s gained her reputation for being a woman saw mill owner on this land, still unconventional to this day.

SPARK ROAD
LINZ – no duplicate in Auckland region
Another land trader who did much of his business in this area out of Australia, often in collaboration with Henry Tayler. Spark never set foot on the land, so it is likely he simply financed Tayler into many of the deals he struck across this area.

KUINGA STREET
LINZ – no duplicate in Auckland region
At the foot of Mt. Pleasant the source or head (kuinga) of the Waterloo Stream and Weiti River begin here.

HOUPUNI ROAD
LINZ – no duplicate in Auckland region
All along the Weiti River, Maori would set up camps (houpuni) especially in this area where they would gather food, medicine and materials.

ORA NUI STREET
LINZ – no duplicate in Auckland region
This area was used extensively for gathering plants or berries for rongoā (medicine) to bring health (ora) in abundance (nui)

HAUPA NUI STREET
LINZ – no duplicate in Auckland region
This area was used extensively for snaring birds, trapping eels, mussels and crayfish, gathering plants or berries for food (haupa) in abundance (nui)
Milldale Road Naming

Stage 3 – Milldale

KETE LANE
LINZ – no duplicate in Auckland region on the current LINZ website
This area where the streams and rivers formed was quite wet and flax grew well here, which Maori harvested and used for weaving baskets (Kete) and garments etc.
The area was considered a food and medicine basket for the Maori.
New road name in the Fulton Hogan Land Development Limited subdivision at 17 Old Pine Valley Road, Pine Valley

Milldale Stage 3 Scheme Plan
New road name in the Te Arai North Limited subdivision at Te Arai Point Road, Te Arai Point

File No.: CP2020/04018

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

Purpose of the report
1. To approve a road name for a new private road in the Te Arai North Limited subdivision at Te Arai Point Road, Te Arai Point.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

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

3. The applicant, Te Arai North Limited, has submitted the following name for the right of way serving the Te Arai North Limited subdivision at Te Arai Point Road, Te Arai Point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Name</th>
<th>Alternative Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jemasa Lane</td>
<td>Manaaki Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. This report was submitted to the February meeting, (Resolution RD/2020/8), but deferred due to lack of any comment from iwi. It is now resubmitted with amendments

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Rodney Local Board:

a) approve the new road name ‘Jemasa Lane’ for the Te Arai North Limited subdivision at Te Arai Point Road, Te Arai Point, in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974 and as referenced in Attachment A and B to the agenda report.

Horopaki
Context

5. The subdivision into 6 rural residential lots has been approved and the council reference is SUB60310254.

6. A condition of the subdivision consent was to suggest to council a name for the new right of way.

7. In accordance with the national addressing standards all public roads and any private road that serves more than 5 lots requires a name.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

8. 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 names for the local board’s approval.

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

10. The applicant has submitted the following names for consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jemasa Lane</td>
<td>In reference to the developer’s three daughters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Name</td>
<td>&quot;to support, take care of, give hospitality to”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manaaki Lane</td>
<td>The name is a representation of the developer and iwi working together harmoniously.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. The name ‘Jemasa’ has its origins in the Kayne family (that of Ric Kayne, the developer and owner of the Tara Iti golf course and the Te Arai North development). ‘Jemasa’ is a reference to his three daughters – Jenni, Maggie, and Saree. The name is a combination of the first two letters from each daughter.

12. While a theme of Maori names has been chosen for the Te Arai North and Tara Iti developments to the North off Pacific Road, the Stage 4 development of Lot 41-46 is isolated. For this reason this alternative name has been chosen.

13. In this instance, the developer has a strong preference for the use of this name. Given the minor and private nature of the development, no public consultation has been undertaken. However, a name that iwi has offered for a nearby development, ‘Manaaki Lane’, has now been included as an alternative here.

14. The road naming report for the nearby development is also on the agenda for this meeting. It should therefore be noted that should ‘Manaaki Lane’ be preferred here, then the alternative name in that report will need to be used.

15. Land Information New Zealand has confirmed that the proposed road names are unique and acceptable.

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

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

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 does not trigger any significant policy and is not considered to have any immediate impacts on any council groups.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
19. The decision sought for this report does not trigger any significant policy and is not considered to have any immediate impacts on the community.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
20. A Maori name supplied by iwi to the same developer for a new road in a nearby subdivision, has been included in this report as an alternative name.

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

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

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

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Te Arai Point Road Scheme Plan</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Te Arai Point Road Locality Map</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Frank Lovering – Senior Subdivision Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Trevor Cullen - Team Leader Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesley Jenkins - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New road name in the Te Arai North Limited subdivision at Te Arai Point Road, Te Arai Point
New road name in the Te Arai North Limited subdivision at Te Arai Point Road, Te Arai Point
New road name in the Te Arai North Limited subdivision at Pacific Road, Te Arai Point

File No.: CP2020/03956

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To approve a road name for a new private way in the Te Arai North Limited subdivision at Pacific Road, Te Arai Point.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

1. Auckland Council has road naming guidelines that set out the requirements and criteria of the council for proposed road names. These requirements and criteria have been applied in this situation to ensure consistency of road naming across the Auckland Region.

2. The applicant, Te Arai North Limited, has submitted the following names for the right of way serving the Te Arai North Limited subdivision at Pacific Road, Te Arai Point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Name</th>
<th>Alternative Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manaaki Lane</td>
<td>Katipo Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Rodney Local Board:

a) approve the new road name ‘Manaaki Lane’ for the Te Arai North Limited subdivision at Pacific Road, Te Arai Point, in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974 and as referenced in Attachment A and B to the agenda report.

Horopaki

Context

4. The subdivision into 7 rural residential lots has been approved and the council reference is BUN60335668.

5. A condition of the subdivision consent was to suggest to council a name for the new right of way.

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

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

7. 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 names for the local board’s approval.

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

9. The applicant has collaborated with local iwi and obtained their comments submitting the following names for consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manaaki Lane</td>
<td>“to support, take care of, give hospitality to” The name is a representation of the developer and iwi working together harmoniously and also relates to the other road names already approved in the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katipo Drive</td>
<td>A venomous native and protected native spider, black with a red spot on its back and found on the beach and along this coastline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. It should be noted that ‘Manaaki Lane’ has also been offered as an alternative name for a new road in a nearby subdivision being undertaken by the same developer. The road naming report for that road is also on the agenda for this meeting. If ‘Manaaki Lane’ is preferred for that road, then ‘Katipo Drive’ will need to be chosen here.

11. Land Information New Zealand has confirmed that the two proposed road names are unique and acceptable. A third proposed name was not acceptable.

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

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

13. 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**

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

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

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

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

16. The applicant has contacted local iwi who have suggested the proposed names.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

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

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

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

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

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

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Pacific Road Locality Map</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0</td>
<td>Pacific Road Scheme Plan</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Frank Lovering – Senior Subdivision Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Trevor Cullen - Team Leader Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesley Jenkins - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New road name in the Te Arai North Limited subdivision at Pacific Road, Te Arai Point
Item 21

New road name in the Te Arai North Limited subdivision at Pacific Road, Te Arai Point
Rodney Ward Councillor update

File No.: CP2020/00098

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. The Rodney Local Board allocates a period of time for the Ward Councillor, Greg Sayers, to update them on the activities of the Governing Body.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:

a) thank Cr Sayers for his update on the activities of the Governing Body.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Ward councillor report March - May 2020</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Robyn Joynes - Democracy Advisor - Rodney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Lesley Jenkins - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cr Greg Sayers: Accountability Report
March - May 2020

This is a voluntary report initiated monthly by the Councillor to keep the Rodney Local Board, its staff and the residents and ratepayers of Rodney updated on activities and duties he has participated in. It is a summary of highlights only.

1. Committee Meetings

Finance and Performance Committee
(Thursday 19 March)
Auckland Council Group and Auckland Council Quarter 2 Performance Report to 31 December 2019. The Auckland Council Group was in a strong financial position on 31 December 2019 with significant debt headroom and liquidity.

Emergency Governing Body
(Tuesday 24 March)
Establish a temporary Emergency Committee of the whole of the governing body, to assume the functions and power of all governing body committees (and sub-committees), except the Audit and Risk Committee. Standing order 3.3.3. notes governing body members can attend the committee meetings by audio- and audio-visual link.

Emergency Governing Body
(Thursday 2 April)
Emergency powers during the state of national emergency to CDEM Group Controller.

Emergency Committee Workshop – Shovel ready projects
(Wednesday 8 April)
Non decision-making
An initial discussion on a preliminary list of ‘shovel ready’ infrastructure projects and programmes for submission to Crown Infrastructure Partners Limited.

Emergency Governing Body
(Thursday 9 April)
Approval of council’s shovel-ready infrastructure projects and programmes to Crown Infrastructure Partners Limited.

Extraordinary Audit and Risk Committee
(Tuesday 14 April)
Risk and assurance update and financial risk update covering the approach to risk management and assurance activities during the Covid-19 lockdown and recovery and the identification and management of risks arising from the Covid-19 pandemic.

Emergency Governing Body
(Thursday 16 April)
Financial position and Annual Budget 2020/2021 Update.

Emergency Governing Body
(Thursday 23 April)
Community loan guarantees and loans and approval of the Auckland Regional Amenities Funding Levy 2020-21.

Governing Body Workshop
(Wednesday 29 April)
Non decision-making
Chief Executive Recruitment Interview Approach.
Emergency Governing Body
(Thursday 30 April)

Te Pōari o Kaipātiki ki Kaipara Hui
(Friday 1 May)
Kaipātiki Draft Concept Plan.

Finance and Performance Committee Workshop
(Wednesday 6 May)
Non decision-making
Input from Local Boards around savings that could be made on the Annual Budget 2020/21.

Emergency Governing Body
(Thursday 7 May)
Auckland Response to 2019/2020 drought, the Governing Body approve stage 1 water use restrictions to come into force on 16 May.

2. Constituent Queries:

Councillor query - noise control in Snells Beach; Hole in bus shelter – Wellsford; AT removal of carparks outside the Pink Spot Dairy; Feracon possum raps & ongoing issues with council drains/ culvert near property; Resource consent for pond; 2B Foley Quarry - Building and Consents; Blocked drainage pipes under driveway entrance- Constable Road; AUP rule for additional water tanks on property; Golf course maintenance Covid 19- Mumhawi Golf links; Help for Kawau - transport of essential goods for residents; APTR vs Business Rates - small accommodation providers.

Greg Sayers
Auckland Councillor
Rodney ward
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Attached are the Rodney Local Board workshop records for 25 March, 1 April, 22 April and 13 May 2020.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:
a) note the workshop records for 25 March, 1 April, 22 April and 13 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>Workshop record 25 March</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Workshop record 1 April</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Workshop record 22 April</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Workshop record 13 May</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Authorisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robyn Joynes - Democracy Advisor - Rodney</td>
<td>Lesley Jenkins - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rodney Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Rodney Local Board held on Wednesday 25 March 2020, commencing at 2.00pm by Skype for Business.

**PRESENT**
- Chairperson: Phelan Pirrie
- Members: Brent Bailey, Steven Garner, Danielle Hancock, Tim Holdgate, Beth Houlbrooke, Louise Johnston, Vicki Kenny

**Apologies:** Colin Smith (due to connectivity issues)

**Also in attendance:** Lesley Jenkins (Relationship Manager), Matthew Karr (Senior Local Board Advisor Hibiscus and Bays), Justin Kary (Local Board Advisor), Robyn Joynes (Democracy Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson’s welcome and apologies</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Chairperson opened the workshop and noted the apologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Matters</td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific decisions</td>
<td>The relationship manager updated the local board members on the COVID-19 situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Local Initiative update</td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific decisions</td>
<td>Ms Haes, Ms Wiggins and Mr Harris provided a further update on the One Local Initiative following stakeholder engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Programme (LDI)</td>
<td>Discussions took place and feedback given to staff on the draft 2020/2021 local board work programmes prior to approval in June 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Purdie</td>
<td>Lead Financial Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff Pitman</td>
<td>Area Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Martin</td>
<td>Manager Work Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Hope</td>
<td>Work Programme Lead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie Bennett</td>
<td>Work Programme Lead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shyrel Burt</td>
<td>Service and Asset Planning Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Dodds</td>
<td>Strategic Broker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Smith</td>
<td>Portfolio Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Brewster</td>
<td>Manager Mobile Library Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 5.10pm.
Rodney Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Rodney Local Board held on Wednesday 1 April 2020, commencing at 2.00pm by Skype for Business

PRESENT
Chairperson: Phelan Pirrie
Members: Brent Bailey
Steven Garner
Danielle Hancock
Tim Holdgate
Beth Houlbrooke
Louise Johnston
Vicki Kenny
Colin Smith

Apologies: Danielle Hancock
Also in attendance: Lesley Jenkins (Relationship Manager), Justin Kary (Local Board Advisor), Robyn Joynes (Democracy Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson’s welcome and apologies</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Chairperson opened the workshop and noted the apologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Work Programme – Environment and Infrastructure Services</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Infrastructure and Environmental Services staff were in attendance to discuss the local board work programme projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Haliwell</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia Parra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Healthy Waters Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Young</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Conservation Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Team Manager Mainland North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Johnson</td>
<td>Senior Healthy Waters Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Purdie</td>
<td>Lead Financial Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsealed road</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Auckland Transport staff were in attendance to provide an update and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvement programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>options regarding the Unsealed Road Improvement Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Burt</td>
<td>Chief Engineer and Asset Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Wallace</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Portfolio Delivery Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Pang</td>
<td>Principal Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len van der Harst</td>
<td>Road Corridor Delivery Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Barrett</td>
<td>Elected Member Relationship Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Sayers</td>
<td>Rodney Ward Councillor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 4.15pm.
Rodney Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Rodney Local Board held on Wednesday 22 April 2020, commencing at 2.00pm by Skype for Business

PRESENT
Chairperson: Phelan Pirrie
Members: Brent Bailey
Steven Garner
Danielle Hancock
Tim Holdgate
Beth Houlbrooke
Louise Johnston
Vicki Kenny
Colin Smith

Apologies: No apologies
Also in attendance: Lesley Jenkins (Relationship Manager), Justin Kary (Local Board Advisor), Robyn Joynes (Democracy Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson’s welcome and apologies</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Chairperson opened the workshop and noted the apologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Matters</td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific decisions</td>
<td>The relationship manager discussed administrative matters and sought feedback from local board members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Local Board Plan 2020</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Staff were in attendance to provide the local board members with a local board plan pre-engagement summary, to seek feedback on the draft Rodney Local Board Plan 2020 and to inform members of the next steps, including the special consultative procedure (SCP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Kary (Local Board Advisor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Kerr (Senior Local Board Advisor – Hibiscus and Bays)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Waugh (Engagement Advisor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Dodds (Strategic Broker)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenda Lock (Consultant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 5.00pm.
Workshop record of the Rodney Local Board held via Skype for Business Wednesday 13 May 2020, commencing at 2.00pm.

**PRESENT**

**Chairperson:** Phelan Pirrie
**Members:** Brent Bailey, Steven Garner, Danielle Hancock, Tim Holdgate, Beth Houlbrooke, Louise Johnston, Vicki Kenny, Colin Smith

**Apologies:** No apologies received

**Also in attendance:** Lesley Jenkins (Relationship Manager), Anwen Robinson (Senior Local Board Advisor), Justin Kary (Local Board Advisor) Robyn Joynes (Democracy Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson’s welcome and apologies</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Chairperson opened the workshop and noted the apologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Matters</td>
<td></td>
<td>The relationship manager discussed administrative matters and sought feedback from local board members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley Jenkins (Relationship Manager)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skype protocols for business meeting</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The relationship manager discussed the protocols and guidelines for conducting business meetings via Skype for Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley Jenkins (Relationship Manager)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Budget/Local Board Agreement</td>
<td>Setting direction / priorities / budget</td>
<td>Mr Kary, Ms Waugh and Mr Purdie were in attendance to discuss feedback received through the Annual Budget 2020/2021 consultation part one and next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Kary (Local Board Advisor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Waugh (Engagement Advisor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The workshop concluded at 2.55pm.
Governance forward work calendar

File No.: CP2020/05926

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To present to the Rodney Local Board with a governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
1. This report contains the governance forward work calendar, a schedule of items that will come before the Rodney Local Board at business meetings and workshops over the coming months until the end of the electoral term. The governance forward work calendar for the local board is included in Attachment A to the agenda report.

2. The calendar aims to support local boards' governance role by:
   • ensuring advice on agendas and workshop material is driven by local board priorities
   • clarifying what advice is required and when
   • clarifying the rationale for reports.

3. The calendar will be updated every month. Each update will be reported back to business meetings and distributed to relevant council staff. It is recognised that at times items will arise that are not programmed. Local board members are welcome to discuss changes to the calendar.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:
a) note the governance forward work calendar.
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