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Welcome

Kua uru mai a hau kaha, a hau maia, a hau ora, a hau nui,  
Ki runga, ki raro, ki roto, ki waho 
Rire, rire hau….pai marire

Translation (non-literal) - Rama Ormsby
Let the winds bring us inspiration from beyond,  
Invigorate us with determination and courage to achieve our aspirations for abundance and sustainability 
Bring the calm, bring all things good, bring peace….good peace.

Apologies

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

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.

Confirmation of Minutes

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Wednesday 22 April 2020 and the extraordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Wednesday, 13 May 2020, as true and correct records.

Leave of Absence

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

Acknowledgements

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

Petitions

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

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 Waiheke Local Board. This means that details relating to deputations can be included in the published agenda. Total speaking time per deputation is ten minutes or as resolved by the meeting.

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

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

9.1 Public Forum - Denis Powell - Local Parks, Job Creation and High Value Tourism Projects

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
1. Denis Powell – will be in attendance to speak under Public Forum on the topics Local Parks, Job Creation and High Value Tourism Projects.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation
That the Waiheke Local Board:
  a) thank Denis Powell for his attendance.

9.2 Public Forum - Kate Hastings - The Esplanade and Double Decker Tourist Buses

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
1. Kate Hastings – will be in attendance to speak under Public Forum on the topic the Esplanade and Double Decker Tourist Buses.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation
That the Waiheke Local Board:
  a) thank Kate Hastings for her attendance.

9.3 Public Forum - Christina Hyde - Grant Application - Visitor Economy Marketing Plan

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
1. Christina Hyde – will be in attendance to speak under Public Forum on the topic Grant Application – Visitor Economy Marketing Plan

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation
That the Waiheke Local Board:
  a) thank Christina Hyde for her attendance.
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.”
Councillor’s Update

File No.: CP2020/05465

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To provide Councillor Pippa Coom with an opportunity to update the Waiheke Local Board on Governing Body issues.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) receive Waitemata and Gulf Ward Councillor, Pippa Coom’s update.

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’s report</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
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Pippa Coom Councillor Report – Waiomatā and Gulf Ward

General update

This is my Councillor report covering the period from 15 April until 15 May. It has been prepared for the Waiheke Local Board business meeting to be held on 27 May.

The purpose of my report is to provide an update on the key governing body decisions in response to the Covid-19 crisis and the matters brought to the Emergency Committee as well as providing a report on my activities during this time as Councillor.

Auckland Council response to the Covid-19 crisis

In my previous report to the local board I reported on Auckland Council’s response as the pandemic unfolded and through the lockdown period. As NZ moves from Alert Level 3 to 2 council facilities and venues are opening up and planning is underway for the post Covid-19 recovery.

The Emergency committee was established as an ad hoc committee of the whole of the Governing Body due to the emergency. It assumed the functions and power of all governing body committees (and sub-committees), except for the Audit and Risk Committee, and its responsibilities include all the responsibilities of the Governing Body which can legally be delegated as well as the responsibilities of all the committees it assume the functions and power for. We are continuing to review the format for committees under the requirements of Level 2 and beyond.

Governing Body meetings

The minutes for all meetings are available on the Auckland Council website here.

On 16 April the Emergency Committee received a verbal briefing from Ian Maxwell, Director Executive Programmes and Mace Ward, Group Controller, Auckland Emergency Management. Representatives from the Taxpayers Union and the Auckland Ratepayers Alliance presented in public forum. Cr Darby introduced an extraordinary item regarding Auckland International Airport share purchase plan. Members agreed 18-5 to seek a report looking at improving the council’s oversight of the airport company, including whether as the biggest shareholder, it should seek to appoint a director.
Auckland Council’s submission on the Accessible Streets Regulatory Package was approved (Attachment 1: Council supports ‘Accessible Streets’ rule changes).

The confidential part of the meeting covered council’s Financial position and Annual Budget 2020/2021 Update. Councillors were unanimous that the council needs to take decisive steps to reduce the pressure on residents and businesses facing economic hardship, while ensuring we can protect and maintain the essential services Aucklanders rely on. It was agreed that another round of consultation including the option of limiting any rates rise to 2.5%. (Attachment 2: Councillors agree rates support for Aucklanders)

On 23 April the Emergency Committee approved the levy for funding Auckland’s regional amenities for the next financial year, appointed Phil Wilson as the Group Recovery Manager for COVID-19 and received its regular Auckland Emergency Management update.

Watercare Chief Executive Raveen Jaduram also provided an update on Auckland’s water shortage situation and the requirements for stage one water restrictions.

On 30 April the Emergency Committee received the regular weekly update on the Covid-19 pandemic and the Auckland Emergency Management response.

The committee approved the total levy applied for by the Museum of Transport and Technology of $14,890,578 for 2020/2021 and made appointments to the District Licensing Committee. A governing body meeting was also held to approve Bylaw Panel recommendations on the proposed new Food Safety Information Bylaw 2020 and approve procedural plan changes.

On 7 May the Emergency Committee received the regular weekly update on the Covid-19 pandemic and the Auckland Emergency Management response.

In response to one of the most severe droughts in Auckland’s history, the committee voted unanimously to introduce mandatory water restrictions, which will come into effect across the region from Saturday 16 May.

Auckland Council’s submission on the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport was approved and the committee endorsed Auckland Transport’s applications to the first tranche of Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency’s Innovating Streets for People pilot fund. It also approved the process for developing a recommended package of projects for the second funding round closing on 3 July 2020, which will include Auckland Council, Auckland Transport and Panuku Development Auckland projects.

Successful applicants in round one are expected to be announced in June 2020. Local boards can put forward applications for round two.


The committee unanimously endorsed the rationale, scope, and proposed process for updating the Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP) 2020 and its terms of reference. Within the terms of reference, it was agreed to propose an additional objective for the shared government and council priorities for transport in Auckland to improve the resilience and sustainability of Auckland’s transport system and significantly reduce greenhouse gases. The refresh will consider a number of emerging issues including the impact of Covid-19 on...
funding, any government economic stimulus packages, the New Zealand Upgrade Programme (NZUP) of transport investment in Auckland, climate change, mode shift and emerging brownfield and greenfield priorities.

The committee considered the reappointment of three directors of the Tamaki Redevelopment Company (TRC). Of the directors on the board, Auckland Council and the government appoint one director each and the remaining directors are jointly appointed by both the government and the council. With the terms of three of the current directors ending soon decisions need to be made about appointments to those positions.

Other meetings and events

The weekly meeting with the Mayor for Chairs and Deputies of the committees of the whole has continued via Skype. A fortnightly Auckland Transport catch up on ward issues has also continued during the lockdown.

I attended the LGNZ metro sector meeting on 8 May as alternate for the Mayor and the Infrastructure Commission briefing to local government representatives. I also attended the National Council meeting on 15 May. (all via Zoom)

I attended the online Waiheke Local Board meeting on 22 April, the Waitematā Local Board meeting on 5 May and the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board meeting on 12 May (all via Skype).

A virtual Anzac Day service was observed with neighbours joining from their bubble for Stand at Dawn (photo right).

Emergency Budget 20/21

A major piece of work is underway for the upcoming Emergency Budget 20/21, with workshops for elected representatives to discuss where significant financial savings can be made. This work will inform the consultation on the budget starting on 29 May.

In response to a “rates freeze” campaign and many emails from constituents seeking a zero rates rise I have provided the following information:

The draft 2020-21 annual budget that was consulted on prior to the lockdown proposed a 3.5% rates increase. We now need a new “emergency” budget that responds to these extraordinary times. We are in incredibly challenging times dealing with the Covid-19 crisis and there is no doubt the economic downturn is going to continue hitting hard across our businesses and communities.

At the Emergency Committee meeting on 16 April Councillors were unanimous that the council needs to take decisive steps to reduce the pressure on residents and businesses facing economic hardship, while ensuring we can protect and maintain the essential services Aucklanders rely on (Attachment 2 Our Auckland: Councillors agree rates support for Aucklanders). There will be another round of consultation including the option of limiting
any rise to 2.5%. For the average ratepayer, a 2.5% increase would be equivalent to an extra $1.35 per week, while a 3.5% increase would be $1.83 per week.

The final details of the Emergency Budget 20/21 including rates will not be voted on until July.

In considering the options it is clear that cutting rates will end up costing ratepayers more and will slow down Auckland’s recovery. It is important to note:

- There is going to be a substantial reduction in non-rates revenue caused by the recession, some projects and services will need to be cut or postponed to reduce expenditure. Development Contributions and fees make up 53% of council’s income. Potential reductions in cash revenue of $350-650m for 20/21 depending on the length of disruption caused by Covid-19
- The credit rating agencies have allocated Auckland Council an AA/Aa2 rating. This enables council to borrow for capital projects at attractive interest rates, for longer time periods, and means there is no shortage of those wishing to invest. Our financial policy is to limit our debt to revenue ratio to 270%, although internally we manage to a 25% ratio to give ourselves a buffer. Lowering income could potentially put this at risk. The outcome would be higher interest rates, reduced funding abilities and shorter timelines for debt renewals. All these add up to very real costs which would be to the detriment of ratepayers, both now and well into the future. A 1% increase in rates equals $17 million in additional income. 3.5% equates to $59 million net. A 1% increase in interest rates equates to around $100 million of additional interest costs. A single notch credit rating downgrade would cost council approximately $15 million every year in additional interest costs.
- Even at a 3.5% rates rise there will be substantial cuts to the infrastructure projects, maintenance and services provided by the Council. This work is already underway with many temp or contracted staff having been given notice.
- At the same time, council has already driven savings of $270 million in operational expenses, $62 million of additional savings are budgeted for this year. All opportunities to cut spending still need to be reviewed from across the council group.
- The CEO and senior executives have voluntarily agreed to pay cuts
- The Emergency Committee agreed to consult on targeted measures including suspending the Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate and the broadening of council’s rates postponement policy. We also announced more help to ratepayers and business who may be struggling to pay their rates in the financial year to 30 June.

I believe we have taken a principle-based approach with a strong commitment to financial prudence and sustainability. An austerity budget based on zero rates rise will hit our most vulnerable communities hardest and limit council’s ability to play a key role in working with Government to promote economic recovery. I think targeted assistance to ratepayers suffering financial stress is preferable.

Consultation on the Emergency Budget 20/21 budget is due to start by the end of May for three weeks. The consultation material will provide a clear explanation of what each rating option will mean for council services and infrastructure. Please take the time to review the information and provide feedback.
Other matters

The work of the Environment and Climate Change Committee has continued with briefings and catch-ups via Skype. The Covid-19 crisis has had an impact on the timeline for Auckland’s Climate Action Plan but the current aim is to bring the final plan to a committee meeting in July.

I have been working with the Executive Officer and Tangata Whenua co-chair of the Hauraki Gulf Forum to create a draft work plan and governance statement. We hosted two co-chair drop-in sessions via Skype to provide Forum members the opportunity to give feedback ahead of the Forum meeting to be held on 25 May. On 14 May a media release went out about the new governance arrangements for the Forum (Attachment 3: Our Auckland: Co-Chairs to lead Hauraki Gulf Forum)

I provided feedback on Auckland Council’s submission on the Accessible Streets Regulatory package that went to the Emergency Committee meeting on 16 April (Attachment 1: Our Auckland Council supports ‘Accessible Streets’ rule changes).

I have supported Auckland Transport rolling out a set of initiatives on 20 roads and popular walkways across Auckland to assist with safe physical distancing during Covid-19 Alert Level 3 (photo right of the additional space on Ponsonby Road). These emergency measures are being reviewed going into Alert Level 2. (Attachment 4: Improved facilities for people walking and cycling across Auckland)

I’ve been kept up to date on the Area Plan work for Waiheke and Acteon Great Barrier. Consultation on the draft plans is scheduled to coincide with the draft local board plan consultation process in July.

Throughout this period, I have been contacted by members of the public seeking reassurance and answers to a wide range of issues.

Recommendation

That this report be received.
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Council supports ‘Accessible Streets’ rule changes

Our Auckland: Published: 6 May 2020

Auckland Council has strongly supported a central government package of proposed rule changes to make streets safer, more accessible, and to encourage active modes of transport, while requesting a greater focus on pedestrian safety.

In its submission on Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency’s Accessible Streets Regulatory Package - nine proposals aiming to improve safety for footpath, shared path, cycle lane and cycle path users, encourage more active transport and clarify the rules for using small personal transport devices, such as e-scooters - the council supports most of the proposals but seeks some changes to prioritise pedestrian safety and encourage more walking and cycling.

Councillor Pippa Coom says: “The council strongly supports Waka Kotahi’s overall package. The proposed changes will help make streets more people friendly and welcoming to a variety of transport modes and are aligned with the council’s strategic plans to create more vibrant and livable neighborhoods.

“Tidying up existing rules is a good step forward but we are seeking further changes to provide even greater levels of safety for pedestrians, such as limiting e-scooter footpath speeds to 10km/h, especially with new technologies driving a growth in the types and range of designs of small personal transport devices.”
"We’re also asking that additional funding be made available to provide for more active transport infrastructure. Waka Kotahi’s Innovating Streets for People pilot fund is a great start, but these proposed changes will increase the numbers of people and transport modes being used on cycle lanes and shared paths, so more infrastructure to provide more space for all users will be needed.

"Overall, the benefits of these changes will be significant. More people walking and cycling is healthier for Aucklanders, it will lead to improved and more equitable, pedestrian-friendly street design, and it is better for our climate with a greater use of no or low emission transport”, says Cr Coom.

Key points from the council’s submission

- support for new, clearer rules for people riding on footpaths and speed restrictions but seeking changes to only allow cyclists up to 16 years old and over the age of 65 to use footpaths as well as accompanying caregivers.

- support for allowing transport devices, such as e-scooters, to use cycle lanes and paths.

- support clarifying the types of small transport devices that can use the footpath, like e-scooters, but requests a reduced speed limit to 10 km/h.

- support for shared path users giving way to pedestrians with changes to the default speed limits of 25km/h for all shared paths and 50km/h for cycle paths to reduce the risk to the more vulnerable users of these spaces. Also, priority given to cyclists over users of powered transport devices.

- support allowing cycles and transport devices to ride straight ahead from a left turn lane, to pass slow-moving vehicles on the left and that turning traffic must give way to all people using the footpath or separated lanes if those people are travelling straight through at an intersection.

- support clarifying the rules and requirements for road controlling authorities to restrict parking on berms and remove the need for signage.

- support the requirement to give way to signalling buses pulling out of bus stop.

Read Auckland Council’s full submission

More information about the Accessible Streets Regulatory Package’s nine proposed changes is available [here](#).
Councillors agree rates support for Aucklanders

Our Auckland. Published: 17 April 2020

After a marathon 10-hour meeting of Auckland Council’s Emergency Committee, Councillors yesterday agreed on the key priorities needed to guide the regional response to COVID-19 and its impact on the economy.

“Councillors were unanimous yesterday that the council needs to take decisive steps to reduce the pressure on residents and businesses facing economic hardship, while ensuring we can protect and maintain the essential services Aucklanders rely on,” said Mayor Phil Goff.

“With a substantial reduction in non-rates revenue caused by the recession, some projects and services will need to be cut or postponed to reduce expenditure. Already many temp or contracted staff have been given notice.

“But Aucklanders will want us to continue to provide core services that the city needs, and which make our city a great place to live. Aucklanders will also want us to partner with the government to invest in the construction of vital infrastructure that the city needs, and which will contribute a stimulus to growth and jobs to assist our recovery.

“Auckland Council will consult with the public on a rate increase of 2.5 or 3.5 per cent. For the average ratepayer, a 2.5 per cent increase would be equivalent to an extra $1.35 per week, while a 3.5 per cent increase would be $1.83 per week.

“The Emergency Committee looked at all options for rate increases and the impact different levels of rate increase, including a zero per cent increase, would have on the ability of the council to provide services for Aucklanders and to invest in infrastructure for jobs.

“There will be a new round of consultation with Aucklanders providing a clear explanation of what each rating option would mean for council services and infrastructure and we will be
providing robust information as part of the consultation document to ensure that picture is very clear," he said.

The Emergency Committee has agreed a suite of measures to immediately offer some support to all ratepayers, including businesses, facing hardship due to the crisis:

- Waiving the APTR payment from 1 April to 30 June (2020) for all accommodation and tourism businesses
- Offering all ratepayers experiencing financial hardship the opportunity to defer payment of their fourth quarter rates instalments.
- As part of the public consultation, Aucklanders will be asked if they support options including:
  - A recommendation brought by the Mayor for both a 2.5 per cent and 3.5 per cent rate rise to be considered, with information included outlining the potential impact of both those options.
  - A broadening of the council's rates postponement policy to include businesses experiencing financial hardship.
  - Suspension of the Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate, and the expenditure that it would fund, until 31 March 2021.

Mayor Phil Goff said, "The measures we agreed yesterday add to the strong financial support programmes already announced by central government. These changes will help to reduce the financial strain many Aucklanders are under as a result of the COVID-19 induced recession.

"Businesses in the accommodation and tourism industries are under particular pressure, so we are waiving the fourth quarter instalment of the APTR to provide some relief.

"All businesses and residents facing financial hardship will be able to request deferring their fourth quarter rates payments until the due date of the first rates instalment for the next rating year (31 August 2020) without penalties.

"Our priority is to look at what we can do in the area of rates to support those Aucklanders under real strain; acting to protect and maintain the key services Aucklanders rely on; ensuring we play our role in partnering with the government on the projects needed to kickstart economic recovery and employment, and taking a long-term view of the budget to ensure we can meet the short-medium term financial challenges posed by COVID-19 while continuing to invest in our region’s future."

The Emergency Committee also requested staff to undertake further analysis of the impact different rates increases between 0 and 3.5 per cent would have on council services and business activity in Auckland. This analysis will help inform the public consultation process.

Finance and Performance Committee Chair, Councillor Desley Simpson said, "I believe that it is really important for Aucklanders to understand what services they might lose if we want for an even lower rates rise which is why this will be clearly outlined in the consultation document.

"We need to ensure our residential and business ratepayers are supported if they need assistance but at the same time keep key council services funded and operational. We know that not all ratepayers will be in a position to pay their rates during this financial hardship and that will impact on our income."

"This is an emergency budget for extraordinary times."

Download the COVID-19 Financial Update [here](#).
Co-Chairs to lead Hauraki Gulf Forum

Our Auckland Published: 14 May 2020

Hauraki Gulf Forum
Tikapa Moana
Te Moananui-ā-Toi

The Hauraki Gulf Forum has become the latest institution to adopt a co-governance leadership model, taking a historic decision to appoint co-chairs: one of whom will be from and confirmed by its tangata whenua members.

The inaugural co-chairs are:

- Nicola MacDonald (Ngāti Rehua, Patuharakeke, Te Whanau Whero and Te Ākitai (hāpu of Ngāti Wai), and Te Rarawa and Taranaki iwi), and;
- Pippa Coom (Auckland Councillor, Waitematā and Gulf ward)

“It is really exciting that the Forum agreed to adopt a co-governance leadership model,” says Co-chair Pippa Coom.

“It takes us to the next level and brings us closer to operating in partnership under the Treaty of Waitangi to integrate and respect Te Ao Māori as well as other world views.”

“Our kaupapa is to restore the mauri of Te Moananui-ā-Toi, Tikapa Moana, the Hauraki Gulf” says Co-chair Nicola MacDonald. “The moana is under increased pressure and the time for action is now. We need more marine protection. We need greater support for restoration work. And we need to stop marine dumping in or near to the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park.”

Co-chairs Coom and MacDonald are the first co-Chairs of the Forum and the first wāhine to hold the top job in the Forum’s 20-year history.

Their first meeting as co-chairs will take place online on 25 May 2020.
Improved facilities for people walking and cycling across Auckland

Our Auckland Published: 28 April 2020

Auckland Transport (AT) is delivering the first of a rolling set of initiatives on 20 roads and popular walkways across Auckland to assist with safe physical distancing during COVID-19 Alert Level 3.

By Tuesday 28 April, 17km of temporary cycle space will have been installed across the region.

Tamaki Drive (between The Strand and St Heliers Bay) was the first location to benefit from the initiative, with measures installed on Friday 24 April.

Car parking on the sea side of the road has been temporarily removed and replaced with a wider space for people walking or cycling, giving Aucklanders the ability to keep 2 metres apart from each other’s ‘bubbles’.

AT is trialling these as temporary measures, providing the ability to adapt available space on the road to reflect their use by Aucklanders during different alert levels.

Auckland Mayor Phil Goff welcomed the rollout of the temporary cycle spaces.

“The lockdown period saw many people get outside to exercise, with the number of people walking and cycling increasing by 100% in some areas,” he said.

“As our roads become busier during Level 3, temporary cycleways and will help ensure that people on bikes and walking can stay safe and maintain the physical distance requirements that are so important to helping us break the chain of COVID-19 infection.

“Please remember to look out for your fellow road users and help keep yourself and others safe.”

Waitematā and Gulf Councillor Pippa Coom says, “These new temporary cycleways and extra space for pedestrians respond to the COVID-19 crisis to keep everyone safe while also showing what is possible quickly and cheaply as we work towards making our streets safer and more people-friendly.”

AT Chair Adrienne Young-Cooper says AT is responding firstly to public health directives on physical distancing in busy areas for people walking and cycling.

“This means some road space will be reallocated to temporarily widen footpaths and widen cycleways or install temporary cycleways.
“So many families and people making essential or recreation trips are choosing to walk and ride bikes in their neighbourhoods because streets are quiet,” she says. “But as vehicle traffic increases and physical distancing must still be practiced, using the road carriageway or stepping out into the road to distance from other people becomes more hazardous.

“We are responding to this change as quickly as we can by installing temporary cycleways in areas where we have seen the greatest increase in people cycling.

“We are also temporarily widening footpaths in areas we know people are present in higher numbers. We want Aucklanders to be safe through the different COVID-19 levels when they are walking and cycling.”

Other initiatives to support the increased number of people walking and cycling across the city are also being rolled out. Signage and markings reminding those out and about to maintain physical distancing have been installed and most pedestrian crossings switched to auto-mated, reducing the need for people to touch the request button.

Included in the rollout for widened spaces are temporary emergency safe speed limits where applicable to increase safety for all road users. With more people driving to get to work and freight services returning to normal it is expected that roads will be busier than what they were at Alert Level 4.

Other locations Auckland Transport is installing new walking and cycling measures:

- Queen Street
- Quay Street
- Customs St/Queen Street intersection
- Ponsonby Road
- Oteha Valley Road
- Lonely Track Road
- Mangere town centre
- Otara town centre
- Manukau town centre.

AT will continue to roll out these temporary measures on a responsive risk-based approach and is responding to local boards’ requests for safety-based interventions.

Auckland Transport is also reminding people who may return to using their car to be aware of vulnerable road users when they travel. More than ever people are using their road space to walk or use a bike, and as a collective Aucklanders can all play a role in keeping everyone safe.
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Minutes of the Waiheke Local Board meeting held Wednesday, 22 April 2020 at 5.17pm via Skype for Business. A recording will be uploaded on the Auckland Council website.

PRESENT

Chairperson
Cath Handley

Deputy Chairperson
Bob Upchurch

Members
Kylee Matthews
Robin Tucker
Paul Walden

ALSO PRESENT

Councillor
Pippa Coom
1 Welcome

Members opened the meeting with a karakia.

Kua uru mai a hau kaha, a hau maia, a hau ora, a hau nui,
Ki runga, ki raro, ki roto, ki waho
Rira, rire hau...pai marire

2 Apologies

There were no apologies.

3 Declaration of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

4 Confirmation of Minutes

Resolution number WHK/2020/43
MOVED by Chairperson C Handley, seconded by Deputy Chairperson B Upchurch:
That the Waiheke Local Board:
a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Wednesday, 26 February 2020, as a true and correct record.

CARRIED

5 Leave of Absence

There were no leaves of absence.

6 Acknowledgements

There were no acknowledgements.

7 Petitions

There were no petitions.

Note: With the agreement of the meeting item 12 was considered after item 7.

12 Attendance at local board meetings during the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice period

Resolution number WHK/2020/44
MOVED by Chairperson C Handley, seconded by Member R Tucker:
That the Waiheke Local Board:
a) note the temporary amendments pursuant to the COVID-19 Response (Urgent Management Measures) Act 2020 which allows members to attend meetings by audio-visual link, as of right and despite anything to the contrary in standing orders and to be counted for the purposes of quorum.
b) amend its standing orders by including a new Standing Order 3.3.10 that reads as follows:
   Attendance of non-members by electronic link
   A person other than a member of the local board may participate in a meeting of
   the local board by means of audio link or audio-visual link if the person is
   otherwise approved to participate in accordance with Standing Orders Sections
   6 and 7.

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

8 Deputations

There were no deputations.

Note: With the agreement of the meeting items 9 and 9.1 was considered after item 11.

10 Extraordinary Business

There was no extraordinary business.

11 Local Ward Area Councillor’s Update

Resolution number WHK/2020/45

MOVED by Chairperson C Handley, seconded by Deputy Chairperson B Upchurch:
   That the Waiheke Local Board:
   a) receive Waitemata and Gulf Ward Councillor, Pippa Coom’s update.
   CARRIED

9 Public Forum

9.1 Public Forum – Denis Powell – Climate Change and Myths

A copy has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council
website as a minute attachment.

Resolution number WHK/2020/46

MOVED by Chairperson C Handley, seconded by Deputy Chairperson B Upchurch:
   That the Waiheke Local Board:
   a) thank Denis Powell for his attendance via skype and his submissions.
   CARRIED

Attachments

A  20200422 Waiheke Local Board Meeting - Public Forum - Denis Powell - March 2020 Submission
B  20200422 Waiheke Local Board Meeting - Public Forum - Denis Powell - April 2020 Submission
Note: With the agreement of the meeting item 12 was considered after item 7.

13 Urgent Decision Report

Resolution number WHK/2020/47

MOVED by Member R Tucker, seconded by Member K Matthews:

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) note the urgent decision made on 23 March 2020 as follows:
   - approve allocation of funds from the following Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI)
     budget to support a special edition of the Gulf News containing important
     health information and delivery to all Waiheke letterboxes:
     - Social and Economic development $7000.00
     - Film revenue $1905.20

b) note the urgent decision made on 17 April 2020 as follows:
   - approve formal feedback as tabled on the Council-Controlled Organisations
     Review to the Independent Panel.

c) note the urgent decision made on 14 April 2020 as follows:
   i. approve formal feedback as tabled on the changes to the draft Te Taruke-a-
      Tawhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework.
   ii. note that this feedback has been developed and agreed to by the full local
       board and is being executed using the urgent decision mechanism because
       it is not practicable for the local board to meet in the current public health
       emergency.

d) note the urgent decision made on 17 April 2020 as follows:
   - approve feedback as tabled on Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency’s
     Accessible Streets Regulatory Package.

CARRIED

Attachments

A 20200422 Waiheke Local Board Meeting - Formal Feedback on Accessible Streets
B 20200422 Waiheke Local Board Meeting - Formal feedback on Auckland Climate
  Change Framework

14 First Review - Waiheke Local Board and Auckland Transport Memorandum of
Understanding

Resolution number WHK/2020/48

MOVED by Member P Walden, seconded by Deputy Chairperson B Upchurch:

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) accept the first formal review report of the Memorandum of Understanding
   between the Waiheke Local Board and Auckland Transport.

b) confirm the updates to the Implementation section of the Memorandum of
   Understanding as outlined in Attachments A and B.

c) note that it will present the reviewed Memorandum of Understanding to the next
   available Waiheke Transport Forum for its consideration and feedback.
15 Auckland Transport Report - March/April 2020

MOVED by Member R Tucker, seconded by Member P Walden:
That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) receive the Auckland Transport Report March/April 2020.
b) agree that the Matiatia Summer Trial end date be extended until 31 May 2020 to allow time for public feedback to be analysed and the results reported back to the Board.

c) request a more detailed formal report in response to resolution WHK/2020/10 and downtown ferry terminals that includes options for achieving equity for commercial operators at both terminals and that details how existing arrangements comply with the purpose and provisions of the Commerce Act.

The motion was carried.

The substantive motion was put.

Resolution number WHK/2020/49

MOVED by Member R Tucker, seconded by Member P Walden:
That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) receive the Auckland Transport Report March/April 2020.
b) agree that the Matiatia Summer Trial end date be extended until 31 May 2020 to allow time for public feedback to be analysed and the results reported back to the Board.

c) request a more detailed formal report in response to resolution WHK/2020/10 Matiatia and downtown ferry terminals that includes options for achieving equity for commercial operators at both terminals and that details how existing arrangements comply with the purpose and provisions of the Commerce Act.

CARRIED

16 Little Oneroa Reserve Concept Plan

Resolution number WHK/2020/50

MOVED by Member R Tucker, seconded by Deputy Chairperson B Upchurch:
That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) endorse the Little Oneroa Reserve Concept Plan, as shown in Attachment A to this report.
b) support funding of playground, stairs and existing footpath widening with $230,000 renewal budget.
c) support funding of hill slide, vegetation removal, furniture and some new path works with $180,000 LDI budget subject to confirmation of post covid-19 budgets.

17 Request to covenant two parcels of land at Te Huruhi Bay Reserve
Resolution number WHK/2020/51
MOVED by Deputy Chairperson B Upchurch, seconded by Member K Matthews:
That the Waiheke Local Board:
   a) approve, in terms of Section 108(2)(d) of the Resource Management Act, the covenant of Section 1 SO 422102 and Lot 1 DP 45886 at Te Huruhi Bay Reserve.
   b) seek to ensure that both parcels are leased by the Piritahi Marae Committee.

18 Waiheke Local Board Grants Programme 2020/2021
Resolution number WHK/2020/52
MOVED by Chairperson C Handley, seconded by Deputy Chairperson B Upchurch:
That the Waiheke Local Board:
   a) adopt the Waiheke Grants Programme 2020/2021 with the addition and particular focus on supporting post covid-19 economic development initiatives and support for initiatives that address community hardship.

19 Chairperson’s report
Resolution number WHK/2020/63
MOVED by Member R Tucker, seconded by Deputy Chairperson B Upchurch:
That the Waiheke Local Board:
   a) receive the Chairperson, Cath Handley’s update.

20 Local board feedback for inclusion in Auckland Council submissions
Resolution number WHK/2020/54
MOVED by Member R Tucker, seconded by Deputy Chairperson B Upchurch:
That the Waiheke Local Board:
   a) delegate authority to the chair to approve and submit the local board’s input into Auckland Council submissions on formal consultation from government departments, parliament, select committees and other councils.
   b) note that the local board can continue to use its urgent decision process to approve and submit the local board’s input into Auckland Council submissions on formal consultation from government departments, parliament, select...
committees and other councils, if the chair chooses not to exercise the delegation sought in recommendation (a).

c) note that this delegation will only be exercised where the timeframes do not allow for local board input to be considered and approved at a local board meeting.

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

CARRIED

21 List of Resource Consents Applications
Resolution number WHK/2020/55
MOVED by Member P Walden, seconded by Deputy Chairperson B Upchurch:
That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) note the lists of resource consents lodged related to Waiheke Island from 9 to 15 February, 16 to 22 February, 23 to 29 February and 1 to 7 March, 8 to 14 March, 15 to 21 March, 22 to 28 March and 29 March to 4 April 2020.

CARRIED

22 Waiheke Local Board Governance Forward Work Calendar 2019 - 2022
Resolution number WHK/2020/56
MOVED by Member P Walden, seconded by Deputy Chairperson B Upchurch:
That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) receive its Governance Forward Work Calendar for the political term 2019 - 2022 dated April 2020.

CARRIED

23 Waiheke Local Board Workshop Record of Proceedings
Resolution number WHK/2020/57
MOVED by Member P Walden, seconded by Deputy Chairperson B Upchurch:
That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) note the record of proceedings for the local board workshops held on 19 February, 26 February 2020, 4 March, 11 March, 18 March, 25 March 2020 and 1 April 2020.

CARRIED

24 Local board representative on the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group
Resolution number WHK/2020/58
MOVED by Member R Tucker, seconded by Member K Matthews:
That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) appoint Chairperson Cath Handley of the Waiheke Local Board to be a representative to the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group.

CARRIED

25 Consideration of Extraordinary Items

There was no consideration of extraordinary items.

Member Kylee Matthews closed the meeting with the following karakia.

Waiho i te toipoto kaua i te toiroa
Let us keep close together, not far apart

7.22 pm The Chairperson thanked Members for their attendance and attention to business and declared the meeting closed.
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Janine,

Good afternoon,

Below my question to Councillor Pipa Coom, whom I understand was to be attending the Local Board Business meeting and still maybe if that continues online?

This question relates to my queries as to who, how and why and the reasons for the outcome, where the Environment and Climate Change committee opted not to implement the recommendations of the experts report, and unanimously voted to keep the climate change temperature band at 1.5 degrees.

My question then to Councillor Coom is as follows:

“What is your analysis of the Environment and Climate Change Committees rational, i.e. their compelling reasons why they chose to remain with the 1.5 degrees temperature increase when we all know there is little chance of us meeting the conditions of the 2015 Paris Accord?”

Background and supporting evidence: That we have passed any possibility of containing global warming to 1.5 degrees.

The Paris Agreement central aim is to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change by keeping a global temperature rise this century well below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5 degrees Celsius. Additionally, the agreement aims to strengthen the ability of countries to deal with the impacts of climate change. To reach these ambitious goals, appropriate financial flows, a new technology framework and an enhanced capacity-building framework will be put in place, thus supporting action by developing countries and the most vulnerable countries, in line with their own national objectives. The Agreement also provides for enhanced transparency of action and support through a more robust transparency framework. Further information on key aspects of the Agreement can be found @:

https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/what-is-the-paris-agreement

Last June, President Trump announced that the United States would withdraw from the 2015 Paris agreement on climate change. How are the Paris goals looking, a year later?

It may be too early to assess whether the Paris signatories are on track with their pledges for the year 2030, but rising carbon dioxide emissions in Asia and Europe, in particular, are a troubling sign. The Paris agreement outlined steep emission reductions to meet the stated goal of limiting global warming to two degrees Celsius.
The 1.4 percent increase in global carbon dioxide emissions in 2017 is itself troubling but not surprising. Global economic growth is one obvious culprit — the world economy grew by 3.7 percent in 2017. This growth created demand for extra energy, which means more oil, natural gas and coal combustion. Regardless of U.S. participation in the Paris agreement, rapid global economic growth increased the use of fossil fuels.

Trump’s withdrawal from the Paris agreement means other countries will spend less to fight climate change.

More fundamentally, though, political-science research shows that national governments have only limited ability to control a country’s emissions. Great uncertainties surround both future emissions and the impact of different new policies.

With or without the Paris agreement, it’s hard to know what each country’s emissions levels will look like in the future. Here are four policy areas to watch:

1) Governments cannot credibly commit to long-term policy

In climate politics, governments simply cannot promise that their climate policies will continue indefinitely, as the next government may decide to overturn the policies. Democratic governments face elections every few years, and dictators can be unseated by coups and revolutions.

Given these political realities, climate policies often have short life spans — and this can be a major barrier to effective climate policy. From renewable-energy subsidies to carbon-emissions trading, governments can formulate and implement policies now and hope that they stick. But if the policies prove unpopular — as costly policies often do — and have few loyal supporters, they will fall by the wayside as political fortunes wax and wane.

U.S. cities and states want to implement the Paris climate accord goals. It’s not that simple.


Is climate change humanity’s greatest ever risk management failure?

Guardian Dana Nuccitelli

Fri 23 Aug 2013 03.19 BST First published on Fri 23 Aug 2013 03.19 BST

Humans are very good at managing risks, except when it comes to the greatest risk we’ve faced - climate change. Climate Change seems to be a major exception to this rule. Managing the risks posed by climate change is not a high priority for the public as a whole, despite the fact that a
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climate catastrophe this century is a very real possibility, and that such an event would have adverse impacts on all of us.

Watching our ice sheets disappear
Thin Ice Climate: Collaboration between Oxford University and Victoria University, Wellington

Eric Rignot leads a US research group that uses satellite data to monitor the world’s ice sheets. He explains how measurements since the early 1990s show that Greenland and Antarctica are losing ice at an accelerating rate, which, if unchecked, will result in about 1 metre of sea-level rise by the end of the century, and 6 - 9 metres in the next few hundred years.

https://zimeo.com/204798097

Tax Justice Network

#99: Climate crisis, transition and tax justice

*Mar 19, 2020

We’re inline for 4 degrees warming approximately 4 minutes into the podcast

Economics, Models and Assumptions: In whose interest? Six Myths, hiding in plain sight

I had hoped to engage in some interactive discussion with this section of my presentation.

For now, it is sufficient to table the ideas around which this submission would have been structured, i.e. the introduction of 6 major shibboleths of Austerity Economics.

1. We Must Live Within Our Means
2. Governments Must Balance The Books
3. We Must Tighten Our Belts
4. Never Go Into Debt
5. Taxes Are A Burden

Those ideas we take for ‘granted,’ as being ‘common sense’ and ‘obvious.’ The Covid-19 pandemic and governments’ reaction to the containment of Covid sees the introduction of
heterodox economic models, which are ‘suddenly’ tolerated, raising the question: “Why can’t we do this for the even more pressing problem of Climate Change.”

The answer, I submit is “We can.” Having introduced the six austerity myths to instigate discussion, I ask the Local Board to support this dialogue, and if supportive, how would they see that unfolding, and what support could be mobilised to engage that community korero?

If not, what reasons does the local board rely upon, given that traditional growth models and assumptions have brought us to this critical juncture?

My submission that: There is always an alternative.

Supporting Evidence:

**Interlocking Strategies: Short and Long-run Dynamics: The Woven Universe or BAU?**


**Coronavirus Means Zero Hour for the European Union**

By Thomas Ferguson and Edward J. Kane

Mar 16, 2020 | Macroeconomics | Europe

If the European Central Bank does not jump to the aid of peripheral countries weakened by the pandemic, the Eurozone could collapse.

Lagarde did outline a series of measures to ease “liquidity” and encourage banks to lend. But then she added a remark that echoed around the world, declaring that the ECB “is not here to cope spreads.”

Everyone grasped the implication: Italy, and perhaps other Eurozone countries facing similarly severe budget challenges down the road, had to watch out. They could not count on the ECB to hold down their funding costs.

The shock was global and profound: Eurozone stocks plunged yet again, while rates on Italian debt rocketed upward, in what some touted as the greatest one-day rise in the country’s history. The prospect that bond prices (and thus interest rates) of different countries in the Eurozone might diverge wildly, presaging a breakup of the zone itself, suddenly became real again.

As many economists, including more than a few writing for INET, have recounted, the long running Euro crisis has created deep patterns of center-periphery dependence within Europe.\[3\] Basically Germany and a handful of other northern countries form the core, and everyone else, especially in the south, constitutes the periphery. Germany routinely ignores
pro forma injunctions from eurozone officials and outside analysts to rein in its current account surplus by expanding German domestic spending. This would stimulate imports from its partners and allow its own population to live better. Instead Germany keeps piling up enormous trade surpluses, while leaving many of its trading partners with even higher debts. With their economic growth slowed to a crawl, capital and younger workers in the periphery flee to richer countries, leaving behind economies whose productivity is too weak to make good their debts to foreign and domestic banks. When we factor in restrictions on budget deficits and state spending that the macroeconomic rules of the Eurozone prescribe, the result is deep, persisting austerity that cripples hope of effective state action in the south to stimulate growth and a vicious circle of demoralizing cuts in social spending and services, including education and public health, that affects even some northern countries. [4]

https://www.ineteconomics.org/

Coronavirus Means Zero Hour for the European Union

Posted on March 17, 2020

We wrote yesterday of our concern that Christine Lagarde, the new head of the European Central Bank, wasn't bluffing when she said that the ECB job wasn't to close the spreads of various state borrowers like Italy. Italian bonds plunged. Lagarde made what looked to us like a half-hearted walk-back.

Understand how serious this is. If the ECB won't support Italy's borrowing, which is sure to rise due to the need to prop up the Italian economy as a result of the massive hit of the coronavirus shutdown, you can kiss the Italian banking system goodbye. And that conflation will engulf undercapitalized European banks.


Watching our ice sheets disappear

Thin Ice Climate: Collaboration between Oxford University and Victoria University, Wellington

Eric Rignot leads a US research group that uses satellite data to monitor the world’s ice sheets. He explains how measurements since the early 1990s show that Greenland and Antarctica are losing ice at an accelerating rate, which, if unchecked, will result in about 1
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metres of sea level rise by the end of the century, and 6 - 9 metres in the next few hundred years.

https://vimeo.com/204798032

Tax Justice Network

#99: Climate crisis, transition and tax justice

*Mar 19, 2020

We're inline for 4 degrees warming approximately 4 minutes into the podcast

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jaIXCXSht2U&feature=youtu.be

Coronavirus: What Has it Revealed? | Russell Brand Mar 16, 2020

Russell Brands: wisdom fear vs. neurotic fear.

"Neurotic fear hoards toilet rolls, wisdom fear says wash your hands."

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C1sbpSoyVh4
Submit to Waiheke Local Board virtual Meeting, April 22nd 2020

My submission is and relates to the recommendations arising from the March 12th ECC meeting, item 8.

The question of the soundness of the thinking which underlies and informed the ACFA Purposed Changes Item 6 is still undecided, in particular the reasoning behind remaining with the 1.5-degree warming target.

At page 34 of the ACFA document relied upon when coming to the recommendation, The ECC reaffirmed:

c) reaffirm our commitment to a plan consistent with a 1.5-degree rise, an interim target of halving Auckland's emissions by 2050, and a precautionary approach to planning for change.

This is a strategic political error.

My submission to the March 25th Local Board Business meeting (see attached) addresses my concerns about the 1.5 figure and stated:

That we have passed any possibility of containing global warming to 1.5 degrees.

The public is being hoodwinked, by faulty reasoning, this submission should convey my very strong concerns regarding the 'fit for purpose' of the ECC's 'endorsement' at (c) above.

At page 30 of that same document, we have the reappearance of the 3.5 degrees of warming, the figure I have seeking an explanation and evidence for since the HY's budget meeting March 4th.

I know that council staff have been hampered in the execution of their professional duties, by being restricted to the 1.5-degree, a figure which has been surpassed some time ago.

Without the higher 3.5 figure being accepted by the ECC, Council planners cannot instigate planning and consequent alignments to the Codes of Practice that this move would necessitate, for starters.

Remaining at the 1.5-degree warming is an irresponsible act which sabotages the urgent need to deal with the upper bunch of CC, rather than the politically less contentious lower bunch, which leave the question of Codes of Practice untouched, when we know, here at Whiti Road, that the proposed stormwater provision cannot be guaranteed as 'fit for purpose' in terms of projected CC because its implementation is constrained to the now grossly outmode Codes of Practice.

It is the necessity for forward planning that the political BAU 1.5-degree figure, finds its' most egregious error, stifling the work needed to accurately plan and cost for what is going to be a 2.1, or more, temperature rise.

While the ECC and ACFA argue for the 1.5-degree figure as a target for the 'people' to aim for looking ahead to 2050, the ECC is complicit in political lagdomain which thumps its nose at the community who know the 1.5-degree figure is yesterdays benchmark.

The effect of this omission is to further weaken any trust citizens might have in the effective administration of government's primary responsibility which is: to protect the people.

No governing body can protect people by withholding critical evidenced-based climate change data, notwithstanding how well intentioned those withholdings are.

ECC committee's decision was specifically qualified, it gave a directive to Local Boards and Mana Whenua seeking their feedback on this issue before they made their decision absolute.
I can find no evidence of either effective engagement or an informed consultation with the Waiheke Island Community on this matter.

How are the directions of the ECC recommendations going to be given effect to?

Ends.
Notes to WLM Virtual Meeting April 22nd 2020

Preface:

Future engagements between the Board and myself will rely on the Board having read and understood the evidence and readings I have provided in my March 25th and April 22nd submissions to the Board.

March 25th Submission.

1. **Background - note 1.5 degrees** Page 1

2. **Economics, Models and Assumptions** page 3

**Myths:**

6 major shibboleths of Austerity Economics.

1. We Must Live Within Our Means
2. Governments Must Balance The Books
3. We Must Tighten Our Belts
4. Never Go into Debt
5. Taxes Are A Burden

See: A coronavirus recession could be supply-side with a 1970s flavour | Kenneth Rogoff

Guardian: 3 02 2020

**Affected countries will, and should, engage in massive deficit spending to shore up their health systems and prop up their economies.**

*Kenneth Rogoff is professor of economics and public policy at Harvard University. He was the chief economist of the IMF from 2001 to 2003.*
Japan Public Debt 100% of Annual GDP, New Zealand nowhere near that figure.

Randall Wray says:

A government that has the power to create money never has to default. That doesn’t mean that an unlimited amount of money should be created, but we are currently within the bounds of what’s possible.

April 22nd Submission

c) reaffirm our commitment to a plan consistent with a 1.5-degree rise, an interim target of halving Auckland’s emissions by 2030, and a precautionary approach to planning for change.

This is a strategic political error.

See March 25th submission

Halving CO2 emissions by 2030 is the strategic goal.

Temperature 1.5 degrees, whatever, is a tactic - it doesn’t matter what the temperature is.

After 4 weeks of Level 4 lockdown, NZ has met its emissions target in April 2020.

1.5 degrees is a political notion - to encourage public buy-in, to engage in an ‘achievable’ effort.

We have surpassed 1.5 degrees. Who can trust the Council when it publishes yesterday’s temperature readings?
The ACAF treat the public as non-informed at best, dumbs the public down, reflects yesterday’s BAU thinking.

That world no longer exits, there is no BAU – gone. Over.

The ECC decision was specifically qualified - gave a directive:

(a) ... subject to the direction of Mana Whenua and consideration of feedback from Local Boards

My question: how has the local Board given effect to the directions of the ECC April 12th directive?

I am assuming those members who have further questions will take the time to contact me via email or by phoning 372 6948 to seek clarification on any point they might have regarding the intentions of both these submissions.

Thank you.
Waiheke Local Board formal feedback on the Accessible Streets Regulatory Package
17 April 2020

Please find the responses below from the Waiheke Local Board to the submission
questions posed in the New Zealand Transport Agency’s document:

“ACCESSIBLE STREETS – OVERVIEW TO THE RULES 9 MARCH 2020”.

Proposal 1A: Pedestrians and powered wheelchair users – Questions for your submission:

1. Do you agree that powered wheelchairs should be treated as pedestrians? Why/why not?
   A. Yes, as this means that powered chairs can be used on footpaths, which is much safer.

Proposal 1B: Changing wheeled recreational devices – Questions for your submission

2. Do you agree with the proposal to replace wheeled recreational devices with new categories
   for unpowered and powered transport devices? Why/why not?
   A. Yes, because as this will give greater clarity about which parts of the carriageway can
      be used by riders of these devices. Segways should be included in this current process as
      lack of clarity is an issue now and must be resolved.

3. What steps should the Transport Agency take before declaring a vehicle not to be a motor
   vehicle?
   A. The key step is to understand the power, dimensions and potential speed of the device to
decide which space would provide the greatest safety for rider and pedestrians.

4. If the Transport Agency declares a vehicle not to be a motor vehicle, do you think it should
be able to impose conditions? If yes, should such conditions be able to be applied
regardless of the power output of the device?
   A. Yes, the Transport Agency should be able to impose conditions regardless of the power
output of the device, as the safety of each device must be considered on its merits. The key
condition is maximum speed which we recommend is 10km/h on the footpath. Conditions
need to be publicised on a simple, central NZTA platform which is easily accessible to all
stakeholders.

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

Do you agree with this proposed clarification? Why/why not?
Item 12

Proposal 1C: Clarifying cycles and e-bikes – Questions for your submission

(questions about using cycles on footpaths are in proposal 2)

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

A. Small-wheeled cycles propelled by cranks should be defined as bikes and not be used on the footpath as they would present a hazard to pedestrians. Small-wheeled cycles that are not propelled by cranks, such as scooters and balance bikes, should be defined as transport devices and allowed on the footpath to remain consistent with other devices allowed on the footpath.

Proposal 1D: Mobility devices – Questions for your submission

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

A. Yes, mobility devices such as a mobility scooter should give way to pedestrians and powered wheelchairs because they are more powerful devices and the safest option is for them to wait for pedestrians and powered wheelchairs to go first. People using powered wheelchairs usually have less mobility and should have right of way.

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

A. Yes, there are often insufficient curb-cuts and level accessways into shops, bus stops and public facilities. Footpaths, particularly in semi-rural areas like Waiheke, are often undeveloped or uneven. More funding to address these issues to give better access for people with disabilities is required.

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

A. NZTA should consider speed rules and etiquette guidelines to better manage shared use of the footpaths.

Alternative proposal - Question for your submission:

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

A. The board prefers the option to change vehicle definitions now which would bring greater clarity. Interim guidelines would be useful, in lieu of legislative change, on
Proposal 2: Establish a national framework for the use of footpaths – Questions for your submission:

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

A. The board does not support cycles on the footpath as there are growing number of user categories using the footpath. Where cycleways end, the road should be used. In rural areas where cycle lanes are not continuous, it can be hazardous to cross between footpath and cycle lanes.

E-scooters are a particular hazard on city streets and should be relegated to cycle lanes or cycle paths. If these are not available, the e-scooter should use the footpath but to a maximum speed of 10 km/hr.

12. We have outlined two alternative options to address cycling on the footpath. These are:
   a. allow cyclists up to 18 years of age to use the footpath; or
   b. Continue the status quo, where most cyclists are not allowed to use the footpath.

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

A. Yes, the board supports children up to 12 years of age using the footpath as they are less skilled cyclists on the road, and with their smaller cycles and lower speeds, pose less of the hazard to footpath users. Must keep speed below 10km/hr.

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

   A. Up to 12 years of age as stated above.

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

   A. Yes. It makes sense to allow local knowledge to inform restrictions for local communities and conditions particularly on rural and semi-rural areas where network density is less well developed. Road controlling authorities should partner with local boards and community boards to gain insights into local conditions. Retain centres with a higher volume of foot traffic should also be able to be restricted to protect pedestrian safety. (For Waiheke that would include Onetangi, Turakina and Oneroa retail areas.)

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

   A. Yes, it is preferable to provide for a consistent approach nationwide. The resolution approach is preferable as it means better flexibility for local communities. The best practice is to allow for the detail of the regulatory measures to be determined by resolution that enables a more agile response requiring less formally,

   The process to amend a bylaw is cumbersome as it requires the use of either the special consultative procedure or the alternative public consultation process under section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002. Even the lesser consultation process is excessive and
resource intensive for a minor determination such as this, which is also potentially subject to frequent change.

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

A. Yes, as above consistency of approach is preferable which a set of criteria would provide.

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

A. No, a new framework is preferable to sort out the growing inconsistencies in the application of the law and to improve road safety.

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

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

A. Yes, because pedestrians are the most vulnerable parties, given the potential hazards created by transport devices on the footpath.

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

Do you agree with these three requirements? Are there any others we should consider?

A. Yes, and it is recommended adding a requirement to keep speed to an appropriate level for footpath conditions and numbers of other footpath users regardless of the speed limit (i.e. the recommended 10km/hr)

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

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

Do you think the proposed speed limit should be higher/lower?

A. No, since according to the Accessible Streets Overview children currently cycle at approximately 10.2km/h and scooters 10.9km/h, a speed limit of 10km/hr is the more appropriate limit to minimise potential hazards.

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

A. Yes it makes sense to allow local knowledge to inform restrictions for local communities and conditions particularly in rural and semi-rural areas where road networks can be less well developed. Road controlling authorities should partner with local boards and community boards to gain insight into local conditions.

22. Are there other ways, that you can think of, to improve footpath safety? Please explain.
Proposal 2C: 750mm width restriction for vehicles that operate on the footpath – Questions for your submission

23. Do you agree with the proposed maximum width measurement of 750mm (except for wheelchairs) for devices on the footpath? Should this maximum width limit be wider/harder?
   A. Yes as this will minimise the potential hazards to other footpath users.

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

25. Should the maximum width limit apply to mobility devices? Why/why not?
   A. Yes, the new rules should be applied consistently.

26. We propose that people who already own a device wider than 750mm could apply for an exemption. This document also considers three alternative approaches to mitigate the impact on existing device owners:
   a. Mobility devices purchased before the rule changes could be automatically exempt from the width limit.
   b. The Transport Agency could declare certain wider devices to be mobility devices under section 16EA of the Land Transport Act, and exclude them from width requirements, or
   c. Apply a separate width limit to mobility devices.

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

A. Option b is preferred as it allows exemptions for the specific requirements of users which the new regulations have been unable to consider.

Proposal 3: Establish a national framework for the use of shared paths and cycle paths – Questions for your submission

27. Do you agree that road controlling authorities should be able to declare a path a shared path or a cycle path? What factors should be considered when making this decision?
   A. Yes, this will be useful where there is lack of clarity due to non-standard path configurations. Users will know which rules apply to which type of path.

The proposal is in line with existing measures that enable road controlling authorities to determine regulatory measures for all other uses of the road, e.g. the location of slip signs, one-way streets, mandatory right/left turn lanes etc.
It recognises that local roading authorities are best placed to regulate the roads in their jurisdiction, and specifically enables them to provide an integrated regulatory system.

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

A. Yes these are appropriate:

• in a careful and considerate manner
• at a speed that is not dangerous to other people on the path
• in a way that doesn’t interfere with other people using the path.

It would be useful to include the give-way prioritisation mentioned on page 40, i.e.

Pedestrians have greatest priority. Everyone must give way to pedestrians if they’re travelling in a shared path.

People using mobility devices must give way to pedestrians. Everyone else must give way to people using mobility devices.

People using transport devices must give way to mobility devices and pedestrians.

Cyclists must give way to transport devices.

Cyclists must give way to all other users in a shared path.

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

A. Yes, as per question 18, because pedestrians are the most vulnerable parties, given the potential hazards created by transport devices on the shared path.

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

A. No, it is unsafe for shared paths and cycle paths to have the same speed limits as the roads to which they are adjacent. The overview states that most devices or cycles only reach speeds of 30km/h on the flat, and this is recommended as a safe maximum speed limit for cycle paths. There should be a maximum of 10km/hr on shared paths to protect pedestrians and other footpath users.

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

A. Yes, because this will lead to greater national consistency and road safety approaches.

Proposal 4: Enable transport devices to use cycle lanes and cycle paths – Questions for your submission:

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

A. Yes because greater speeds are allowed, and this will afford greater safety to footpath users.

33. Do you agree that road controlling authorities should be able to exclude powered transport devices from cycle lanes and/or cycle paths? Why/why not?

A. Yes because slower devices could cause a safety hazard in a busy cycle lane or cycle path.
Proposal 5: Introduce lighting and reflector requirements for powered transport devices at night – Questions for your submission

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

A. Yes because this will minimise a potential safety hazard to other road users.

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

A. Yes, the necessary accessories are available or could be developed.

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

A. Yes any transport device used at night should attach a reflector or lights to ensure safe visibility to traffic.

Proposal 6A: Allow cycles and transport devices to travel straight ahead from a left turn lane – Questions for your submission:

34. Do you agree that cyclists and transport device users should be able to ride straight ahead from a left turn lane at an intersection, when it is safe to do so? Why/why not?

A. Yes, as this is a safer option for cyclists, and according to the Overview, aligns with common practice. It is difficult and unsafe for cyclists to move over to the centre lane in fast moving traffic.

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

38. Do you agree that cyclists and transport devices should be allowed to carefully ‘undertake’ slow-moving traffic? Why/why not?

A. Yes, as there is usually enough width in the roadway to allow cyclists to pass slow-moving or stationary motor vehicles safely.

Proposal 6C: Give cycles, transport devices and buses priority over turning traffic when they’re travelling through an intersection in a separated lane – Questions for your submission:

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

A. Yes, because this would reinforce and enable 6A above and prevent unsafe crossing of cycles into the centre lane. Improved safety and cyclist priority would encourage more cycling in line with our active transport goals.

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

A. Yes as the list could provide guidance on best practice and the safest devices to use for all road users.
41. Should the definition of a separated lane include the distance between the lane and the road? Why/why not?

A. Since road widths are so variable it is recommended that this be treated as a best practice guideline rather than definition.

Proposal 62: Give priority to footpath, shared path and cycle path users over turning traffic where the necessary traffic control devices are installed – Questions for your submission:

42. Do you agree that turning traffic should give way to path users crossing a side road with the proposed markings? Why/why not?

A. Yes, because this is the safer option. It is very difficult for cyclists to observe the traffic behind them and stop when necessary.

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

A. No, a painted section the width of the cycle path would provide better visibility for turning traffic.

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

A. Consideration should be given to colour and brightness characteristics which are optimal for both day and night conditions.

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

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

A. These gaps appear too small for the stated speeds. It is recommended that the gaps be 1.5 metres and 2 metres respectively to provide for greater safety of those being passed.

Proposal 8: Clarify how road controlling authorities can restrict parking on berms – Questions for your submission:

46. Do you agree with the proposal that road controlling authorities should be able to restrict berm parking without the use of signs and instead rely on an online register? Why/why not?

A. Yes because of public concern about the proliferation and cost of street signage. The online register would need to be well publicised.

The requirement to provide signage makes enforcement potentially vulnerable to vandalism of signage – no sign, no enforcement. This is likely to lead to the damage and/or removal of signs by those inconvenienced by the restriction, which will prevent efforts to enforce the restrictions.

47. Would it be helpful if information on berm parking restrictions was available in other places, like at a local library, i-SITE, or a local council?

A. Yes
Proposal 9: Give buses priority when exiting bus stops – Questions for your submission

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

A. Yes, because in busy traffic it can be very difficult for large buses to rejoin the traffic if they are not allowed back in by motorists.

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

A. This only occurs in urban situations and the courtesy of ‘merging like a zip’ should apply to all situations where lanes come to an end.

Chair Cath Handley
Chair
Waiheke Local Board
Formal feedback to the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review

The Waiheke Local Board appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback to the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review. This is an important piece of work as it is now a decade since Auckland’s unique governance model was put in place.

In 2017 a three-year Auckland Council pilot programme was established to trial greater devolution of decision-making to the Waiheke Local Board. It also sought to improve relationships and how the local board works with CCOs. The pilot is due to conclude in October 2020 and findings will be reported to the Governing Body and shared with other local boards and participating CCOs.

Improved collaboration with Auckland Transport on transport issues was a focus of the pilot and as a result a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Auckland Transport and Waiheke Local Board was signed in May 2019. The MoU is a key instrument in shaping the relationship between Auckland Transport and the board, allowing for greater alignment to achieve transport outcomes that meet Waiheke’s needs. It provided the guiding framework for delivery, among other things, of a unique 10-year Transport Plan which supports the priorities and aspirations of both the board and the Waiheke community. The MoU underpins a much more robust relationship that has been established between the two parties, but it is less than a year in and it is still early to see the full effect, as the new intentions have to find their way in the old setting of Auckland Transport. The leadership ethos of the organisation is refreshing and brings hope that the much-needed culture change will be established in time.

The board’s feedback is based on the two overall objectives of the review:

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

Feedback

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a. notes that the timing of the public engagement of the CCO Review precludes the Waiheke Local Board receiving and reflecting on current community views in providing local feedback, however, note the community survey led by Council’s Research Investigation and Monitoring Unit (RIMU) during the Waiheke pilot provided insight into community views.

b. agrees that the Council Controlled Organisations can be an effective and efficient model for delivering services to Council and Aucklanders but CCOs have variable track records at delivering services, as do departments of council’s own operations.

c. agrees that the CCO decision-making model can enable sufficient political oversight, public transparency and accountability, however, note that culture and CCO priorities influence the degree to which a CCO delivers sufficiently to local outcomes. A corollary...
c. The question might be what models do CCOs need to utilize to satisfy each of the objectives of political oversight, public transparency and accountability.

d. agrees that it is appropriate that CCO’s operate and present themselves as distinct from Auckland Council externally, if they are sufficiently and demonstrably connected with Auckland Council and each other internally and strategically. Conversely a single identity for such a large organisation carries intrinsic reputational risks where one component impacts the whole.

e. Identifies the following opportunities to foster greater internal connection between Auckland Council, including local boards and the community:

i. CCO staff and board members to receive governance inductions to create a shared understanding of the Auckland governance model and to generate a greater respect for respective roles and responsibilities.

ii. CCOs to actively engage at the development stage of local strategic plans which provide the context for local strategic priorities, and to reference these in the development of the statement of intent to facilitate regular, relevant and joined-up reporting and engagement.

iii. Auckland Council to facilitate local board input into the development and approval of CCO Statement of Intent (SOIs), including providing analysis of SOIs in terms of local outcomes and facilitating formal feedback and in doing so provide a platform for ongoing engagement and delivery partnerships.

iv. CCOs and council to create a shared agenda of values, commitments and aspirations, rather than council directing these. If CEOs, CCO Boards, and politicians shared a process, the chances of CCOs delivering to it are much higher. This is how the Waiheke Local Board developed a MOU with Auckland Transport’s CE and leadership team. We share ownership.

f. note that, with the exception of Panuku Development Auckland, CCOs do not take a place-based approach to delivery, which creates a disconnect with local and community aspirations. The independent panel has an opportunity to consider and clarify the mandate of CCOs in the place-shaping space and either divert this to Auckland Council or require CCO’s to prioritise and resource a place-based approach.

g. provide the following feedback on the approach to roles and responsibilities, accountability and engagement with Council and community by CCO:

Auckland Transport:

; is currently appointing to a new management role specific to Waiheke to address the shortfall between the MOU with the Local Board and the delivery of the intended outcomes:

; to ensure that the board has early visibility of local community feedback to inform board deliberations;

; to ensure local priorities and outcomes in the planning and delivery of projects and initiatives;

; to bridge the gap in local communications on transport projects within the community that currently defaults to the local board;

; to provide an effective voice internally within AT for local projects.
Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development
- has met with the Waiheke Local Board to understand how ATEED and the local board might better align in the future but has not advanced the agenda for that.
- beyond event delivery, does not seek meaningful economic development initiatives at a local board level.
- promotes tourism and visitor strategies that directly impact Waiheke and its communities and society, but without reference to the priorities of the local board, including the Waiheke Local Board Plan.
- provides no financial support or alignment with council and other CCOs to meet the infrastructure demands and negative impacts of visitors on Waiheke.
- provides no support for Waiheke to access national tourism funding nor council funding.

Panuku Development Auckland
- has allowed significant asset deterioration over council properties that it has been responsible for leasing, rather than a balanced approach that incudes reinvestment in assets over time.
- should be reined in for property and urban development but responsibility for its service and other properties not planned for development should be returned to the Council group.

Regional Facilities Auckland
- noting that while Waiheke Local Board area does not have any regional facilities, Regional Facilities regularly and adequately engages with the local board through their Elected Member Relationship Manager.

Watercare
- are successful in engaging with local communities in the development of projects and activities
- are accessible and approachable at a staff and CE level and makes an effort to understand the local environment
- noting that Waiheke Island is not reticulated other than for Oneroa Village and Watercare only has one small wastewater plant on the island.

Waiheke Local Board
21 April 2020
Waiheke Local Board

OPEN MINUTES

Minutes of an extraordinary meeting of the Waiheke Local Board held on Wednesday, 13 May 2020 at 5.15pm via Skype for Business. A recording will be uploaded on the Auckland Council website.

PRESENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chairperson</th>
<th>Cath Handley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Bob Upchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Kylee Matthews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Robin Tucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Walden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 5.26pm
Attachment C

Item 12
1 Welcome

Member Kylee Matthews opened the meeting with a karakia.

Kua uru mai a hau kaha, a hau maia, a hau ora, a hau nui,
Ki runga, ki raro, ki roto, ki waho
Rire, rire hau…pai marire

2 Apologies

There were no apologies.

3 Declaration of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

4 Leave of Absence

There were no leaves of absence.

5 Acknowledgements

There were no acknowledgements.

6 Petitions

There were no petitions.

7 Deputations

There were no deputations as this is an extraordinary meeting as part of a Special Consultative Process.

8 Public Forum

There was no public forum as this is an extraordinary meeting as part of a Special Consultative Process.

9 Extraordinary Business

There was no extraordinary business.
## 10 Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

**Resolution number WHK/2020/59**

MOVED by Member P Walden, seconded by Chairperson C Handley:

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed Waiheke Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Waiheke Local Board area.

c) recommend that the Governing Body acknowledge the approval of $1 million (debt funded at the rate of $100,000 per annum from LDI operating expenditure budget) towards development of a community swimming pool, noting this was approved by the Governing Body in FY16, and this will be required in the next 12–18 months.

\[d)\] provide feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 as follows:

- that budgets and priorities should be renegotiated with a focus on supporting covid-19 impacts and climate change, and the purposes of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act.

- that commercial rating of the non-commercial properties including the Accommodation Providers Targeted Rate (APTR) needs to be revoked and Waiheke Island should be moved from zone B to zone C.

- that board request the Governing Body address the inequity of legacy funding for art galleries, and develop a policy framework for determining the funding of asset based services which include community art galleries as a priority.

- note feedback on other local matters was mixed.

e) delegate the chairperson, in consultation with the board, to provide feedback to help the Governing Body determine its draft Annual Budget 2020/2021 (Consultation part 2), referred to as the “Emergency Budget”, by Monday 18 May 2020.

f) note that there will be additional feedback on the annual budget proposals following the second tranche of public consultation on the Emergency Budget (Consultation part 2).

CARRIED

## 11 Consideration of Extraordinary Items

There was no consideration of extraordinary items.

*Member Kylee Matthews closed the meeting with the following karakia.*

_Waiho i te toitūto kaua i te toiroa_

_Let us keep close together, not far apart_

5:48 pm The Chairperson thanked Members for their attendance and attention to business and declared the meeting closed.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD AT A MEETING OF THE WAIHEKE LOCAL BOARD HELD ON

**DATE:** ………………………………………………………………

**CHAIRPERSON:** …………………………………………………
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve the allocation of $30,000 of Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) funding to support the Waiheke Island Tourism Campaign.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Waiheke Island Tourism forum (the forum) has formed a working group to support visitation to Waiheke to assist the economy to recover from the severe impacts of COVID-19.
3. A local grants application has been made seeking local board funding of $30,000 to support the campaign (Attachment A).
4. Reallocation of Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) budget will be necessary should the board decide to support this proposal.
5. A set of guiding principles has been provided for use of LDI opex funding balances for financial year 2019/2020 due to the financial impact of COVID-19 on the council’s budget. Further details are below within the financial implications section.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) approve allocation of $30,000 to the Waiheke Tourism Forum to support the Waiheke Tourism Campaign from 2019/2020 Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) budgets.

Horopaki
Context
6. The Waiheke Island Tourism Forum (the forum) represents tourism business on Waiheke Island. The forum’s objective is to promote sustainable tourism and to ensure a positive visitor experience. They provide members with key communication updates and advocacy on matters impacting their business.
7. The forum has formed a working group to develop a campaign to support visitation to Waiheke to assist the economy to recover from the severe impacts of COVID-19.
8. A local grants application has been made seeking local board funding of $30,000 to support the campaign (Attachment A – Waiheke Tourism Campaign brief).
9. As the amount applied for is greater than the remaining grants budget, reallocation of existing Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) budgets will be required should the board wish to support the campaign at the level requested.
10. Waiheke’s economy and employment has been severely impacted by the effects of COVID-19 and the board have indicated a focus on supporting local employment (combined with environmental restoration) and the rebuilding of the visitor economy over the coming years.

11. As a result of border restrictions, the international visitor market has been halted for the foreseeable future.

12. The Waiheke Tourism Campaign aims to kickstart visitation to Waiheke Island to help Waiheke economy recover from the impacts of COVID-19.

13. Objectives of the campaign are as follows:
   • To capitalize on the border shutdowns and position Waiheke as the number one domestic holiday destination for Aucklanders
   • To create a campaign with longevity, that builds strength over the years
   • To encourage Aucklanders to book a multi-night stay on Waiheke Island
   • To encourage visitors to spend at the Island’s restaurants, vineyards, tours, shops and activities.
   • To get more people to come, to stay longer, and to spend more.

14. The total budget for the campaign is estimated at $105,000. It is proposed the Tourism Forum will be contribute $23,000 and the remaining budget will be sourced from funding partners.

15. Proposed local board funding will be to fund the creative concept ($5,000) and media expenditure ($25,000).

16. A set of guiding principles has been provided for use of LDI opex funding balances for financial year 2019/2020 due to the financial impact of COVID-19 on the council’s budget. Further details are below under the financial implications section.

17. Given the urgency to support the Waiheke tourism economy, this funding application could be considered vital for the recovery period and deferring payment could impact service delivery later.

18. There is no reference within the campaign brief to greenhouse gas emissions however the use of public transport is mentioned.

19. Consideration could be given to including reference and support for the Electric Island Waiheke project which encourages electric vehicle and e-bike use on Waiheke.

20. The local board is also investing in a number of sustainability projects, which aim to build awareness around individual carbon emissions, and changing behaviour at a local level. These include:
   • Sustainable Schools – Waiheke Marine education
   • Ecological restoration and tree planting
   • Pest management
   • Dune planting and protection
   • Community resilience and emergency preparedness plans
   • Zero waste.

21. It is recommended the board’s initiatives be referenced within the campaign.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

22. ATEED’s Product development manager is a member of the Waiheke Island Tourism Forum and a member of the working party formed to progress this campaign.

23. There would be no significant impact on other CCOs other than a potential increase in public transport patronage and use of footpaths and cycleways.

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

24. The 2017 Waiheke Local Board Plan includes objectives relating to building a sustainable economy and positive visitor experience. These include working with local businesses to promote activities that retain and enhance Waiheke’s natural environment, and strengthening the economy in keeping with the islands character.

25. The board have identified support for Waiheke’s economy, employment, welfare and environment as key priorities following COVID-19.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

26. The Waiheke Tourism Forum includes Māori representatives and one of their future objectives of the forum is a cultural development and future heritage project.

27. Korero with mana whenua and the Piritahi Marae would be recommended during the development of this campaign to ensure alignment with the aspirations of mataawaka and the role of kaitiakitanga.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

28. In line with the council’s guidance for use of LDI opex funding balances for financial year 2019/2020, a set of guiding principles has been provided for decision-making.

29. The key principles to guide this decision-making are:

- Whether services are deemed to be essential or non-essential
- Whether activities or services are still able to be delivered
- Any existing contractual commitments or legislative requirements
- Whether funding is critical for the survival of the receiving organisation
- Whether funding is provided in whole by a third party and/or is a reimbursement for work that has already been carried out.

30. There will be some exceptions where payment of grants and funding for non-essential services must continue. These exceptions include:

- Some services that will be vital during the recovery period and deferring payment could impact service delivery later.
- Welfare services which are critical for vulnerable people.
- Where funding is provided in whole by a third party and/or is a reimbursement for work that has already been carried out.
- Where it has been established that deferring payment would incur more costs and therefore require further funding.

31. Funds of over $20,000 will require review by one of the Finance Commercial Managers.
32. Year to date spend on the Omni-bus Parks Management Plan has resulted in $20,000 available for LDI reallocation. Due to the hold on contractor payment during COVID-19 lockdown, it is anticipated there will be approximately $30,000 available from the Rangihoua Reserve / Onetangi Sports Park management plan for FY2019/2020.

33. There is also $10,000 remaining in the Walking and Cycling Promotion budget, and $5,000 within the Parks Strategic fund which could be considered for reallocation.

34. Given the urgency to support the Waiheke tourism economy, this funding application could be considered vital for the recovery period and deferring payment could impact service delivery later.

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

35. Partner funding is dependent on local board funding. There is a risk this proposal would not go ahead if not supported by the board.

36. It is noted that promotion of tourism for the island may not be supported by all residents.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**
**Next steps**

37. Following the consideration of this report funds will be allocated as resolved.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Waiheke Island Tourism Campaign brief</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**
**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Inglis</td>
<td>Local Board Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorisers</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louise Mason</td>
<td>General Manager - Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janine Geddes</td>
<td>Acting Relationship Manager - Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waiheke Island Campaign Brief
April 2020

A domestic marketing campaign
to kickstart Waiheke’s economy
Waiheke Island Tourism Campaign Brief

PURPOSE

A working group formed by The Waiheke Island Tourism Forum (WITF) is leading a project to develop a campaign to kickstart visitation to Waiheke Island, when the time is right.

Waiheke is one of the world’s most desirable tourist destinations. Waiheke Island Tourism Forum members support sustainable tourism on Waiheke, respecting Waiheke’s natural environment, and aware of the challenges in balancing tourism with the needs of the local community.

WITF members are also an integral part of the Waiheke local community. There are over 100 tourism businesses on Waiheke Island that rely on tourist trade. The tourism sector provides direct employment on the island for a significant number of island residents, feeds important revenue through the rest of Waiheke’s businesses, and is probably the biggest contributor to Waiheke’s economy. Supporting tourism is the biggest key lever for boosting Waiheke’s economy post-lockdown.

By collaborating on a collective campaign Waiheke’s tourism businesses will speak in a cohesive voice. Funding from key stakeholders can be combined to create a louder voice. By working together, all stakeholders will benefit from higher cut-through, higher awareness and higher response.

This campaign must provide an overarching message that embraces Waiheke’s tourism sectors as well as providing tools to enable each business to market itself within the campaign platform.

When the government announces that people are free to travel, Waiheke must be ready to maximize the opportunity, and jolt the island economy back to life.
THE PROCESS

1. Develop brief
2. Consult with key stakeholders
3. Obtain Funding
4. Develop creative concept and media strategies
5. Develop executions
6. Brief members, provide resources
7. Execute, measure and refine

In order to move as quickly as possible, a small working group has developed this brief, in order to present to Stakeholders for support. The working group is comprised of:

Christina Hyde, Waiheke Island Motel and Onetangi Beach Apartments
Christina is Chair of the Waiheke Island Tourism Forum and has a background in corporate marketing, branding and advertising in Australia and New Zealand.

Kelly Addis, Waiheke Island Motel and Onetangi Beach Apartments
Kelly worked as a strategist in advertising for 20 years, and owned a leading advertising agency in Melbourne for 10 years.

Andrea Rongonui, Wharetana Beach Retreat
Andrea has a background in marketing media, is on the Waiheke Tourism Forum Committee, and is a co-owner of Go Media.

Daniela de Bruyn, Waiheke Wine Growers Association
Daniela is on the Waiheke Tourism Forum Committee, has a background in PR and marketing, and has worked extensively in consumer experience and consumer psychology.

Damon Howard-Smith, Found Restaurant, Surfside
Damon is a leading member of the Waiheke Hospitality Association, representing 32 Waiheke restaurants.

John O’Toole, Nudge Partners
John is a seasoned marketing professional, passionate about brand and innovation driven growth. John is consulting with Fullers, driving their digital growth strategy.

Zac Watson, Product Development Manager, ATEED
Zac is ATEED’s representative on the Waiheke Island Tourism Forum Committee, and is ATEED’s main point of contact for Waiheke tourism.

Andrew Glen
Andrew has a senior international marketing background. He designed and launched the hugely successful Oyster Inn brand, sold it and now writes articles for publications in New Zealand and abroad.

To assist in taking the brief forward into development and execution, key stakeholder participation is required to ensure key stakeholder needs are met and synergistic opportunities are maximised. Stuart Odgen, Fullers360 GM for Marketing and Products has agreed to be a member of the working group going forward. ATEED may wish to designate a member of their marketing team. Tourism Forum member Gavin Oliver from Ecozip has also been consulted and invited to form part of the collaborative team for the next stages.
STAKEHOLDERS
- Waiheke Island Tourism Forum: over 100 members including accommodation, transport, activities, events, tours, retail, vineyards, arts, cafés/restaurants. Includes Waiheke Winegrowers Association members and Waiheke Hospitality Association members.
- ATEED and Waiheke Local Board
- Fullers360
- Sealink

OBJECTIVES
1. To capitalize on the border shutdowns and position Waiheke as the number one domestic holiday destination for Aucklanders
2. To create a campaign with longevity, that builds strength over the years
3. To encourage Aucklanders to book a multi-night stay on Waiheke Island
4. To encourage visitors to spend at the Island’s restaurants, vineyards, tours, shops and activities.

To get more people to come, to stay longer, and to spend more.
TARGET AUDIENCES

Target High Value Market Segments

Target mid and upper socio economic groups, who during this time of economic stress are more likely to have money to spend on travel and activities. Females are more often the organisers (make travel plans and bookings) within a group or family dynamic.

Age groups
1. 30 – 60 years.
2. 18 – 30 years
3. Families

Within these geographic areas:
1. Primary – Auckland region
2. Secondary – Waikato, Bay of Plenty, Northland. This group are also likely to stay at least one night in Auckland on the way to or from Waiheke.

INSIGHTS
Timing: Although we may come out of lockdown during winter, there are many attractions and experiences and activities that given the circumstances, will be strong enough to attract people if packaged the right way.

Patriotic: They know New Zealand businesses have been doing it tough, particularly tourism businesses. And they want to support these businesses. They’re loyal and patriotic – they’ve been staying in lockdown to support their country, now it’s time for them to get out, and spend with these businesses to show their support (along the lines of Uncle Sam Needs You). We are asking them to come and indulge in wine, restaurants, walks, spas, romantic weekends etc where they normally need to justify the expenditure and the indulgence to themselves, in this instance they need to justify why they can’t. The circumstances literally give them permission to indulge.

Financial: With people under some financial uncertainty who normally travel overseas or to other parts of NZ at this time of year, Waiheke Island presents a viable more affordable option.

Substitution effect: when people can’t travel overseas, either for economic reasons, personal safety, or due to government travel restrictions, they will look domestically, an observation coined as the Staycation Effect.

Need to get out: They have been locked up in houses and apartments, with their partners, with their kids. They are bored, they have run out of ideas, they’ve been busy trying to keep themselves occupied. They have pent up energy, and want to get out and do something. They pine for a drink with their friends, a walk on the beach, and freedom to pursue their interests. They can’t go overseas.
UNIQUE SELLING PROPOSITION (USP)

- The world’s best island is in your backyard.
  - Just over 30 minutes by ferry from Auckland
  - See (one of) the best islands in the world without leaving New Zealand
    - Fourth best island in the world (as voted by Conde Nast readers)
    - The world’s 4th best island getaway is only 35 minutes away (as voted by US magazine Travel and Leisure)
    - The world’s fifth best region is only 35 minutes away (as voted by Lonely Planet)
  - Auckland’s number one tourist destination
    - Aucklanders’ top preferences for travel locations are beaches, wineries, restaurants, fishing and walking – Waiheke is well positioned to best fulfill these needs.
    - With so many beautiful beaches and world-famous vineyards, Waiheke has been described as “Tuscany by the sea”.
  - Best island in the world (or so we think)
    - Locals are extremely proud of their island.
    - Locals are friendly, warm, caring, eco focused, and welcoming
  - Nestled in the largest marine park in the country – birds, sealife surround us (Hauraki Gulf Marine Park)
  - The best tropical island getaway without leaving NZ
    - Waiheke is a stunning pacific island, with white sandy beaches, safe swimming, and beautiful bushland. It is also one of the few island destinations Kiwis will have access to.
  - The Best Kept Secret
    - Many islanders like to keep the island and some of its highlights to themselves (shhh don’t tell anyone).
  - Value-add packages. Join transport, accommodation, activities and restaurants into value-add packages.
COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

Brand Response campaign where each execution works alone and serves to build the brand message and generate response.

The most desirable outcome is an accommodation booking, as people who stay longer spend more at all the businesses on the island, including activities, restaurants, cafes, shops, vineyards, transport, etc. Other beneficial outcomes include building email subscribers.

The campaign must be scalable; depending on how much funding is received from Waiheke Local Board, ATEED, Fullers and Sealink.

Ideally:

Outdoor: brand messages and awareness in key Auckland areas. Messages set up the brand positioning and the campaign theme.

Radio: call to action advertising. Build on the campaign theme and advertise events/themes and create frequency;

Digital / Social
- Targeted cost effective and measurable
- Facebook (including Facebook Ads), Instagram,
- Member websites, including tourismwaiheke.co.nz, and waiheke.co.nz

Member Marketing
- 100+ Waiheke Island businesses to spread campaign messaging on their social media, and personalize offers.
- Value-add packages across partners.
- Emails to former customers.
- Member websites

Partner Marketing
- Partners (ATEED, Fullers, Sealink) to spread campaign messaging on their social media, and personalize offers.
- Emails to former customers.
- Partner websites, including Fullers.co.nz, the top tourism website in Auckland by traffic and ranking.

PR
The media will be supportive of us in these trying times. Press releases to be organised and sent to the following media:
- NZME (via Chris Rudd, an island resident)
- Mediapowks
- Stuff Ltd

Interviews to be coordinated on/for:
- TV3 AM show/The Project
- TV One Breakfast/Seven Sharp
- NewsTalk Radio
- Herald Business/Travel
Contact Air New Zealand, for inclusion on their website, digital marketing, inflight magazine, and possibly including the video on their domestic flights.
EVENTS and PROMOTIONAL ATTRACTIONS

*A collection of ideas to be considered – further ideas are to be developed.* Social distancing requirements are to be taken into account. Where possible, include incentives to touch at least one experience from each sub-sector e.g. accommodation, tastes, land/sea, art/culture, activities, etc.

We need something big to kick this off when the time is right, much like an office/store opening party. Big, once in a lifetime and relevant to our brand.

Waiheke Grand Opening Party/Weekend (Could be delayed to Spring). A wine and food festival, spread across participating venues. Sell tickets to a once in a lifetime event, lasting 2-3 days. Different levels of tickets give different levels of access. With food and wine packages, a different musician at each venue, featured chefs at restaurants, free transport around the island, etc. *Alive and Thrive Festival - we’re allowed out, let’s celebrate!* Or would this possibly be seen as being too insensitive to the situation?

Keys to the island – on the first weekend six people win a flight trip around the island, lunch at xxx, they get picked up and taken to xx for dinner and they go to xxx for breakfast the next day.

Value add bundles or a passport that encourages spending – the more you spend the more you save (much like The New York Pass)

- Wine and food extravaganza with our best food and wine
- Wine and restaurant tours to establishments where some of New Zealand’s finest musicians are performing all weekend:
  - Hammond Gamble, Midge Marsden, Shona Lang, Harry Lyon, Paul Ubana Jones etc.
  - Top DJ’s for 20-30 demographic

Waiheke On Sale Month. For the month of xxx, Waiheke has 20% off everything*. Includes ferry tickets, food, wine, shopping, activities and accommodation at over 150 participating outlets.

Travel Waiheke for Free: Receive free ferry and Waiheke bus travel when you’ve booked accommodation (Auckland Council/ATEED to offset cost to Fullers)

Waiheke Passport: collect 10 stamps from participating businesses (must spend x to get a stamp) and go in the draw for xxx

Waiheke Food and Wine Indulgence. One price includes wine tasting, and meals over two/three days at participating vineyards and restaurants.

Waiheke Treasure Hunt: take photos of yourself at this list of locations (the sponsors), show the photos at xxx (Waiheke Wine Centre?), receive a free bottle of xxx and go in the draw for $xxxx. Can do different versions to target different groups, and include different sponsors. Tag pictures in social media, with prizes for the best pictures with most interaction/reach. Can also do a kids version for school holidays.

Brass Monkey Mid-Winter Swimming Event, Onorea Beach. Working with local operators to extend activities to vineyards, restaurants, and accommodation.

School Holidays – Bubble Fun! Bring your bubble for lots of fun activities and events on Waiheke these school holidays.
BUDGET
Need media plan to confirm, but anticipate:

Creative development $5k
Design and executions $5k
Video production $10k
Outdoor Media $25k
Radio $5k per event x 5 events = $25k
Digital campaign $25k
PR $10k

TIMING
We must be careful not to go out too early. There is potential for a backlash, if we promote tourism before the government has announced that its safe.

Phase One: Soft launch, when domestic travel is permitted. To drive bookings for hungry Waiheke businesses and capitalise on consumers that have been locked up and are ready to get out now (even though the weather may not be great).
Waiheke branding, winter-friendly events (aware of any restrictions on gatherings), winter member packages, school holiday special events and packages.

Phase Two: Major launch: Spring
Waiheke branding, promote outdoor activities and attractions, weather-dependent events, member packages, drive bookings for Spring and Summer.

Ideally we would aim to have something in market in time for Queen’s birthday weekend, and the ‘release‘ of lockdown. It is acknowledged that funding approval and artwork approval processes by stakeholders may delay this schedule.

w/c April 27th  Confirm funding support and budget
w/c May 4th   Confirm creative concept
w/c May 11th  Design and finished art,
w/c May 18th  Initial executions for approval
w/c May 27th  First week in market (government travel restrictions permitting)

October        Phase Two
Community-Led Housing Initiatives

File No.: CP2020/06281

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve a grant of $10,000 from the Waiheke Local Board’s 2019/2020 Community-Led Housing Initiatives work programme.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
1. Staff recommend that the local board allocate the available budget in the 2019/2020 Community-Led Housing Initiatives work programme to Waiheke Health Trust (WHT) for the Housing Quality Project.
2. This will enable WHT to grow capacity for the project, support greater collaboration between local organisations, and support local employment. The project will have positive wellbeing impacts for home occupiers and potentially decrease risks of respiratory illness associated with inadequate housing.
3. The board has $10,000 available within its 2019/2020 work programme for community-led housing initiatives.
4. Staff scoped community-led initiatives that align with the Waiheke Local Board Housing Strategy 2019 – 2021, including WHT’s Housing Quality Project and Waiheke Hope Centre’s (the Hope Centre) Emergency and Transitional Housing.
5. The WHT project provides interventions for people whose health and wellbeing are negatively impacted by living in cold, damp, mouldy homes. WHT employs a part time Healthy Homes Coordinator to assess homes and assist home occupiers with repairs and improvements. WHT is seeking $10,000 for coordinator wages and healthy homes assessor certification.
6. Staff also scoped The Hope Centre for funding, which provides emergency and transitional accommodation at the Living Waters Church property in Surfdale. The Hope Centre is seeking $10,000 towards the cost of replacing its onsite wastewater system, which will enable it to expand its community services and provide additional transitional housing for seniors.
7. The Hope Centre’s concept plan requires considerable additional fundraising before it can proceed and is therefore a lower priority for board investment at this time.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) approve a grant of $10,000 from the 2019/2020 Community-Led Housing Initiatives work programme to the Waiheke Health Trust to support the Housing Quality Project.
Horopaki
Context
8. In March 2019, the local board developed and adopted the Waiheke Local Board Housing Strategy 2019 – 2021 (Attachment A) to provide direction and identify key initiatives to ensure Waiheke residents have access to safe and healthy housing.
9. The strategy’s vision is that Waiheke is economically and environmentally sustainable and all residents have access to safe and healthy housing options. One of the key strategies is to support appropriate community-led initiatives focusing on housing issues.
10. The local board allocated $10,000 within its 2019/2020 work programme to fund community-led housing initiatives and respond to the Housing Strategy. The purpose of this fund is to support strengthened community-led housing initiatives.
11. Staff scoped community-led initiatives that align with the Housing Strategy and workshoped the options with the local board on 25 March 2020. This report outlines two options for consideration.

Waiheke Housing Trust Housing Quality Project
12. WHT provides a wide range of community healthcare services. It developed the Housing Quality Project in 2017 to provide interventions for people living in cold, damp, mouldy homes.
13. WHT employs a part time Coordinator to assess homes and assist home occupiers with repairs. The project targets vulnerable people with ongoing health issues, including seniors and people with disabilities.
14. There is strong evidence of a link between housing, health and wellbeing. Numerous studies have shown an increase in respiratory conditions for people living in poor housing conditions. Otago University public health professor Philippa Howden-Chapman has recently stated that people living in cold, damp and overcrowded homes are also more vulnerable to COVID-19.
15. In 2016/2017 the board provided $10,000 to WHT for a pilot study to assess health hazards in the homes of home-support clients. In this first phase of the project, 12 homes were assessed, and occupiers received support with repairs and education.
16. The Housing Quality Pilot Project found that dampness was a major problem for the homes assessed on Waiheke, including roof leaks, flooding, blocked gutters, and lack of ventilation. Most of the issues arose from lack of regular maintenance by owner-occupiers or landlords. In each home, damp and inadequate housing was found to be contributing to health issues for the occupants.
17. The home occupiers who received support reported that their homes are now warmer and drier, with higher satisfaction in their living conditions and positive impact on health and quality of life.
18. WHT networks have identified at least another 30 homes that could benefit from immediate assessment.
19. In 2017/2018, the board provided a further $4,500 for a strategic planning process to provide future direction for the project.
20. The Housing Quality Project now aims to build capacity to ensure a sustainable and funded service. It will continue to assess homes and provide reports to owners or landlords and carry out essential repairs on homes using local tradespeople. It also aims to provide education and advice on healthy homes and practical ways everyone in the community can improve their living environments.
21. Since 2018, the Housing Quality Project has developed collaborative relationships with the charity Habitat for Humanity and Auckland District Health Board’s Noho Āhuru: Healthy...
Homes Initiative, which has enabled Waiheke residents to access services and funding otherwise unavailable on the island.

22. WHT is seeking $10,000 for coordinator wages and a Healthy Home Assessor certification in order to continue the project for another six months and further develop community partnerships to secure its ongoing sustainability.

**Emergency and Transitional Housing**

23. Waiheke Hope Centre Trust provides emergency and transitional housing at the Living Waters Church property in Surfdale. Short-term emergency accommodation is available from 24 hours to 28 days, while longer-term transitional housing is available for seniors and people with disabilities.

24. In 2018/2019 the local board provided a grant of $10,000 to the Hope Centre to apply for the Ministry of Social Development’s Social Services Accreditation (SSA) to enable the Hope Centre to tender for government contracts and therefore potentially obtain additional funds to improve facilities and increase staffing.

25. The Hope Centre completed a review of its policies and procedures and applied for SSA accreditation. The Hope Centre is now able to tender for contracts as they arise, although it has not yet been successful in gaining additional funding.

26. The Hope Centre is now seeking to expand its transitional housing provision and community services. It has developed a concept plan for the property. The first step is to replace its onsite wastewater system, which will enable five new accommodation units and additional bathroom facilities. The new units will have ensuites to better cater for seniors.

27. The new septic system will cost $110,000 including installation and consent fees. A planner and architect have both donated their services to assist the project. The Hope Centre has already fundraised half the project cost and is seeking a $10,000 contribution from the local board to cover the cost of consent fees.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

**Housing Quality Project**

28. The Housing Quality Project aligns with the local board’s objective to ‘foster sustainable living and healthy homes’ and with its Housing Strategy goal to ‘support housing quality improvement programmes that lead to better health outcomes’.

29. The aim of the Housing Quality Project is for everyone on Waiheke to live in warm and dry homes, by providing education on healthy homes and assisting with home repairs using local tradespeople.

30. Funding for coordinator costs will enable WHT to build capacity and shift the service to a more sustainable collaborative model to ensure the project is able to continue to assist vulnerable Waiheke home occupiers to have warmer, drier homes.

31. WHT intends to increase collaboration with other local community organisations on the island and similar services on the mainland. The Housing Quality Project has already achieved positive outcomes for Waiheke households by partnering with Habitat for Humanity. For example, a $20,000 grant was recently provided for a local Māori family to improve their damp bathroom and make it accessible for family members with disabilities.

32. In the Waiheke rental market there are significant numbers of poor-quality rental properties in part due to the legacy of small baches, built with cheap materials and often not insulated or properly heated. Many are now used for permanent accommodation but are not fit for purpose.
33. The elderly are some of the most vulnerable home occupiers on Waiheke. Often older people who own their own homes may struggle to carry out repairs and maintenance and then suffer the health consequences of living in cold, damp conditions.

34. Providing a service on Waiheke that assists home occupiers with repairs, especially the elderly, will mean that more people can choose to age in place in their homes on the island and have increased wellbeing outcomes.

35. The Housing Quality Project also addresses some of the underlying conditions which can make people vulnerable to COVID-19. WHT is an essential service under the COVID-19 alert levels, and the Housing Quality Project is able to continue at Alert Level 2 or 3, therefore the project can be progressed immediately.

36. The project also provides local employment to both the Coordinator and the local tradespeople involved in repairs.

37. Staff recommend that the local board allocate the available $10,000 budget to WHT for the Housing Quality coordinator role as the proposal will grow capacity for the project, support greater collaboration between local organisations, and support local employment. The project will have positive health impacts for home occupiers and potentially decrease risks of respiratory illness associated with inadequate housing.

**Emergency Housing Initiatives**

38. The Hope Centre’s proposed expansion aligns with the Housing Strategy goal to ‘support the development of emergency housing initiatives on Waiheke’.

39. The Hope Centre’s accommodation is usually full, with up to 14 residents in emergency and transitional housing units. The Hope Centre also provides additional support such as welfare checks and weekly hot meals through the soup kitchen. There is no other such housing available on Waiheke.

40. People seeking emergency or transitional housing include seniors, people on low incomes, women and children impacted by family violence, seasonal workers and youth. Clients are referred to the Hope Centre by police, health providers or other community organisations, in addition to self-referrals. Many of the clients also have additional health concerns.

41. A new septic tank will enable the Hope Centre to move forward with its plan to build additional units to meet community demand for transitional housing, especially for elderly people.

42. The Hope Centre aims to install the new wastewater system within the next year and has $50,000 already set aside for the project.

43. The Hope Centre is not able to proceed with installation of the wastewater system until it can raise the remaining budget required for the $110,000 project. It is anticipated the group will be able to achieve this goal through community donations and it is unclear if additional board funding will be required, therefore it is not recommended that the board fund the project at this stage.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

44. Building capacity for housing support on Waiheke reduces the need for travel to and from the mainland for these services, which has positive climate impact through reduced transport-related carbon emissions.

45. The Housing Quality Project improves housing conditions which also has the potential to decrease carbon emissions through reduced power consumption for heating.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

46. Environmental Services’ Low Carbon Living Team provides ongoing advice and support to the Housing Quality Project to assist with healthy homes education in the community.

47. Budget in the Waiheke Local Board’s 2019/2020 Community-Led Housing Initiatives work programme is administered by staff from council’s Community Empowerment Unit.

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

48. The Waiheke Local Board Plan 2017 Outcome 4: Thriving, Strong and Engaged Communities, includes the objective to ‘foster sustainable living and healthy homes’ and the initiative to ‘develop a Housing Strategy and implement key actions which meet identified community needs.’

49. The Housing Quality Project helps to meet this objective by increasing the number of healthy homes in the local board area.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

50. Piritahi Marae has indicated the cost and availability of quality housing are concerns for Māori families and seniors on Waiheke.

51. The Waiheke Local Board Housing Strategy contains the goal to ‘support appropriate community-led initiatives focusing on housing issues and to be responsive to the needs and aspirations of mana whenua and matawaka Māori’.

52. The Housing Quality Project helps Māori households on Waiheke to access home improvement grants through partnership with Habitat with Humanity. WHT identifies eligible Waiheke families and assist them to complete the application process, in addition to providing ongoing local support as families go through the repair process.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

53. The 2019/2020 Community-Led Housing Initiatives work programme has an allocated budget of $10,000 to improve the availability and affordability of safe, healthy housing on the island.

54. The Housing Quality Project budget includes $8,000 for Coordinator wages and $2,000 for Healthy Homes Assessor Certification.

Ngā raru túpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

55. The Housing Quality Project mitigates health risks for people living in damp and inadequate housing on Waiheke.

56. WHT requires ongoing sources of revenue to ensure sustainability of the project. Assuring ongoing funding through partnership and collaboration with other aligned organizations will be one of the main goals for the next phase of the project. There is a risk the project will be discontinued in future if sustainable funding is unable to be achieved.

57. If the board were to fund The Hope Centre, there is a risk it will be unable to fundraise the additional $50,000 budget required for the septic tank installation.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

58. Staff will work with the Waiheke Health Trust to develop a funding agreement.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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Waiheke Local Board Housing Strategy 2019 - 2021

**Vision**

Waiheke Island will develop into the future as a thriving, inclusive community that is economically and environmentally sustainable. All Waiheke residents can access safe and healthy housing that meets their needs and gives them security of tenure.

**Strategies**

1. **Provide strategic input into the Waiheke Area Plan, Hauraki Gulf District Plan review, Auckland Unitary Plan, Local Parks Management Plan and any other appropriate planning documents with a view to addressing housing issues on Waiheke.**
2. **Positively influence housing accessibility on Waiheke by advocating for new policy streams and housing initiatives to local and central government and through involvement with LGNZ.**
3. **Support appropriate community-led initiatives focusing on housing issues and be responsive to the needs and aspirations of mana whenua and mataawaka Māori.**
4. **Promote relevant council housing-related programmes.**

**Initiatives**

- Ensure the Waiheke Area Plan includes potential future scenarios for the island’s population, particularly those that address the needs of marginalised groups, seniors and key workers.
- Analyse affordable housing and social housing models, infrastructural support and options appropriate for Waiheke to be considered for local board action.
- Investigate New Zealand planning provisions and worldwide exemplars that address future housing needs in tourist communities and understand how they have been resolved.
- Work with the governing body to advocate for better protection for tenants and landlords including longer periods of tenure.
- Request a new council property policy defining social housing as a 'service use'.
- Facilitate local initiatives to develop an aged care facility for rest home level care, dementia care and respite care options on Waiheke.
- Progress the Waiheke Local Board 2018 Social Housing Initiative at 6 Belgium St / 7 Waiake Rd or an alternative site, including on council land.
- Support the development of emergency housing initiatives on Waiheke.
- Support council’s Retrofit Your Home Scheme and other existing initiatives to support improved housing quality.
- Promote council’s EcoDesign Advice Service.
- Explore plans change which support development of non-permanent small-scale houses.
- Advocate for a change in emphasis in appropriate planning documents from provision of visitor units to provision of permanent minor dwellings.
- Work with LGNZ Housing Committee on developing Housing Policy for councils in line with the four wellbeing.
- Request that council revisits the former Housing Bonds Scheme and advocates for council to underwrite and support Community Housing Initiatives.
- Support local housing organisations to develop options for affordable housing for seniors.
- Support housing quality improvement programmes that lead to better health outcomes.
Waiheke Walking Festival 2020

File No.: CP2020/06255

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To approve the allocation of $10,000 Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) opex to support the Waiheke Walking Festival Trust in the delivery of the Waiheke Walking Festival 2020.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The Waiheke Walking Festival was established by Auckland Council in 2010. The Hauraki Gulf Conservation Trust delivered the festival between 2012 and 2016.

3. The Waiheke Walking Festival Trust (the Trust) has governed and managed the festival since 2017.

4. In past years this popular event has offered guided walks across the island during a 10-day period in November each year. The festival promotes sustainable tourism and highlights the conservation work that has taken place on Waiheke. The Trust has applied to the local board for $10,000 to support the 2020 event which is scheduled for November 2020.

5. With consideration to COVID-19 Level 2 alert status, the Trust is proposing that the November 2020 event take place over a 3-week period, providing a diverse range of walks for smaller groups. The extended festival period will enhance the experience for the visitors, align with environmental conservation protocols and bring a steady stream of visitors to local businesses throughout the month of November.

6. The relevant COVID-19 health and safety rules will be applied to the November 2020 event.

7. The Waiheke Local Board has an annual work programme item that provides $20,000 of the LDI opex budget for walking and cycling promotion (WHK/2019/53). It is recommended that $10,000 LDI opex is granted from the 2019/2020 budget to contribute to the running of the November 2020 Waiheke Walking Festival.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) approve allocation of $10,000 to the Waiheke Walking Festival Trust from the 2019/2020 LDI opex budget for walking and cycling promotion for the Waiheke Walking Festival scheduled for November 2020.

Horopaki
Context

8. The Waiheke Walking Festival was established by Auckland Council in 2010 and the management of this event was passed to the Waiheke Walking Festival Trust in 2017.

9. The festival promotes sustainable tourism by showcasing Waiheke Island as a premier walking destination. The festival demonstrates to visitors and the community the conservation work that is taking place on the island and strengthens the active support we have amongst our community to protect and enhance our natural environment.
10. In previous years, the walking festival has offered guided walks during a 10-day period, with walks that encourage families and individuals of all ages and abilities to enjoy the public walkways and private land that are available during the festival each year.

11. Many of the walks involve the Te Ara Hura walkway, Waiheke’s 100km network of trails, beaches and roadways that loop the island. Council’s parks and community facilities staff support the event and work closely with the Trust to designate walking routes.

12. At the business meeting on 26 February 2020, the Trust updated the local board on the walking festival held in November 2019 (WHK/2020/23) and outlined the upcoming 2020 Waiheke Walking Festival, providing financial details in Attachment A.

13. The estimated cost to deliver the 2020 festival is $71,000.

14. The Trust is seeking an allocation of $10,000 from the local board to support the 2020 walking festival. Local board funding will enable this scheduled event to take place.

15. If the Trust is unable to secure local board funding for the festival there are potential reputational risks and missed opportunities to showcase the island’s offerings and promote sustainable eco-tourism.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

16. The Waiheke 2019/2020 work programme includes $20,000 of LDI opex for walking and cycling promotion.

17. The Trust has applied to the local board for $10,000 to support the 2020 Waiheke Walking Festival event scheduled for November 2020.

18. The walking festival held in 2019 offered 50 walks over 10 days and had approximately 2000 registrations, with 48 per cent new participants and 51 per cent local participants. The local board granted $10,000 towards the 2019 event.

19. There was an estimated $25,000 contribution toward local businesses, not including the visitor spend on accommodation, transport and dining.

20. Attendance for the 2020 walking festival is expected to be at a similar level to the 2019 event. The $10,000 local board contribution will equate to $5.00 per person.

21. The Trust has progressed several initiatives to enhance the sustainability of the festival including the retention and newly secured major sponsors, as well as the strengthening of the Friends of Festival membership, which provides an additional funding stream.

22. The Trust has also progressed development of ‘A Walking On Waiheke’ website to promote self-guided walking year-round providing maps, route descriptions and photos.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

23. The walking festival aligns with local board goals to grow and strengthen sustainable tourism, promoting the benefits of walking and educating locals and visitors on significant conservation issues such as Kauri Dieback.

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

24. All required approvals will be obtained during the events permitting process. The proposed decision has no identified impacts on other parts of the council group.

25. Best practice will be applied to hygiene, social distancing and track tracing should COVID-19 Level 2 or Level 1 rules apply to the event in November 2020. The Trust has proposed an extended festival period to allow for walks accommodating smaller groups. If Level 3 or
Level 4 rules apply in November 2020 the event is likely to be cancelled and the board’s contribution carried over to the 2021 Walking Festival programme.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
26. The Waiheke Local Board has supported the Waiheke Walking Festival since its establishment in 2010.
27. The event aligns with the Waiheke Pathways Plan approved in April 2019 and the aspirations of the board to develop walking, cycling and riding networks across the island which promote our natural environment, and encourages social cohesion.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
28. The Trust continues to work with Ngāti Pāoa and other local iwi to enrich the quality of the festival with a stronger focus on the cultural history and stories of Waiheke and surrounds.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
29. There is $20,000 of LDI opex funding in the 2019/2020 Waiheke Local Board work programme for walking and cycling promotion.
30. If the local board approves the allocation of $10,000 to the Trust for the November 2020 walking festival, there will remain $10,000 of LDI opex for allocation to walking and cycling projects for this financial year.
31. If $10,000 of funding is approved for the November 2020 event, but the remaining $10,000 of LDI opex budget is not allocated during this financial year, the remaining budget will not be carried forward to the 2020/2021 financial year.
32. If the local board decide not to allocate funding to this event, other possible alternatives for this budget might include brochure or map reprints, marketing or supporting other events promoting walking and cycling.
33. If the board decide not to support the event there is a risk that part, or all, of the $20,000 LDI opex budget may not be allocated within this financial year.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
34. Without the support of the board there may be a risk that the event has insufficient funds to continue.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
35. Following the board’s decision, the Trust will be notified, and any approved funding will be processed.
36. Staff will draft and progress the required funding agreement. The local board and the Trust will be kept informed.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
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Thank You So Much

The **Waiheke Walking Festival** wouldn’t exist without the ongoing support and funding provided by the Waiheke Local Board. **Thank you.**
The following slides summarise the 2019 Festival and outline our funding needs and activities. We see a partnership with the Waiheke Local Board as essential to the continued success of this much loved community event.
Waiheke Walking Festival

The **Waiheke Walking Trust** was borne to provide enhanced sustainability of the Festival:
Continued focus on revenue streams.

- In 2019 we continued with securing sponsors – Ray White, Treescape & Fullers, plus added Make Tracks as a new major sponsor.
- We have secured ongoing support from our presenting partner Ray White for another three years.
- Our Waiheke Walking Trust Patron base continues to be strong

**Succession planning.**

- Anna Reinstein contributed to the structure and forward planning with her global event experience and has left the Festival Management team with a template for ongoing success
- Vicki Angland, local business owner of iWalkWaiheke has been appointed as Festival Manager

**Enhanced expertise across the suite of skills required to deliver a professional event.**

- New Trustee Judy Cowie brings a wealth of IT experience
- Mandy Hudson with continue to strengthen our health & safety
- Social media support and an administrative coordinator are being appointed to support the Event Manager
- Committees for a targeted programme have been developed
2019 Event – Vital Statistics

Over 2000 registrations

48% were brand new to the Festival.

51% locals – our locals continue to support us and love the Festival

38% wider Auckland (up 5%)
6% other NZ regions (up 2%)
5% international (up 2%)

• 10% of visitors stayed in paid accommodation, most for 2 nights, some 10!

• This aligns perfectly with our goal to grow sustainable tourism on Waiheke.

• The Festival continues to be a much loved event enjoyed by a diverse group.

• Overwhelmingly positive feedback from walkers, volunteers, guides, landowners, partner businesses and sponsors.

• Encouraging locals to use our public walkways and be physically active.
2019 Event – Key Achievements

- $25,000+ spent at local businesses as part of Festival walks (lunches, transport etc) – this does **not** include visitor spend on accommodation, transport, ferry travel, restaurants etc during their stay.

- Relationship with Ngati Paoa strengthened further.

- Wonderful opening event at Piritahi Marae, attended by many first-time guests to the marae.

- The opening event provided a fund-raising opportunity for Te Huruhi primary school, and also a contribution toward Waiheke High School’s kapa haka group.

- Kauri Dieback protocols strengthened (see following slide)

- We replaced missing Te Ara Hura red badges from walkway sign posts during the walking festival to ensure the walkway remains easy to follow for visitors and locals throughout the year.

- Immediate re-signing of several key sponsors

- Repeating popular walks allowed more people to enjoy the walks over private land

- Incredible feedback from walkers, volunteers, guides, landowners,
Kauri Dieback – we are protecting our Island

- We are absolutely committed to KDD prevention and containment.
- We carried out even more robust KDD training with our 2019 volunteer group.
- Track closures and protocol changes were a challenge for 2019 Festival planning.
- For the 2020 Festival we will continue to work very closely with Auckland Council’s biosecurity team and other key stakeholders such as Forest and Bird, to further strengthen our already rigorous protocols and ensure we follow best practice guidelines.
- We are fully supportive of, and pride ourselves on being local champions for, KDD prevention protocols & educating our walkers about the devastating impact the disease is having on our precious Kauri.
2020 Waiheke Walking Festival

14th – 22nd NOVEMBER

• 9 days
• 50+ walks
• Continued volunteer training programme
• New walks, Te Ara Hura nine day walk, art walks, dog walks, walk and accommodation packages, bringing back the popular walks
• Same feel-good event and, as always, a wee bit better than the last
## What will it cost to deliver the 2020 event?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total costs</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF Manager</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF Social media coordinator and admin</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website (hosting, maintenance, content renewal)</td>
<td>$6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme design and brochure print</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer training and support</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment (radio hire, first aid kits etc)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public liability insurance</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and promotion</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits and sundry costs</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festival Finale thank you event</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are we doing to secure the necessary funds?

- Ray White Waiheke as Presenting Partner secured for a further three years: 2020-2022.
- We will continue to strengthen our Festival Friends programme - $150 membership fee allows early access to booking system and additional walk bookings.
- A stronger emphasis on the use of our website and technology to elicit more donations
- We are looking at keeping a proportion of walks free, and introducing some ‘premium’ walks which would have a cost associated with booking
- Funding applications to be submitted to Lotteries, Foundation North and other appropriate funding bodies. We are confident of securing some funds from these sources.
- We are working hard to secure larger cash contributions from our major sponsors alongside their in-kind support.
- We absolutely require ongoing funding support from the Waiheke Local Board.
- Our projected deficit for 2020 is $21,000.
What else are we doing to promote Walking on Waiheke?

The Waiheke Walking Trust is committed to promoting sustainable tourism by promoting walking on Waiheke year round. In 2020 we have planned;

**A Walking on Waiheke Website** that promotes self-guided walking on Waiheke. We are busy mapping walks on the island, creating walk notes including way points, descriptions, gradients, photos and videos, as well as getting there and back info. It will have a search function so walks can be filtered by location, duration, grade, terrain etc.

- This will also be shared with the Walking Access Commission so they can put content on their national site too
- We are committed to working alongside and sharing information with Auckland Council

- We have paid for **annual brochure space at the Matiatia visitor information kiosk**. We will use this space for Walking Festival brochures in Sept/Oct/Nov, but outside this time we are filling these spaces with Te Ara Hura maps.

- **Off-season monthly walks** open to our volunteers and their friends and family. These events are an opportunity to connect with each other and strengthen our volunteer network and programme.
We are committed to:

• Being an inclusive event, encouraging participation across age groups and all demographics

• Promoting healthy and active lifestyles, and we remain smokefree

• Including walks which help protect and educate about the environment, heritage, culture and arts

• Continuing to collaborate with Ngati Paoa, and community organisations; to support local business, to promote Waiheke, and to promote zero waste

• Remaining accessible to the community, our visitors and our children by keeping the majority of the walks FREE

• Providing employment opportunities on the island (2019 Festival Manager, Volunteer Coordinator & Social Media coordinator. 2020 Festival Manager & Social Media coordinator)

• Training & supporting volunteers.
Waiheke Walking Trust & Waiheke Local Board Partnership

- We continue in 2020 to build upon the hard work of 2019. We have exciting plans to promote walking on Waiheke and are fully committed to delivering the best ever Waiheke Walking Festival in 2020 with the support of the Waiheke Local Board, other funders, our sponsors, our Festival Friends and Waiheke Walking Trust Patrons, Ngati Paoa and our Festival partners.

- The walking festival is a fantastic community event that continues to be much loved and supported. We see so many opportunities to strengthen and grow this Festival - and walking opportunities on Waiheke - even further.

- We look forward to having the Waiheke Local Board on this journey with us.

Thank you
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To provide the Waiheke Local Board with information on applications in Waiheke Local Grants and Multiboard Grants Round Two 2019/2020; to enable a decision to fund, part fund or decline each application.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. This report presents applications received in Waiheke Local Grants Round Two 2019/2020 (refer Attachment B), and Multiboard Grants Round Two 2019/2020 (Attachment C).


4. The Waiheke Local Board has set a total community grants budget of $50,000 for the 2019/2020 financial year. A total of $28,361 has been allocated to Local Grants and Quick Response Round One 2019/2020. This leaves a total of $21,639 to be allocated to one local grant and one quick response round.

5. The Waiheke Local Board has set a total environmental budget of $33,000 for the 2019/2020 financial year. A total of $21,318 has been allocated to Waiheke Environmental Grant 2019/2020 and a total of $3,300 has been allocated towards the overspent contractor costs for the Waiheke Lightscape Management Plan (WHK/2019/189). This leaves a total of $7,382 to be allocated in the 2019/2020 financial year.

6. Thirteen applications were received for Local Grants Round Two 2019/2020, including one multi-board application, requesting a total of $44,689.45.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application received in Waiheke Local Grants Round Two, listed in Table One:

Table One: Waiheke Local Grants Round Two 2019/2020 grant applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Requesting funding for</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LG2018-206</td>
<td>Pottery Studio under the umbrella of The Catherine Mitchell Art Centre</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of a small kiln oven for the pottery studio at the Catherine Mitchell Arts Centre.</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>LG2018-208</td>
<td>Te Huringa o Te Tai - The Turning Tide Charitable Theatre Trust</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards venue hire costs of the Artworks Theatre from October to November 2020 for the &quot;Rangitoto&quot; theatre production.</td>
<td>$2,010.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2018-210</td>
<td>Fhiona Wainwright</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards the Waiheke Youth Community Choir costs including venue hire, teacher costs and food.</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2018-217</td>
<td>Otherworld Costume Hire under the umbrella of The Artworks Theatre Incorporated</td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Towards costs for a costume creation for &quot;The Crucible&quot; theatre play including project management fees, travel, administration, materials, theatre hire, maintenance and a printer purchase.</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2018-204</td>
<td>Onetangi Residents Association Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the purchase and installation of two heat pumps at the Onetangi Community Hall.</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2018-207</td>
<td>Waiheke Playgroup Incorporated</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the Old Blackpool School Hall hire costs from June 2020 to June 2021.</td>
<td>$3,864.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG2018-216</td>
<td>Waiheke Health Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards costs for the “Quality Homes” programme on Waiheke</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application ID</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Main focus</td>
<td>Requesting funding for</td>
<td>Amount requested</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2018-221</td>
<td>The Raukatauri Music Therapy Trust</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Towards the costs of music therapy sessions at Waiheke Schools.</td>
<td>$3,880.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2018-203</td>
<td>Omiha Welfare and Recreation Society Incorporated</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Towards Rocky Bay Ratbusters annual project costs including bait, stations and data collection elements.</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2018-202</td>
<td>Waiheke Youth Centre Trust</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards hireage costs of the Waiheke Recreation Centre for the multisport programme.</td>
<td>$3,192.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2018-209</td>
<td>Tukaha Waiheke</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of new mats for the Tukaha Brasilian Jiujitsu Club.</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG2018-222</td>
<td>Waiheke Community Pool Incorporated</td>
<td>Sport and recreation</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of swim equipment and a lifeguard chair.</td>
<td>$5,462.80</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$43,908.80</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) agree to fund, part-fund or decline each application received in Waiheke Multiboard Local Grants Round Two, listed in Table Two.

*Table Two: Waiheke Multiboard Local Grants Round Two 2019/2020 grant applications*
Horopaki Context

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

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

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


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

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

12. The aim of the local board grant programme is to deliver projects and activities which align with the outcomes identified in the local board plan. All applications have been assessed utilising the Community Grants Policy and the local board grant programme criteria. The eligibility of each application is identified in the report recommendations.

13. Due to the current COVID-19 crisis, staff have also assessed each application according to which alert level the proposed activity is able to proceed. For example, under alert level two, only gatherings of up to 100 people can take place. Events and activities have been assessed according to this criteria.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 16</th>
<th>Throughout Auckland.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$780.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Climate impact statement

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

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

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

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

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

Local impacts and local board views

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

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

19. A summary of each application received through Waiheke Local Grants Round Two 2019/2020 (Attachment B), and Multiboard Grants Round Two 2019/2020 (Attachment C) is provided.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

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

21. Five applicants applying to Waiheke Local Grants Round Two indicated that their project targets Māori or Māori outcomes.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

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

23. The Waiheke Local Board has set a total community grants budget of $50,000 for the 2019/2020 financial year.

24. A total of $28,361 has been allocated to Local Grants and Quick Response Round One 2019/2020. This leaves a total of $21,639 to be allocated to one local grant and one quick response round.
25. The Waiheke Local Board has set a total environmental budget of $33,000 for the 2019/2020 financial year. A total of $21,318 has been allocated to Waiheke Environmental Grant 2019/2020 and a total of $3,300 has been allocated towards the overspent contractor costs for the Waiheke Lightscape Management Plan (WHK/2019/189). This leaves a total of $7,382 to be allocated in the 2019/2020 financial year.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

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

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

27. Following the Waiheke Local Board allocation of funding for the Local Grants Round Two and Multiple Grants Round Two, Commercial and Finance staff will notify the applicants of the local board’s decision.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Waiheke Local Board Grants Programme 2019/2020</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Waiheke Local Grant Round Two -2019/2020 grant applications (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Waiheke Multi-board Round Two 2019/2020 grant applications (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Agus Castro Pons - Grants Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Marion Davies - Grants and Incentives Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janine Geddes - Acting Relationship Manager - Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waiheke Local Board – Local Grants Programme 2019/2020

Our Local Grants Programme aims to provide contestable and discretionary community grants to local communities.

Outcomes sought from the local grants programme

The Waiheke Local Board recognises the vital role that community groups and organisations play in developing diverse, strong, inclusive, connected and sustainable communities.

Our grants programme will be targeted towards supporting the priorities in our Local Board Plan – such as environmental, cultural, arts, community development, recreational and heritage initiatives, and supporting our youth.

We aim to assist groups to provide activities, projects, programmes, initiatives, and events that make a positive contribution within our local board area.

Our priorities for grants

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

- young people – supporting youth-centred initiatives that build engagement, resiliency and transitions to adulthood
- community elders – meeting the needs of the ageing population
- the environment – restoring and protecting our natural environment
- culture and arts – creating a sense of identity and cohesion that reflects the island’s identity
- social cohesion – ensuring a resilient and connected community
- recreation and sport – helping our communities lead active and healthy lifestyles
- heritage – protection and conservation.

Higher Priorities for grants

- collaboration with other community organisations
- gaining other sources of funding for a project or event, from businesses or community
- local procurement

Lower Priorities for Local and Quick Response Grants

We will also consider applications for other services, projects, events and activities. However, these may be considered a lower priority.

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

- commercial entities and promotion of commercial entities
- ticketed events
- activities that primarily benefit communities outside the Waiheke Local Board area
- activities that primarily benefit a third party (e.g. activity to gain money for an organisation)
Item 16

- grants to support that purchase of or maintenance associated with motor vehicles
- wages or operational costs
- individuals with projects on private land
- individuals applying without nominating an umbrella organisation

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

- Exclusion One: alcohol
- Exclusion Two: applications for Liquor licenses

Criteria for Local and Quick Response Grants

Grants applications need to meet the following criteria:

- the project is working towards zero waste
- has a level of interaction with local business
- includes support for local procurement
- promotes Waiheke as a destination
- brings together community groups
- collaborating with other events/working in conjunction with other groups
- supports community-led activities using local facilities
- captures a wide demographic and encourages intergenerational diversity
- accessible to the community and/or schools (e.g. early bird specials)
- delivery of a smoke-free programme
- encourages active transport
- collaborates with mana whenua and mataawaka

Waiheke Environmental Grants:

The local board aims to support and grow community and landowner conservation efforts and environmental initiatives within the Waiheke Local Board area.

Grant outcomes:

Outcome 1. Islands, coastlines, forests, wetlands and marine areas are flourishing and protected.

Outcome 2. Our community is engaged with their natural environment and is actively involved in the care, protection and restoration of their environment.

Outcome 3. Community projects follow good practice and achieve long term benefits.

Outcome 4. Contributes towards resolving global environmental issues.

Who can apply?

Grants are available to all community groups, environmental groups and landowners operating within the Waiheke Local Board area.

Applications are accepted for work on private land or public land.
In addition to the higher priorities for grants, the environmental grant round will prioritise material costs associated with environmental projects (e.g. plants, fencing material, and equipment) and for projects which enhance sites with high biodiversity values.

Investment approach
The Waiheke Local Board has allocated budgets to support the local grants programme as follows:

- **Quick Response Grants:**
  - minimum amount per grant: $500
  - maximum amount per grant: $2000

- **Local Grants:**
  - minimum amount per grant: $2,000
  - maximum, generally up to $4,000

- **Environmental Grant:**
  - minimum amount per grant: $2,000
  - maximum amount generally up to $10,000 per grant
  - includes a requirement for applicant contribution (financial, in-kind or voluntary labour) towards project costs

Accountability measures
The Waiheke Local Board requires that all successful applicants provide:

- Accountability measure one: Accountability forms must be completed and submitted by the due date, proving that grants have been used for the right purpose.
- Accountability measure two: Any grant money that is unspent and not used for the project must be returned to Council.
- Accountability measure three: Recognition of the Waiheke Local Board’s support of your initiative.
- Accountability measure four: An invitation to the funded project, programme, activity or event should be extended to the members of the board, where appropriate.

Application dates
Grant rounds for 2019/2020 will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>7 October 2019</td>
<td>1 November 2019</td>
<td>12 December 2019</td>
<td>16 December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>20 April 2020</td>
<td>15 May 2020</td>
<td>25 June 2020</td>
<td>1 July 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Local grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>24 June 2019</td>
<td>2 August 2019</td>
<td>26 September 2019</td>
<td>1 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>10 February 2020</td>
<td>20 March 2020</td>
<td>28 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Multi-board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>3 June 2019</td>
<td>19 July 2019</td>
<td>26 September 2019</td>
<td>1 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>10 February 2020</td>
<td>27 March 2020</td>
<td>28 May 2020</td>
<td>1 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Waiheke environmental grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>24 June 2019</td>
<td>2 August 2019</td>
<td>26 September 2019</td>
<td>1 October 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the Waiheke Local Board on transport related matters in its area including the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report covers the results of the Matiatia Traffic Trial, including feedback from the public through the survey on this trial.
3. Attached is a report from Auckland Transport’s transport design consultants, Stantec. Stantec did the initial design work for the current layout and have monitored the trial both with personal visits and observations, questioning of Auckland Transport staff who are on-site for extended periods (Parking Officers) and by viewing extensive CCTV coverage of the areas covered by the trial.
4. The report on the public survey carried out on the Matiatia Traffic Trial has been circulated prior to this meeting and will be tabled at the meeting to admit it into the official record.
5. The report also covers outcomes of the trial to service Ostend Road and Wharf Road and, re-instatement of the 50B and initiation of the 501 service from Kennedy Point to Matiatia. These changes will finally deliver the full Waiheke New Network as it was designed.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Waiheke Local Board:
a) receive the Auckland Transport report May 2020.
b) support making the Matiatia Traffic Trial operation semi-permanent on the basis that these changes to traffic operations at Matiatia will deliver the following:
   • a safer environment for all users
   • more orderly and controlled traffic operations
   • retention of infrastructure that will not be able to be replaced prior to the full Matiatia Transport Plan implementation
   • optimisation of Auckland Transport Metro operations at Matiatia
c) acknowledge that the patronage measured on the Ostend/Wharf Road loop during the trial of this, is far below that which would be required for a public bus route and support Auckland Transport’s decision to remove this loop from the Waiheke bus network.

Horopaki
Context
6. This report addresses transport related matters on Waiheke and includes information on the status of the local board transport capital fund.
7. Auckland Transport (AT) is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. They report on a monthly basis to local boards, as set out in their Local
Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important engagement role local boards play within and on behalf of their local communities.

8. The LBTCF is a capital budget provided to all local boards by Auckland Council and delivered by Auckland Transport. Local boards can use this fund to deliver transport infrastructure projects that they believe are important but are not part of Auckland Transport’s work programme. Projects must also:
   - be safe.
   - not impede network efficiency.
   - be in the road corridor (although projects running through parks can be considered if there is a transport outcome).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Matiatia Traffic Trial
Since 8th December 2019 Auckland Transport (AT) and the Waiheke Local Board have been trialling a new way to manage traffic at Matiatia ferry terminal over the busy summer season to help reduce congestion and improve safety for everyone who uses the area.

Background
9. The Matiatia Traffic Trial started on 8 December 2019, with the objective to improve safety and relieve congestion at Matiatia during the peak summer season.

10. The trial was initiated as the result of a request by the Waiheke Transport Forum to trial a different way of traffic operating in and around the Matiatia Wharf. The original plan for the trial had public buses and large passenger service vehicles in the keyhole, taxis in the turnaround area immediately infront of the keyhole and public pick-up and drop-off on both sides of a raised platform in the lower car park. This original plan was put forward by the Waiheke Transport Forum and endorsed and partially funded by the Waiheke Local Board.

11. A public petition, a week before the local body elections, protested that this trial arrangement would unfairly impact on local residents and only benefit visitors to the island. As a result of this petition the Waiheke Local Board requested that Auckland Transport amend the trial and swap the taxi and public pick-up/drop-off areas. This change was made but has resulted in significant numbers of complaints from taxis and the operators of small tour vehicles, who were no longer able to use the keyhole and landward turnaround area.

The final version of the trial included the following changes:

12. Space available to public buses has been increased in the keyhole so we can optimise the new network timetable. Three buses are able to utilise the space available at any one time.

13. Only buses and a few authorized vehicles are able to operate out of the seaward keyhole area. This helps to reduce congestion and increase safety, as buses are now able to safely manoeuvre through this area. The seaward keyhole area also includes a space for mobility drop-off and 2 loading zones. The original mobility drop-off zone in the landward turnaround remains but with slightly improved geometry.

14. A larger public pick-up zone was built within the lower car park against the seaward side of a raised pedestrian platform. The previous P2 and Drop-off areas in the landward turnaround remain.

15. Pre-booked taxis/shuttles/tours have been removed from the seaward keyhole area and a dedicated P15 area has been created for them in the lower carpark against the landward side of a raised pedestrian platform.
16. Tour buses depart from the keyhole, as they did previously. Their space has been allocated across from the ferry terminal. Tour guides from the Waiheke Hop-on Hop-off Explorer bus now meet their passengers and walk them over to their departure point opposite the public bus area.

Observations and conclusions

17. Overall Auckland Transport considers that the trial changes have achieved the primary aims of increasing overall safety within the keyhole area and generally improving traffic flows.

18. Before the trial started, consulting engineering firm Stantec observed many different conflicting users and movements observed within the ‘keyhole’ area as taxis and shuttle buses park on the western and north-eastern side, Auckland Transport Metro buses park on the south-western side whilst off-street parking for mobility users, motorcycles and mooring permit holders.

19. In their report (see below link (right click to open hyperlink)), Stantec conclude “The temporary changes implemented as part of the trial have resulted in safety and operational benefits within the Matiatia Ferry Terminal area by reducing conflicts between pedestrians, taxis, buses and general traffic. Therefore, it is considered that the trial has provided a successful outcome suggesting that these changes can be made permanent with minor refinements to ensure the safety and operational benefits are maintained within this area.”

https://aucklandtransport-my.sharepoint.com/:b:/g/personal/tina_kittelty_at_govt_nz/Ec-etUd3xBJOmuMDvHIW-FwBnzXVYhn2py63AAqcjjD3hg?e=wWq5bM

20. Auckland Transport’s Parking Compliance team provided the following feedback:

- The trial generally achieved its goals of keeping a steady movement of transport through the keyhole area and improving safety of pedestrians getting to buses and taxis.
- Parking officers did not receive many complaints from passengers or residents on the changes. The majority of feedback received, which was mostly negative, was from taxi operators who would prefer to continue to operate out of the keyhole area as they previously were able to. Additionally, most of the negative feedback was received from one particular local operator and city-based operators.
- As the trial progressed, we found passengers were able to follow the signage and find their way to the new taxi rank, and that most operators became accustomed to the changes.
- The parking compliance team’s preference is to continue to limit use of the keyhole, but to make a change to designate use of the landward side of the keyhole for Large Passenger Service Vehicles (a change from the current designation of Bus Parking), keeping the time limit to 30 minutes.
- The majority of abuse received by parking officers was from drivers parking in the P2 drop off area. The parking compliance team would like to keep this area as it is for drop off only and educate residents to use the P30 spaces in the car park if they arrive too early to pick people up from the ferry.

Public consultation and feedback

21. We consulted on the proposed Matiatia Ferry Terminal on Waiheke Island from Tuesday 17 March 2020 until Wednesday 22 April 2020.

22. Public feedback to the trial changes was predominantly negative, with 82.5% of respondents dissatisfied with the trial layout.

23. While full details will soon be released in the public feedback report which is currently being finalised, key themes in the feedback were:

- Confusion around trial (including parking and bus zones); taxis now too far away / let taxis back in the keyhole
- Proposal gives priority to Fullers and tourists over residents, taxi providers and local traders
• Pick up and drop off is difficult, especially for elderly and disabled
• Concerned about loss of parking spaces – not enough parking for cars and condition of parking
• Do not regard any safety and congestion improvement in trial layout/ it was better before the trial
• Create pedestrian crossings to get across the road, dedicated pathways and lighting
• Take the taxis out of the lower car park and back to the front of the terminal - too far to walk under trial layout
• Add speed reduction measures
• Improve signage
• Stop double decker or large buses including from the keyhole

Recommendations
24. Auckland Transport recommends that the trial changes be made semi-permanent, with some further improvements to be made:
   • 30-minute bus parking in the inner keyhole to be amended to 30-minute large passenger service vehicle parking. The purpose of this change is to ensure the keyhole remains available to larger buses and that all operators of small tour vehicles are located in the lower carpark on the opposite side of the raised pedestrian platform used by the taxis.
   • Rationalise parking provision within the upper car park to fully utilise the space formerly used by the rental cars, including the space currently occupied by the soon to be demolished rental car buildings. This will result in pre-trial numbers of car parks being available.
   • Retain the current arrangement for public drop-off and pick-up in the landward turnaround area.
   • Remove temporary fencing infrastructure and replace with proper fencing to direct pedestrians and install a more aesthetically acceptable shelter on the new platform.
   • Review the overall layout of the carpark to improve vehicle tracking, ease existing pinch points and provide marked pedestrian walkways within the carpark.
   • Review and upgrade temporary signage and road markings to improve information provided to all users (e.g. internal circulation within the car park).
   • Widen the footpath on the northern side of the Keyhole to facilitate its use by tour coach passengers.

25. Auckland Transport acknowledges that this recommendation does not align with public opinion on the trial, however believe it is the most viable option considering the space constraints in and around Matiatia, as well as Auckland Transport’s obligation to provide the safest possible environment, while balancing the needs of all users. This move also foreshadows future changes in and around Matiatia, one of which will see the lower car park retired from use as parking.

26. Auckland Transport would seek additional funding to make the proposed infrastructure changes, but we note that COVID-19 is likely to impact upon overall budgets available within Auckland Transport and may constrain this project.

Waiheke Bus Services – Discontinuation of Ostend/Wharf Road trial
27. The attached memorandum ‘Waiheke Bus Services – Discontinuation of service to Ostend Road and Wharf Road’ details the trial and the options that were explored by Auckland Transport. Given the extremely low patronage for the Ostend Rd stops (Average of 1 passenger every 7 trips) it is Auckland Transport’s intention to discontinue the trial but wants to give the Waiheke Local Board the opportunity to have input before this decision is made. (See Attachment A)

Auckland Transport Responses to Resolutions
28. That the Waiheke Local Board:
   a) receive the Auckland Transport Report March/April 2020.
Item 17

29. In response to b) above the trial period was extended until the end of May 2020.

30. In response to c) above, a more detailed formal report is being prepared for the June meeting of the Waiheke Local Board.

COVID-19 Level 2 update

31. New Zealand moved to Alert Level 2 at 11:59pm on 13 May 2020. This is what it means in relation to transport related activities.

32. The Government has advised that the general rule for Alert Level 2 is to play it safe. This means that if you are feeling sick you should stay home. Do not go to work or school. Do not socialise, and if you are showing symptoms of COVID-19 you should avoid using public transport when travelling to a medical appointment.

33. Public transport services will return to normal levels while we are at Alert Level 2 so people can travel to where they need to go. However, please note that the Government has advised that you must not travel to events which do not meet the requirements for gatherings at Alert Level 2.

34. Aucklanders are also advised that fare collection on public transport, as well as the collection of parking fees and enforcement of time restrictions and special vehicle lanes will re-commence when we move to Alert Level 2.

35. Public transport users are also advised that passenger capacity on buses, trains and ferries will be significantly lower than what was available prior to COVID-19. This is because of the need to maintain physical distancing onboard public transport vehicles as required by the Government for Alert Level 2.

36. We therefore ask our customers to ensure that they plan their journey ahead with the Auckland Transport Mobile app, which now also displays how many people are on a bus or train service at any given time, or the journey planner on our website.

37. Alternative ways of working under Alert Level 2 are also being encouraged by the Government, such as remote working, shift-based working, physical distancing, staggering meal breaks and flexible leave.

38. Auckland Transport also encourages Aucklanders to consider travelling outside of usual peak hours (7:00-9:00am and 3:00-7:00pm) where possible. This not only supports physical distancing as more people return to work, but also helps reduce peak congestion and the strain on public transport to make sure everyone can get to where they need to go quickly and safely.

39. Many Aucklanders chose to walk or cycle while we were at Alert Level 3 and 4 and we encourage people to continue doing so as this is a great option to maintain safe physical distancing. Auckland Transport is in the process of reviewing the effectiveness of the temporary walking and cycling lanes that were introduced at Alert Level 3. Some of these lanes may continue to operate at Alert Level 2 in order to help ensure that people on bikes and walking can stay safe and maintain the physical distance requirements that are so important to helping us break the chain of COVID-19 infection.

40. Businesses and organisations with large numbers of employees may need to look at a wide variety of transport options and actively plan to accommodate their employee’s needs. For
travel planning resources and advice for businesses please visit https://at.govt.nz/driving-parking/ways-to-get-around-auckland/working-with-businesses/workplace-travel-planning/

41. The Government has also advised that domestic travel is allowed within New Zealand, but to follow public health guidance.

42. For more information of where and when you are permitted to travel under Alert Level 2 go to: www.covid19.govt.nz

**Public transport**

43. Public Transport will be operating to normal schedules and with fare collection resuming under Alert Level 2. Cash is still not being accepted. Travellers going to and from Waiheke should check the Fullers/360 and Sealink websites for timetable information.

44. Physical distancing must be observed on all bus, train and ferry services with one-metre distance required between other passengers. While we will be operating to normal schedules, we will be running at about 43% of normal passenger capacity while under Alert Level 2 to make sure safe physical distancing can be achieved. Please note that standing on buses, trains or ferries will not be allowed while we are at Alert Level 2.

45. There will be signage on board buses and trains to guide customers to where they can and cannot sit based on physical distancing restrictions.

46. Physical distancing of two metres must still be observed at all of our facilities such as stations, platforms and stops.

47. Customers may not be able to get on the bus, train or ferry that they want to because of available space to maintain safe physical distancing. To help with this, our Auckland Transport Mobile app now displays how many people are on a bus or train service at any given time, so customers will know if one-metre distancing will be achievable before they board. In addition, all buses will display the number of people it can take with physical distancing restrictions in place. The Auckland Transport Mobile app and journey planner on our website will also tell you when the next service is.

48. For the majority of buses, customers must use the rear door to get on and off the bus. This is to help ensure everyone is kept as safe as possible by minimising the physical contact between customers and bus drivers. In some rare cases, boarding will be necessary though the front door on small buses.

49. Customers who use a wheel chair or other mobility device or require driver assistance can still use the front door of buses. This also applies to vision impaired customers – we ask drivers to assist them through the front door.

50. Auckland Transport is ensuring all public transport is being cleaned throughout its daily service. Buses and trains are being spot checked, with surfaces being sanitised, and we have enhanced our cleaning regime to include antimicrobial protection fogging (spraying) of facilities and our fleet.

51. Cash is still not being accepted under Alert Level 2. We strongly recommend that you register your Auckland Transport HOP card to help with contact tracing should it be required. This will also allow us to monitor passenger numbers and make fast adjustments to services if required due to changes in demand. We will be working to make those changes as quickly as possible and again advise customers to plan their journey ahead.

52. Those who do not already have an Auckland Transport HOP card can find a retailer at: https://at.govt.nz/bus-train-ferry/at-hop-card/at-hop-retailers/

53. We anticipate that public transport will be a lot busier under Alert Level 2 so, if people can, they should consider walking or riding a bike as it may be a good option for some returning to work or school.

54. Our Auckland Transport HOP free public WiFi was disabled during Alert Level 3 to discourage people congregating at rail stations and bus interchanges. This will continue to be the case during Alert Level 2.
School buses
55. Auckland Transport -contracted school bus services will operate during Alert Level 2. Following the Government's guidelines, physical distancing measures will be different to our public transport services but standing on buses will not be permitted.
56. Working closely with the schools, Auckland Transport has several measures to support contact tracing for all passengers. Hand sanitiser will also be made available for students boarding and departing the bus, in addition to the bus being cleaned in accordance with Government guidance.

Busier roads
57. As we saw with Alert Level 3, we will again see roads become busier throughout Auckland during Alert Level 2.
58. We ask that Aucklanders minimise any 'non-essential' travel and make sure that those driving do so safely while staying aware of other road users.
59. With freight services returning to normal levels, there will be more heavy vehicles on the road at all times of the day.
60. Construction sites have also restarted, meaning more construction vehicles on the road and temporary traffic management. Prepare for possible delays to your journey.
61. The move to Alert Level 2 also sees more work on our roads. Activities such as resealing, footpath repairs and cleaning out of drains which were paused have restarted at pace.
62. Other organisations such as Watercare, power lines companies, and other utilities have also begun work on that was previously programmed.
63. As a result, people will notice more activity in the road corridor. Please be aware of workers, drive to the conditions and expect delays throughout the city as these projects get back on track.

Customer service centres
64. We still need to ensure there is managed interaction between our staff and customers under Alert Level 2.
65. During this time, we still recommend customers use self-service options such as ordering an Auckland Transport HOP card online, setting up their account to auto-top up or simply going online to top-up at Auckland Transport HOP card. Journey planning can also be done via the Auckland Transport website or app.
66. Our call centres remain open and customers can speak to us by calling 09 366 6400.
67. If customers are unable to access self-service options, the following customer service centres will be open but will have reduced staff numbers:
   - Britomart ticket windows
   - Manukau Bus Station
   - New Lynn ticket window
   - Panmure
   - Smales Farm
   - Newmarket
   - Albany
   - Constellation
   - Papakura Train Station

The following customer service centres will remain closed while at Alert Level 2:
   - Manukau Train Station
   - New Lynn (ticket office windows will remain open and provide all services)
68. At this stage we are still unable to accept cash payments for Auckland Transport HOP card top-ups at customer service centres, however customers will be able to use EFTPOS.

**Parking and outdoor activities**

69. Paid parking will resume for both on and off-street parking under Alert Level 2. Enforcement of parking restrictions, bus lanes and other special vehicle lanes will also resume.

70. If you are walking or cycling, make sure you are keeping two-metre distance from other people and their ‘bubbles’. Where available please use grass berms and other available space in the road reserve to achieve this.

71. Auckland Transport is in the process of reviewing the effectiveness of the temporary walking and cycling lanes that were introduced at Alert Level 3. Some of these lanes may continue to operate at Alert Level 2 in order to help ensure that people on bikes and walking can stay safe and maintain the physical distance requirements that are so important to helping us play it safe.

72. In addition, we are investigating providing temporary protection at existing painted cycle lanes at key locations to further improve safety for people on bikes.

73. As the demand for travel around Auckland changes at Alert Level 2, we will continue to monitor the network in real time to minimise any disruptions and quickly respond to incidents that may occur.

74. Leisure boating and all water activities are now allowed under Alert Level 2.

75. Harbormaster work under Alert Level 2 will include resuming maintenance of buoys and beacons, as well as the disposal of abandoned vessels and wrecks. Other usual business, such as compliance monitoring, will return to normal levels while maintaining physical distancing requirements.

**Walking and cycling**

76. Almost half of all Aucklanders (47%) are walking more than they did pre-lockdown with 14% cycling more often.

77. With that in mind we expect to continue to see more people walking or cycling as a transport choice to get to work, school or for local shopping trips when we move into Alert Level 2. We are also reminding people to look out for vulnerable road users when they travel. More than ever people are using their road space to walk or use a bike, and as a team of 1.4M Aucklanders we can all play a role in keeping everyone safe.

78. Some of the pop-up spaces that were rolled out during Alert Level 3 may continue to operate for Alert Level 2 with the addition of some new spaces to allow for physical distancing, we ask that people use the pop-up spaces whenever possible. For more information on walking and cycling visit https://at.govt.nz/cycling-walking/

**Construction sites**

79. Auckland Transport restarted work across 160 sites from Tuesday 28 April under Alert Level 3 restrictions. Each site has been operating under strict Health and Safety protocols based on Ministry of Health Guidance and industry best practice.

80. These measures will not change significantly under Alert Level 2 and will continue to include: physical distancing, compulsory PPE, hygiene practices, recording site entry and exit and separating teams into zones on our larger sites.

81. Inductions for new project staff and compulsory COVID-19 education and training will be part of ongoing site protocols while in Alert Level 2, plus any new restarted work will require contractors to submit COVID-19 Health and Safety plans and protocols to demonstrate a safe working environment.
82. Although our aim is to return to normal levels of productivity as quickly as possible to minimize delays and help spur the local economy, our priority remains ensuring the safety of our workers and the general public. As such, the pace of work under Alert Level 2 may not be as rapid as it is under normal circumstances.

83. Auckland Transport will continue to maximise opportunities to accelerate productivity where possible until we can return to normal conditions. These measures may include extending working hours and expanding work sites to take advantage of less traffic on the road.

84. All project timelines are under review pending an assessment of the impact of COVID-19.

Public engagement

85. Engagement (both informing and consulting communities on upcoming projects) will begin again under Alert Level 2 except for the following channels:
   - No drop-in sessions or public meetings
   - No, or very limited, face-to-face meetings with members of the public, stakeholders or elected members

86. Instead of face-to-face communication, AT will engage via channels such as telephone calls, conference calls, email, Facebook live and webcasts.

Auckland Transport offices

87. All Auckland Transport offices will re-open at Alert Level 2 but with only up to 25% of staff allowed in the building at any one time to maintain effective physical distancing measures. We will gradually increase the number of staff allowed within offices in the coming weeks and remaining staff will continue to work from home. During Level 2 external visitors are not encouraged to come into our offices unless absolutely essential. Any visitor that does enter an Auckland Transport office will be asked to register their full contact details at reception areas and will be expected to comply with physical distancing measures that will be in place.

88. We know this has been a challenging time for us all. We ask that people continue to be understanding and patient of everyone else who is in the same situation and appreciate everyone’s cooperation so far under Alert Levels 4 and 3.

89. Again, please try to avoid traveling during peak hours of the day to help make sure everyone can get to where they need to go safely.

90. The best place to find the latest information about the COVID-19 situation in New Zealand is on the Government’s special COVID-19 website: https://covid19.govt.nz/

91. Auckland Transport’s COVID-19 page, which includes up to date public transport timetables, is at: https://at.govt.nz/COVID-19

92. For any other queries the Auckland Transport call centre is available 24 hours/7 days a week 09 355 3553

Local Board Transport Capital Fund

93. A summary of the Waiheke Local Board Transport Capital Fund is contained in the table below. The Board has held the majority of its Local Board Transport Capital Fund for the major reorganisation of Matiatia and therefore has spent very little of its allocation over the last electoral term.

94. In the coming months, the Board will consider the results of the Matiatia summer trial, the public survey results and its subsequent plans for Matiatia.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Consultations**

98. consultations were sent to the local board in the last reporting period.

**Traffic Control Committee**

99. The decision of the Traffic Control Committee that affected the Board area in April 2020 is noted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Putiki Road</th>
<th>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes</th>
<th>Angle Parking / P30 Parking / Mobility Parking / Road Hump / Stop Control</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

100. Interactions with manu whenua is done on a project specific basis.

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

101. There are no financial implications resulting from receiving this report.

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

102. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no risks.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps
103. See above

Ngā tāpirihanga
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To: Waiheke Local Board
From: Dave Hilson / Helen Griffin / Pete Moth, AT
Date: 14 May 2020
Subject: Waiheke Bus Services – Discontinuation of service to Ostend Road and Wharf Road

As part of the New Network for Waiheke Island, bus routes were removed from a section of Ostend Road and Wharf Road in Ostend. This was greeted by opposition from a group of Waiheke Islanders who presented the Auckland Transport (AT) Board with a petition containing over 1,600 signatures requesting the reinstatement of buses to this area. AT received a proposal from the Ostend Bus Group, and subsequently instigated a trial from December 2019 to measure demand for this service. A full description of the issues raised in the Ostend Bus Group proposal and AT’s response is given in this report.

To date, uptake has been low, with around 1 passenger using the service for every 7 trips operated. Balancing this against other factors, including cost and disadvantage to other passengers, AT intends to terminate this trial and to no longer operate services through this section of Ostend Road and Wharf Road.

It should be noted that this intention was based on patronage for a month from early February to early March 2020. This allowed enough time for this route to become established and for residents to be aware of the trial. However, the Covid-19-related downturn in patronage has been disregarded.

Background

In October 2019, AT introduced a New Network for the bus services on Waiheke Island. This was designed to be a simpler network with ‘Frequent’ (a bus at least every 15 minutes, 7am to 7pm, 7 days a week) services between Onetangi and Matiatia as well as better connections with ferries.

Two of the new bus services - 50A and 50B operate every 30 minutes, alternating to give a 15 minutes service between Onetangi and Matiatia, including using the ‘hub’ at Belgium St. These two services operating in this manner offer two main benefits, frequency and a choice in ferry connections.

The frequency means that residents of the island have a bus every 15 minutes through the day, seven days a week, connecting the main destinations of Onetangi, Ostend, Surfdale, Oneroa and Matiatia.

The choice in ferry connections is because we know there are different kinds of passengers. Those commuting or traveling regularly want to minimise their overall travel time, this requires a tight connection time between bus and ferry. On the other hand, some passengers either want, or may require, more time to move between bus and ferry without being rushed. By having the 50A having a tight connection with the ferry and the 50B having more time, both types of customer are catered for. This also allows the 50A and 50B buses to depart from Matiatia on time if the ferry is delayed, (connecting passengers would have a maximum wait of 15 minutes for the next bus that follows a similar route across the island), thus minimising inconvenience for local passengers wanting to catch one of these services from another stop on the route.

In order to truly realise the benefits above, both 50A and 50B need to follow a consistent route. The 50B was previously covering the loop around Jellicoe Parade and Wellington Road,
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however this was just a temporary measure until the route 501 (Kennedy Point) is introduced at the end of May 2020. At that point route 50B will travel directly along Causeway Road, Alison Road and Miami Avenue, the same as the route 50A.

In order to operate this consistent, Frequent service, it is necessary to remove service from Ostend Road and Wharf Road.

Ostend Road/Wharf Road Trial

When AT decided to trial a service, there were two main options looked at:

- Divert services via Ostend Road and Wharf Road thereby missing out Belgium Street; or
- Operate a loop meaning Belgium Street was served twice per trip.

The latter option was chosen, as the national bus driver shortage had resulted in the 50B service needing to be suspended, effectively halving the all-day frequency through Belgium Street. Given that Belgium Street is a local shopping hub, it would have been unacceptable to reduce bus service on this road any further.

The loop option disadvantages passengers travelling through Ostend as they have to travel along Belgium St twice, adding around five minutes onto their travel time.

To minimise this disruption:

- inbound (towards Oneroa and Matiatia) trips would automatically operate via Ostend Road and Wharf Road on every second trip.
- outbound services (towards Onetangi) would only operate this section of the route on every second trip at the request of passengers already on board (including those boarding on Belgium Street).

AT used this trial to gather data to help inform whether or not to serve the Ostend Road/Wharf Road permanently. The data used for comparison is inbound boardings only. This is because we can record the boarding of every passenger whether they are paying by AT HOP, cash or other means (on Waiheke Island there are a considerable number of users of the Fullers Monthly Pass). However, there is only accurate data on alighting passengers when they tag-off using an AT HOP card.

Data collection

Data on the usage of the Ostend Rd trial was collected for the four week period from 10 February to 8 March inclusive.

There were 5,196 passengers using an AT HOP card shown as travelling through Ostend for this same period - that is our AT HOP data shows they boarded prior to Belgium Street and alighted after Belgium Street. For each of these passengers there would be additional travel time of around five minutes should the bus travel around the Ostend Road/Wharf Road area as a loop.

It should be noted this number is likely to be considerably higher. In addition to the AT HOP card-using passengers above, there were an additional 5,800 passengers who boarded between Onetangi and Ostend who paid using either cash or a Fullers Ferry Monthly Pass. As we don’t have information on where these passengers alighted from the bus, we haven’t included them. However, we would expect a considerable number of them to have travelled beyond Ostend. This is due to monthly pass holders travelling primarily to the ferry and at the passengers most likely to pay cash being tourists.
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During this period there were a total of 1,658 boardings from the inbound bus stop on Belgium Street (in front of Countdown), an average of 59 boardings per day.

In comparison, there were a total of just 71 boarding from the Ostend Road/Wharf Road section of this route (distributed across the three inbound stops on this section of the route), an average of just 2.5 boardings per day. This also equates to an average of around one passenger per seven trips, so six times out of seven, passengers travelling through Ostend (Belgium Street) had 5 minutes added to their total journey time for the benefit of no other passengers. This is summarised in the two graphs below.

![Figure 1: Comparison of passenger demand at Belgium Street and Ostend Rd / Wharf Rd](image)

**Customer survey**

As part of a review of the new Waiheke bus network, a customer survey was carried out from 12 to 17 February 2020. Survey participants that were familiar with the 50A service were asked if they would prefer the route to go via Belgium Street, or Ostend Road/Wharf Road. There was no clear preference. Of the 154 respondents that answered this question:

- 22% preferred the route to go via Belgium Street
- 25% preferred the route to go via Ostend Road/Wharf Road
- 53% did not have a preference

Respondents who preferred the route to go via Ostend Road/Wharf Road said this option took the buses closer to where they worked or lived, and they couldn’t walk to Belgium Street.

Respondents who preferred the route to go via Belgium Street said this option was more direct and gave better access to amenities.

A summary of this survey will be published alongside a report, to be made publicly available in the middle of 2020.

---

1 This has been provided to the Local Board separately
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Community Input

Throughout the planning and implementation of the New Network for Waiheke, AT has undertaken extensive communication and engagement with the local community and taken community input into account. For example, residents in Surfdale had given feedback around the lack of connections to early and late ferries. As a result, an additional early morning trip was added to the 50B timetables and evening trips were diverted around this area (on request) as an interim measure until the introduction of route 501. The timetable for the 501 has been designed to accommodate these residents’ requests where possible. However, due to budgetary and resource constraints, AT isn’t always in a position to respond positively to every request from the public.

In December 2019, management and officers from AT met with representatives from the local community, known as the Ostend Bus Group, who presented proposed solutions for serving Ostend Road and Wharf Road. All of the proposed solutions were considered by AT and are addressed below. The proposed community solutions were written at the time when the 50B was not operating, therefore the frequencies referred to reflect that situation, not the complete network. Please note some of these points have already been covered in this document but are listed here for completeness as a direct response to the proposals from the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ostend Bus Group proposed solution</th>
<th>Auckland Transport Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Until driver numbers are sufficient to restore the 50B service, divide Matiatia to Onetangi service into two parts; an hourly service via Belgium Street (50B) and an hourly service via Ostend Road / Wharf Road (50A)</td>
<td>Routes 50A and 50B are designed to cover largely the same passenger catchment for the length of the route but provide different connection times at the ferry for differing needs of passengers, while providing a frequent (15 minute) service for residents making intra-island trips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 50A Ostend Road / Wharf Road route also serve Jellicoe Parade / Wellington Rd to service the hourly (i.e. on the hour) ferry - permanent solution</td>
<td>As it has the shorter connect times with the Matiatia ferry service, the 50A is typically a busy service. It therefore has a direct route across the island, minimising the total journey time for those passengers using the service to access Ostend and Onetangi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50B service should meet the half hourly ferry and is run via Belgium St with no diversions</td>
<td>If the 50A served Jellicoe Parade, Wellington Road, Ostend Road and Wharf Road, the diversions and loops would result in a longer total journey time for customers taking the service to / from the eastern end of the route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The longer connection time between the ferry and route 50B means that should the incoming ferry be delayed that the 50A can depart on time, removing inconvenience to passengers along the route. Passengers from the ferry can catch the 50B with the confidence it will get them to the same destinations as route 50A</td>
<td>The longer connection time with the ferry to have the most direct route across the island. Such an offering (‘short connection time but longer route’ and ‘long connection time but shorter route’) is likely to result in a poor customer experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be counterproductive for the bus service with the longer connection times with the ferry to have the most direct route across the island. Such an offering (‘short connection time but longer route’ and ‘long connection time but shorter route’) is likely to result in a poor customer experience.</td>
<td>50A and 50B are both designed to serve the route between Onetangi and Matiatia giving a frequent, direct, easy to understand service for connections to the ferry plus intra-island travel for destinations such as Oneroa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given Belgium Street’s role as a local shopping and service hub, it would be detrimental to business and customers to reduce the frequency of the</td>
<td>Given Belgium Street’s role as a local shopping and service hub, it would be detrimental to business and customers to reduce the frequency of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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bus serving this street to every half hour (instead of every 15 minutes as will be provided from 31 May 2020).

One of the key objectives of the new bus network was to make the bus a more attractive transport option as population, visitor numbers and traffic-related issues on Waiheke increase. Reducing the frequency of cross island bus services to 30 minutes (instead of 15 minutes as will be provided from 31 May 2020) would be detrimental to making bus travel a more comparable alternative to private vehicles and improving accessibility for people without alternative means of transport.

This feedback was accepted, AT worked with the bus operator to improve destination signage on the buses for improved legibility.

Do not serve the Jellicoe Parade loop with the 501 service - serve with 50A

50A and 50B are both designed to follow the same route between Onetangi and Matiatia.

Also, of the 50A, 50B and 501, the 501 is the route which is the shortest overall distance. Therefore, by using this service to cover Jellicoe Parade and Wellington Street, the passengers subject to the diversion are those with the shorter journey.

Until further drivers are available do not run the Kennedy Point service.

AT accepts that the return of the 50B service should take precedence over the implementation of a new service (501).

However, it eventuated that sufficient drivers became available to recommence the 50B at the same time as implementing route 501 (31 May 2020).

At may make future changes to the Waiheke bus network to address other issues raised by members of the public, bus drivers and survey respondents, as part of our Waiheke network review. This will include looking at how best to serve Blackpool.

Conclusion

AT, having trialled a reinstatement of service to Ostend Road and Wharf Road, and having surveyed customers, has decided that the advantages to passengers of serving these streets are far outweighed by the number of passengers that it will disadvantage. Specific point to note:

- The diversion of one service via Ostend Road and Wharf Road would be for the benefit of a relatively small number of people using the bus to access homes or work places on these roads, and at the expense of a much larger number of people using the bus to access work and amenities on or near Belgium Street;

- The operation of a loop service means the trip through Ostend takes about five additional minutes, disadvantaging those traveling through Ostend. A diversion means missing key patronage on Belgium Street;

- For the sake of consistency both 50A and 50B should travel the same route, via Belgium Street, to allow connections across the island to function;
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- The ‘all-day’ service, 50A, should travel the most direct route at all times and allow a connection to Belgium Street at all times.
- Although not mentioned above, the current network design enables people to transfer between the 50B and 502 with minimal wait time at Belgium St, where there is shelter, lighting and natural surveillance. We know from customer feedback that there is demand for this connection, to enable travel between for example Onetangi and Palm Beach.

Given the strength of feeling from some members of the local community, the intention to no longer serve this area is not one that has been taken lightly. As a result, AT will engage further with the Waiheke Local Board (on 27 May 2020) and the local community before making a final decision. AT hopes to have a final decision by end of June 2020. This decision will take into account that AT has a responsibility to spend ratepayer and taxpayer money responsibly, and therefore the final decision will need to balance the relatively low benefit of serving Ostend Road and Wharf Road against the needs of the local community.
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To provide the Waiheke Local Board the final draft of the Waiheke 10-Year Transport Plan (the Plan) for endorsement and final feedback

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The Waiheke 10-Year Transport Plan is a co-designed plan consisting of over 100 prioritised projects and processes which Auckland Transport and the Waiheke Local Board agree will be the priorities over the next decade.

3. The plan has been through public consultation and approval is now sought for the updated plan, including any final annotations.

4. Approving the plan will fulfil the objectives of the project to release the blueprint for future activity on the island.

5. The risks associated with the plan are that it is not maintained as the core guiding document for projects on Waiheke. Mitigating this will be a joint Auckland Transport/Local Board ongoing effort.

6. Once approved the plan will be sent to the Auckland Transport Board for approval. It will then be published along with associated communications.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) endorse the Waiheke 10-Year Transport Plan for release.

b) provide any final changes to Auckland Transport for incorporation ahead of its release.

Horopaki
Context

7. In late 2018 Auckland Transport and the Waiheke Local Board began work on the 10-Year Transport Plan, to produce an agreed list of projects Auckland Transport would pursue on Waiheke and seek funding for.

8. In mid-2019 the plan went through public consultation and changes to the prioritisation of projects emerged as a result.

9. Auckland Transport has now finalised the plan amendments following this consultation period.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
10. With the plan now updated endorsement of the plan is sought together with approval for its release by Auckland Transport.
11. For the sake of expediency any changes required (content, style, text, etc.) are provided with the endorsement (the endorsement would be subject to the implementation of the changes).
12. Note that the version of the plan sent to you has annotations in it (in the form of yellow boxes). These changes will be made but have not been implemented yet, so as to provide you the plan as soon as possible.
13. At this point while we will have an appendix with the full list of projects, we are not planning to include the around 90 projects which were suggested by the community during consultation as they have not been prioritised by the local board. Instead we suggest they are considered for inclusion in the next version of the plan.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement
14. Protecting the natural environment is one of the core prioritisation criteria used to assess the projects. In addition, one of the ‘process’ elements which Auckland Transport will now mandate for all projects on the island is that they do not negatively impact (and seek to improve) the environmental outcomes for the island, particular with regard to water runoff, coastal erosion and weather resilience.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
15. Auckland Council has been involved in the development of the plan and has given support to its development.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
16. The plan was co-designed with the Waiheke Local Board and has used the previously completed plans and proposals from the local board as the basis for the project and processes in the plan.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
17. There has been substantial engagement with mana whenua and mataawaka through the development of the plan and their feedback has been included in full. The plan will deliver benefits which align with desired māori outcomes.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
18. There are no financial implications for the local board. The funding for items within the plan will be decided as part of the Regional Land Transport Planning process.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
19. There are two risks associated with this plan:
   • There is a risk that Auckland Transport will seek to pursue projects (beyond standard asset maintenance and renewal) which are not on this plan, which would cause
reputational impacts for both organisations. This will require a joint mitigation: the Auckland Transport project team will continually reiterate internally the need to progress the projects in the plan and the local board will need to challenge Auckland Transport projects which emerge which do not feature in the plan.

- There is a risk that should the plan not be implemented and also evolve over time, that it will be seen as a waste of time and will cause reputational damage to both organisations. The mitigation for this will be, first, involvement from the local board in the Regional Land Transport Plan process, to advocate for the projects to receive funding and second commitment by the local board and Auckland Transport to annually update the plan to account for changes over time.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

20. Auckland Transport will incorporate any feedback/changes from the local board and then will seek approval from the Auckland Transport Board for the plan and its release. It will be released with an accompanying communications campaign.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**
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<table>
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</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**
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<table>
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<th>Author</th>
<th>Andrew McGill - Head of Integrated Network Planning - Auckland Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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</tr>
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A guide to this document

This section looks at Waiheke: its people, character and the state of its transport. It also highlights some of the key gaps and challenges faced by its people, services and facilities.

This section outlines what AT is already progressing in Waiheke, what the final list of proposed next projects and processes are and outlines the eventual goal for the island.

This section addresses the background need and vision for Waiheke’s first collaborative, multi-modal 10 year transport plan.

This section describes how AT worked with the Waiheke Local Board to create this Plan, AT’s engagement with mana whenua and local stakeholders, and the public engagement process. It includes a summary of the public input and the changes made in response.

This section outlines the follow up actions of the Plan, including implementation and ongoing collaborative planning, and ongoing monitoring progress and review.
INTRODUCING THE PLAN
Background

One of the gems of Auckland’s Hauraki Gulf, Waiheke is a great place to live, work and play. Its geography, population and vibrant character makes it unique in Auckland. A hot spot for tourism and home to an active and growing population, increasing pressure has been put on the island’s transport network. Recognising these challenges, Waiheke requires a transport plan that embraces its character and reflects its changing transport needs—now and into the future.

As an outcome of Auckland Council’s Governance Framework Review, AT and the Waiheke Local Board collaborated to develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). The MoU is a key instrument in shaping the relationship between AT and the Local Board, allowing for greater alignment to achieve transport outcomes that meet Waiheke’s needs. As a living document, it will also provide a central point of reference for AT to engage on Waiheke transport issues going forward.

One of the key actions that resulted from the MoU was the development of the Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan, which contains a full, prioritised list of the projects, plans, services and processes wanted by the people of Waiheke for potential funding and inclusion in the next Auckland Regional Land Transport Plan.

The vision for the plan

Waiheke’s first collaborative, multi-modal 10-year transport plan

The first of its kind for Auckland and the Island, the Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan is a dynamic plan that envisions Waiheke’s ideal transport network – for its people, character and community.

Keeping Waiheke at the heart of the planning process, AT has developed this Plan with the community and the final product aligns with the needs and wants of this important and unique place.

Set out Waiheke’s aspirations for its transport system and take a strategic view about the future of the island, considering its economy and role – particularly for travel inside Waiheke.

Prioritise a list of projects, plans, services and processes on Waiheke to be considered for funding from 2021 – 2031.

Recognise Waiheke’s unique character and the pressures the island is experiencing now and into the future – particularly due to tourism and population growth.

Evolve with Waiheke’s changing transport needs over time.

CORE OBJECTIVES
A WAIHEKE SNAPSHOT
This map shows Waiheke’s transport landscape and some of the key areas where people live, work and play.
LOCAL CONTEXT

Waiheke’s people

Waiheke has many distinguishing features in comparison to the rest of Auckland and New Zealand, according to the 2018 Census.*

---

**WAIHEKE’S POPULATION IS GROWING.**
Due to net migration, the island’s population is increasing, though not at the rate of the rest of Auckland. In addition to its over 9,500 residents, it also has a significant tourist market, as well as non-resident workers. Due to tourism, its population also fluctuates seasonally.

**WAIHEKE’S POPULATION IS OLDER.**
The Census shows that almost 50% of residents of Waiheke are aged 30-64 and over 20% are aged 65+, compared to 45% and 12-15% for these age groups in New Zealand and Auckland overall.

**WAIHEKE’S POPULATION HAS LOWER INCOME**
generally compared to the rest of Auckland. 42% of Waiheke residents earn between $5,000 and $35,000 compared to 43% of Auckland residents as a whole. Despite this, Waiheke also has a higher than average proportion of people earning over $150,000 (5.3% compared to 3.9%).

*Results from the 2018 Census are only partially released at this time. Where the information is available it has been used. Past use of the 2013 census has been removed.
**WAIHEKE’S POPULATION WORKS IN DIFFERENT INDUSTRIES.**

The population is more employed in areas such as health care, public administration, finance, telecommunications, trade and manufacturing, and less in real estate, accommodation and food services and agriculture.

**WAIHEKE HAS SOME DIFFERENT TRAVEL BEHAVIOUR**

From the rest of Auckland. In addition to lower rates of driving a vehicle and use of buses/trains, Waiheke also has higher rates of walking/jogging, ferry use and working from home. Some of these patterns are a result of the demographics and location, however there are opportunities to improve usage of buses.

**KEY CHALLENGES**

Waiheke’s population, demographics and travel habits are unique in Auckland, and therefore its transport needs are different.
FERRIES

Waiheke’s transport services

Waiheke’s three ferry terminals are owned, operated and maintained by AT as part of the Hauraki Gulf wharves network. Ferries between downtown and Matiatia are operated by Fullers Group Ltd and are deemed to be exempt services, therefore having no contractual relationship with AT. While AT works with Fullers Group Ltd around customer needs, service levels for the ferry are at the discretion of Fullers.

Waiheke hosts more than a million tourists and visitors each year, primarily traveling by ferry. Patronage peaks in summer months with increased number of visitors to the island.

**Matiatia**
Main entry point for most visitors and residents

**Kennedy Point**
Main freight route, provides access for vehicles and passengers to Half Moon Bay and Wynyard Wharf. Vital link for business and island economy. Increasing patronage. These SeaLink services are fully commercial.

**Orapiu**
Fully commercial service, provides transport between Auckland and Coromandel. Seasonal timetable, sailings once a day excluding Mondays.
ACCESS & CONNECTIONS

- Ferry/bus fare integration is being implemented in April 2020. This will mean that single-zone bus/train travel before or after a ferry trip is free.

- Free travel is already available for seniors using an AT HOP gold card.*

- Matiatia and Downtown ferry terminals are both wheelchair accessible.

- Car parking is provided, via the dedicated Owhanake park & ride in close proximity to ferry terminal.

- Multiple operators (public and private) operate within the ferry terminal space.

- The ferry terminal area provides connections to:
  - Buses, which connect with ferry movements at Matiatia
  - Taxi and shuttle services
  - Private tourist operations to serve tourist activities and accommodation transfers (e.g., Explorer Bus)
  - Commercial charter vessels (e.g., Water Taxi)

*Valid after 9:00am on weekdays and all day on weekends and public holidays.

KEY CHALLENGES

- Ferries provide a key link for commuters and visitors, however there are concerns with the cost, frequency, and reliability of this service.

- Visitors significantly outnumber residents commuting by ferry.

- Private services and related vehicle pick-ups and drop-off services contribute to congestion on the water and on land.
BUSES

Waiheke’s transport services

The western end of the island is served by a number of public bus routes. These connect key destinations and service the majority of the urban area of Waiheke. A new bus network was implemented in October 2019 as a result of extensive public consultation which created a high frequency common route alignment between Matiatia and Ostend via Oneroa. Unfortunately since launch there has been a continued shortage of bus drivers, resulting in the cancellation of one of the new routes, route 506 and the delay to the planned implementation of a new route to Kennedy Point, 501.

AT HOP ticketing is not widely used on public bus services and as a result, actual bus patronage is not fully recorded and accurate data is not available.
**ACCESS & CONNECTIONS**

Waikato’s New Bus Network, implemented in October 2019, brings numerous benefits to frequency, accessibility and movement around the island, including:

- Improved routes and timetables.
- A new, electric and fully accessible bus fleet (rolled out from 2020).
- More frequent and longer spanning services.
- A new route serving Kennedy Point ferry terminal.
- New infrastructure, including bus stops, shelters and signage.

Waikato also has a number of operators that offer both scheduled and on-request tours and transport services across the island using a range of vehicles, from small passenger vehicles to double-decker buses.

These transport services include:

- taxis
- car sharing & ride sharing services
- private car rental
- water taxi
- coastal excursion services
- aeroplanes and helicopters

*Some tours are available as part of package deals that include ferry travel to the island.

**KEY CHALLENGES**

- AT does not have clear insights on public transport travel habits on Waikato due to lack of accurate AT HUB data.
- Lack of adequate footpaths or cycleway access at many bus stops along Waikato’s current bus network hinders connections around the island.
ROADS & FOOTPATHS

Waiheke’s transport facilities

Waiheke’s road and street network is diverse, with extensive cul-de-sacs, few through-connections, and rural and urban style roads intermingled. The main road connects Matiatia to Onetangi through Oneroa and Ostend, with a branch to Kennedy Point.

Unsealed roads make up nearly 20% of the roading network and are primarily located on the eastern end of Waiheke. Through its maintenance and renewals programme, AT responds reactively to road and footpath maintenance issues as they arise. However, as these roads are used more frequently by people and freight, maintenance can be problematic. Stormwater management is led jointly by Healthy Waters and AT, but poor maintenance of the drainage network has led to severe flooding in the past.

The main freight route runs between Kennedy Point and Matiatia wharf. Freight movements include trips to Waiheke quarry, water tanker deliveries, waste collection trucks, deliveries to building sites, shops, and seasonal trips to wineries. Freight trips are expected to rise as the island’s population grows and tourism increases.

WAIHEKE PATHWAYS PLAN

This Plan is consistent with the ambitions of the Waiheke Pathways Plan. Prepared and consulted on by the Local Board, the Waiheke Pathways Plan proposes a 10-year programme of priority projects to improve footpaths, roads and trails to provide safer and easier walking, cycling and horse riding.
Waiheke’s road and footpath network poses a number of safety concerns, particularly with the high number of unsealed roads on the island. Lack of adequate footpaths, cycleways and pedestrian crossings have also resulted in safety issues on roads with frequent traffic. Despite the higher than average level of public and active transport usage on Waiheke, much of the island’s footpath and cycle network is fragmented and largely unplanned. Where there are footpaths, many are on grass verges next to narrow, winding roads. In other places, steep topography has left no space to add a footpath or cycle lane. 70% of children living on Waiheke are driven to school, with road safety concerns the main reason deterring walking & cycling.

**KEY CHALLENGES**

- Waiheke’s footpath and cycle network is disconnected.
- The island’s hilly topography constrains space available for walking and cycling.
- The road type and condition is varied with no consistent street design, leading to reactive and problematic maintenance.
- Road safety is the main concern around walking and cycling, particularly for children traveling to school.
- Increased freight movement is placing increased pressure on the road network.
- Many narrow, winding roads are unsuited for frequent traffic or high vehicle speeds.
- Stormwater management is a particular concern, especially with climate change and larger adverse weather events.

**LOCATION OF INJURY CRASHES (2012 – 2016)**

From 2013 to 2017, 60 injury crashes were reported by NZ Police on Waiheke, resulting in 1 death, 16 serious and 57 minor injuries. However it is important to note that many minor accidents on the island go unreported.
DEVELOPING THE PLAN
DEVELOPING THE PLAN

Co-creation of the plan

Collaboration between AT and the Waiheke Local Board has been central in shaping the united vision and purpose set out in this Plan. The MoU has provided the guiding framework for the delivery of the Plan and has enhanced the working relationship between AT and the Local Board by outlining roles, outcomes and how to work together. It also supports the priorities and aspirations of both the Local Board and the Waiheke community by allowing the Local Board to have a greater voice in influencing AT activities.

- Development of a 10-year Transport Plan for Waiheke
- Maintaining an up to date issues register accessible to both parties
- Meeting and workshop regularly (at least monthly)
- Sharing annual infrastructure planning and maintenance documents
- Development of transport design guidelines which reflect the island’s character
- Improving integration with council units with connecting roles (e.g. Healthy Waters)
- Developing and maintaining a rolling three year work programme
- Having accurate and regularly reported transport data
- AT including formal reports focusing on Waiheke transport matters on the Waiheke Local Board’s business meeting agenda at least three monthly
- Advancing public transport on, to and from Waiheke in accordance with the provisions of the Regional Public Transport Plan
- Jointly reporting to AT’s Executive Leadership Team and Auckland Council’s Joint Governance Working Party as appropriate

THE KEY PRIORITIES OUTLINED IN THE MOU
INTRODUCING THE PLAN
Partnering with Mana Whenua

TE ARANGA MĀORI DESIGN PRINCIPLES

**MANA RANGATIRATANGA AUTHORITY**
The status of iwi and hapū as mana whenua is recognised and respected.

**WHAKAPAPA NAMES AND NAMING**
Māori names are celebrated.

**TE TĀIAO THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT**
The natural environment is protected, restored and/or enhanced.

**MAURI TU ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH**
Environmental health is protected, maintained and/or enhanced.

**MAHI TOI CREATIVE EXPRESSION**
Iwi/hapū narratives are captured and expressed creatively and appropriately.

**NGĀ TOHU THE WIDER CULTURAL LANDSCAPE**
Mana whenua significant sites and cultural landmarks are acknowledged.

**ĀHI KĀ THE LIVING PRESENCE**
Iwi/hapū have a living and enduring presence and are secure and valued within their rohe.

This Plan places great importance on the value of working kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face) and ringaringa ki te ringaringa (hand in hand) with mana whenua.

As our Treaty partners, we are committed to engaging with, involving, and understanding the views of mana whenua, particularly in the protection and recognition of sites and values in relation to the Plan.

Desired outcomes for this Plan are:

- AT has a clear, documented statement of the cultural sites and values held for the proposed project areas by mana whenua and any effects the proposed projects may have on these sites and values.

- The Te Aranga mana whenua design principles are incorporated into the design of the proposed projects as applicable.

- Enrichment of AT’s knowledge of mana whenua sites and values for the geographic areas related to this Plan.
Engagement on the Plan

Auckland Transport began engagement on the draft Plan in July 2019, through hui with mana whenua, as well as mataawakia at the Waiheke marae.

A launch event was held on 25 July 2019, led by Auckland Transport Chief Executive Shane Ellison and Waiheke Local Board Chair Cath Handley and in front of a large group of stakeholders.

Over the next four weeks, public consultation was held on the draft Plan, with a dedicated webpage to communicate the plan and collect feedback. The project team also held drop-in sessions on weekends at Matiatia Wharf, Waiheke Library and Oneroa Memorial Hall. Each household was provided with a brochure outlining the proposals and a feedback form. The project team also held meetings with some stakeholders, such as local schools.

450 individual pieces of feedback were received, representing a great result and a strong voice from the community.

Consultation closed on 25 August and the project team reviewed the responses and assessed the necessary changes. The following pages outline what you, the public, told us, and what changes we have made to the Plan in response.
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Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan

TOP POPULAR PROJECTS

2 Speed reduction and management
33 Cycling to school
75 New footpath along section of Brown Rd
1 Kennedy Point Masterplan
48 Walking to school
8 Causeway Road pedestrian/cycling provision
105 Improve storm water quality
102 Upgrade Brown Rd
5 Walking and cycling access - Oceanview Road
7 Surfside Road pedestrian/cycling provision
106 Road erosion prevention measures
26 New Park and Ride - Ostend
107 Upgrade unserved roads
101 EV charging stations
46 Coastal Pathways - Expand to Te Haruhi School
6 Active Transport missing link - Otetangi Road
48 NZ cycle trail extension
35 Road sealing on Man O'War Bay Rd
11 Active Transport missing link - Donald Bruce Road

LEAST POPULAR PROJECTS

35 Road sealing on Man O'War Bay Rd
2 Speed reduction and management
104 Road Caming - Tewhia Dr
1 Kennedy Point Masterplan
63 Road Caming - Frank St
60 Road Caming - Bay Rd
58 Road Caming - Esplanade
57 Road Caming - Manukia Rd
19 Road caming along Donald Bruce Rd
103 Road Caming - Moko St
67 Road Caming - Coromandel Rd
63 Road Caming - Pohutukawa St/Whakanui Rd
55 Road Caming along Ostend Rd
10 New footpath on section of Goodwin Rd
107 Upgrade unserved roads
101 EV charging stations
102 Upgrade Brown Rd
32 Road Caming along O'Brien Rd
31 Footpath widening on Causeway Rd
27 Little Gneroa bridge
25 New footpath on section of Waiheke Rd
12 Active Transport missing link - Goodwin Ave/Hauraki Ave
99 Electric bikes scheme
30 Wharf Rd improvements
17 Active Transport missing link - O'Brien Road
14 Extend footpath on Donald Bruce Road
82 Active Transport missing link - Mission Drive
80 Surfside Park and Ride - Hamilton Rd
56 Road re-engineering on Awaawarara Rd
7 Surfside Road pedestrian/cycling provision
77 New footpath along Beach Parade
69 Road sealing - Taurite St
49 NZ cycle trail extension
41 Active Transport missing link - Cory Rd
34 Intersection upgrade - Donald Bruce Rd/ Causeway Rd/Alison Rd
26 Active Transport missing link - Ostend Rd
22 New footpath along section of Goodwin Ave
20 Active Transport missing link - Coromandel Rd
18 Belgium St Improvements
8 Causeway Road pedestrian/cycling provision

FEEDBACK
What you told us

The community provided their view on what were the most important and least important projects, as well as suggesting new projects not in the draft Plan. Some key recurring feedback themes were:

- Improve road safety and reduce speeds
- Increase the number of footpaths and cycleways on the island, particularly to make travel safe for school children
- Protect the negative impacts of the transport network on the environment, particularly the impacts of stormwater runoff and erosion of the coastal areas
- Ensure that Waiheke’s character is reflected in the design of the transport network, including the roads, public transport network, footpaths and cycleways.

SPREAD OF RESPONDENTS

- I live on Waiheke
- Other
- I work/study on Waiheke
- I run/own a business on Waiheke
- I am a regular visitor
- I own property on Waiheke but don't live there

Some projects proved either unpopular, or polarising. There was support for and opposition to:

- road sealing of Man O’War Bay Road
- speed reduction and management
- a Kennedy Point master planning exercise
- among others.
### What you said about...

### ROAD SURFACE QUALITY
- Desire for more action
- Support for unique style of roads
- Mixed views on sealing, kerbing

### CULTURAL HERITAGE
- Important to preserve – part of identity
- Needs to be built into projects

### FOOTPATHS / CYCLEWAYS
- Strong support in many locations

### ROAD SPEEDS
- Strong support for safety improvements
- Opposition to specific roads and some polarisation

### ENVIRONMENT
- Desire for stronger action and more coordination between agencies

### SIGNAGE
- Desire for signage to reflect the island
- Desire for less signage clutter, but more information

### What you wanted added

### ROAD MAINTENANCE
- Quicker maintenance and strong resilience of the road network
- Mixed views on sealing roads

### ROAD SAFETY
- Acknowledgement of the safety problem and desire for a complete safe route between key destinations

### PUBLIC TRANSPORT
- Desire for more bus services, particularly for ferry connections and connecting park and rides

### ACTIVE TRANSPORT
- More bike parking and storage at ferry terminals
- More cycleways specifically catering to tourists

### PARKING
- Desire for more parking (and different parking types) at ferry terminals and shops

### CONGESTION
- Concern about congestion at key locations, such as Ostend and Matiatia

---

**Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan**

---

**Waiheke Local Board**

**27 May 2020**
FEEDBACK
Mana Whenua and Mataawaka

We received valuable feedback from mana whenua, as well as the mataawaka on Waiheke, which is incorporated into the final Plan.

- Amend the criteria to split ‘character’ into separate criteria to consider the cultural character and environmental character – as both need protecting.
- Ensure that resilience and future-proofing is incorporated into the construction of roads and paths, given the risks for Waiheke from climate change and associated sea level rise.
- Set up processes for protection of uncovered artefacts / koirí which involves the community.
- Provide for recognition of the waahi tapu on the Matiatia waterfront.
- Incorporate cultural heritage into projects, no matter the size and into signage.
- Mitigating stormwater run-off effects should be a high priority and coordination between AT and Healthy Waters (and other agencies as appropriate) should occur as normal practice.
- Improve pathways to provide connections, as long as they are servicing a purpose which supports community needs.
- Take accident locations into consideration as key areas needing action.
- Ensure that the island’s unique road designs are maintained, while increasing safety for more vulnerable users, such as children. This should include perceptions of safety.
What we have changed

As a result of the consultation we have made a number of changes to the Plan, in terms of the approach to the Plan, which affect the results.

The most important change was to amend the scoring criteria, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW SCORING METHODOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic fulfilment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Character</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was changed to reflect the feedback from our partners and stakeholders around the need for more environmental focus and also to ensure that community feedback was part of the prioritisation process.

In addition, we have amended the way the projects are set out - instead of a single list of all projects we are displaying them in groups by project type to reflect that projects do not necessarily need to compete with each other for priority where they are not being progressed or funded by the same area of Auckland Transport.

We have also removed from the priority list the ‘process’ items. Each of these received significant positive public feedback and, as such, we are going to endorse them for incorporation into our standard practices.

We have also added projects which were not in the initial draft Plan, but which came through in the public consultation process. While they are not prioritised, they are identified, with a view to added them into the full Plan at a future point in time.
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Attachment A
### AT's continuing delivery on Waiheke

**AT has a large number of existing and ongoing projects on Waiheke. These are outlined under categories below.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUS SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
<th>FERRY INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS</th>
<th>MAINTENANCE AND RENEWAL</th>
<th>MATIATIA LAND-SIDE IMPROVEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT has implemented a new bus network on Waiheke. This has included the continuing roll-out of a suite of new bus stops and shelters for Waiheke, using a new design, as well as improved customer information. While driver shortages have resulted in the short term cancellation of bus route 50B and delayed the implementation of route 501, these remain part of AT’s plan for Waiheke.</td>
<td>AT is in the process of making upgrades to various components of the ferry terminals on Waiheke. Regular maintenance, together with improvements to customer experience, is continuing at all locations.</td>
<td>AT manages a continuing programme of maintenance and renewal on Waiheke, ensuring that on-road assets are fit for purpose, safe and reliable. These works are part of a region-wide programme.</td>
<td>The current Regional Land Transport Plan (2018) secured funding for a business case for improvements to the Matiatia ferry terminal and surrounding area, including the parking areas. This project is continuing to progress and partner, stakeholder and community consultation is planned to occur during 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The top projects

As a result of the new ranking process which split the character criteria and added in the outcomes of the public feedback, a new final list of ranked projects has been prepared. The top projects by project type are shown below and the full list is an appendix. Note that some of the high scoring projects are processes rather than projects, and they are outlined on the following pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD PROJECTS</th>
<th>PUBLIC TRANSPORT</th>
<th>ACTIVE TRANSPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed reduction</td>
<td>New Park and ride at Ostend</td>
<td>Cycleway provision to schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety improvements Ostend Road</td>
<td>New park and ride at Surfdale (Hamilton Rd)</td>
<td>Pedestrian facility improvements around schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection upgrade Belgium/Ostend/Whakarite</td>
<td></td>
<td>Causeway Road active transport facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium Street improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oceanview Road active transport facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming on Donald Bruce Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surfdale Road active transport facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive upgrade of eastern loop road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our new processes/approach

In addition to specific projects, AT sought feedback on a number of changes to processes which would affect the island as a whole. The response was strongly positive to these and therefore they are all being endorsed to become standard AT practice for all work going forward.

- Waiheke road hierarchy
- Accessibility lens
- Stormwater and erosion management
- Waiheke design guide
- Cultural incorporation into projects

Details of these are provided on the following pages.

Auckland Transport will plan Waiheke's roads in accordance with an agreed hierarchy for the road network. This creates a hierarchy of roads, allocated based on role and usage. Different design outcomes will be delivered for the different street types.

Auckland Transport will develop a Waiheke specific design guide, as it has done for Waitakere Ranges. This design guide will provide for an agreed approach to road layout design which both ensures safety for all users and protects and enhances the unique character of Waiheke.
Our new processes/approach

Auckland Transport understands that Waiheke residents care greatly for the natural environment and wish to ensure that the operation of the island ensures its long term sustainability. There are concerns about:

- Coastal erosion
- Sea-level rise and resilience
- Stormwater runoff and management

Auckland Transport will work closely with other agencies, including Auckland Council and Healthy Waters to coordinate activities, plan transport system upgrades and ensure the transport system supports the long-term liveability of Waiheke. Approach to road layout design which both ensures safety for all users and protects and maintains the unique character of Waiheke.

Auckland Transport recognises that the unique character of cultural history of Waiheke should be reinforced through its transport system and environment. Auckland Transport will therefore look at ways to incorporate this character and culture into its projects. This has already started with projects like the new bus shelter programme.

The Waiheke bus shelter programme was a collaborative effort between local Waiheke artist, Sally Smith and Ngāti Paoa Trust artist, Michael Paki to produce artworks for the glass panels of the shelters. The Waiheke Local Board requested the new bus shelters design would inherit the existing bus shelter design through colour scheme.

By engaging with local artists to create artwork for the Waiheke bus shelters, the project produced a respected public asset that is embraced and valued by its users. The artwork applied offers an organic approach in deterring vandalism to the shelters whilst contributing to the local community and urban landscape.
What is achieved if the plan is realised

If the key projects of the Plan come to fruition, it will result in a step change to the transport system for Waiheke.
THE NEXT ACTIONS
Now that the Plan is finalised, the work can begin! Auckland Transport will focus on four areas over the coming years in relation to the Plan:

- collaboration and joint ongoing planning with the Local Board
- continuing to deliver the existing projects, plans and processes we have committed to
- progressing the delivery of the Plan and its associated projects
- monitoring and reiterating the Plan regularly as things change and progress.

**COLLABORATION & JOINT PLANNING**

**ONGOING**

Through the MoU and ongoing partnerships, AT will meet regularly with the Local Board throughout the 10-year period to update project information and allow for new projects to be added for future consideration to meet Waiheke’s evolving needs.

**DELIVERING EXISTING COMMITTED PROJECTS**

**MID 2019 – MID 2021**

- Ongoing maintenance and renewal
- Ongoing committed projects
- Implementation of policies and processes

**DELIVERING THE PLAN**

**2021 – 2031**

- Future proposed prioritised projects will be considered as part of the draft Regional Land Transport Plan in mid-2021.
- AT will work with the Local Board to develop a process for reviewing the draft RLTP issued for public consultation.

**MONITORING & ITERATING THE PLAN**

**ONGOING**

- As outlined in the MoU, the Plan will be monitored and updated through a detailed issues register, as well as through regular meetings, workshops and reporting.
- AT is committing to reporting regularly to the Local Board on the Plan’s implementation progress.
## Appendix 1 - Complete prioritised project and process list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Original Rank</th>
<th>Final Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kennedy Point Masterplan</td>
<td>Improve parking at Kennedy Point and make improvements to road. Develop a second vessel loading ramp to enable 'all tide' operation.</td>
<td>Kennedy Point</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Speed reduction and management</td>
<td>Investigate reducing speed limits on most streets throughout the island to a maximum of 30km/h and form dedicated shared spaces on low-order streets.</td>
<td>Island-wide: Nikau Rd, Manuka Rd, Mako Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Cycling to school</td>
<td>Provide cycle paths along school routes.</td>
<td>Island-wide</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Walking to school</td>
<td>Improve walking routes around schools, especially on Alison Rd and Seaview Rd.</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Causeway Road pedestrian/cycling provision</td>
<td>Construct an improved and dedicated pedestrian and cycle facility along Causeway Road.</td>
<td>3 Donald Bruce Rd to 43 Causeway Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Walking and cycling access - Oceanview Road</td>
<td>Improve walking and cycling access on Oceanview Road.</td>
<td>Oneroa (Village to Matiatia)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Surfdale Road pedestrian/cycling provision</td>
<td>Construct an improved and dedicated pedestrian and cycle facility along Surfdale Road.</td>
<td>Surfdale Rd (from Oceanview Rd), along Hamilton Rd, Miami Ave, Mitchell Rd and Alison Rd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Active Transport missing links - Surfdale Road</td>
<td>Improve cycle lane markings on Surfdale Road and where possible split shared path.</td>
<td>Surfdale Rd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - Surfdale Road</td>
<td>Separate the cycle lanes on Surfdale Road.</td>
<td>Surfdale Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - Onetangi Road</td>
<td>Extend existing cycle path along Onetangi Road to complete missing sections from Waiata Rd to Trig Hill Rd.</td>
<td>Onetangi Road (Waiata Rd to Trig Hill Rd)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Safety improvements on Ostend Road</td>
<td>Improve safety at 79 Ostend Rd (opposite Placemakers).</td>
<td>79 Ostend Road (opposite Placemakers Centre)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - Donald Bruce Road</td>
<td>Complete cycle lanes along both sides of Donald Bruce Road and where possible split shared path.</td>
<td>Donald Bruce Rd (full length to Kennedy Point)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref Number</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - The Causeway</td>
<td>Complete cycle lane on The Causeway and where possible split shared path.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>New Park and Ride - Ostend</td>
<td>Construct a new Park and Ride in Ostend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NZ cycle trail extension</td>
<td>Extend existing NZ cycle trail to provide cycle routes on the island.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>75-103 Onehunga Rd</td>
<td>Install a new footpath between 75 Onehunga Rd and 103 Onehunga Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>24 Goodwin Ave to Hekeura Rd</td>
<td>Install new footpath between 24 Goodwin Ave and Hekeura Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Donald Bruce Rd to existing</td>
<td>Install new footpath from 24 Donald Bruce Rd to existing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Donald Bruce Road</td>
<td>Donald Bruce Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Goodwin Ave, Hauroko Rd</td>
<td>Goodwin Ave, Hauroko Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ostend Rd to existing</td>
<td>Ostend Rd to existing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Donald Bruce Rd (O'His).</td>
<td>Donald Bruce Rd (O'His).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Donald Bruce Rd (Causeway)</td>
<td>Donald Bruce Rd (Causeway).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Belgium St</td>
<td>Belgium St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ostend Rd/Whakarite Rd</td>
<td>Ostend Rd/Whakarite Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Belgium St/Whakarite Rd</td>
<td>Belgium St/Whakarite Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Donald Bruce Rd (Causeway)</td>
<td>Donald Bruce Rd (Causeway).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Donald Bruce Rd (O'His).</td>
<td>Donald Bruce Rd (O'His).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Donald Bruce Rd (Causeway)</td>
<td>Donald Bruce Rd (Causeway).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Loop road (Man O'War Bay Rd)</td>
<td>Loop road (Man O'War Bay Rd).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Loop road (Coves Bay Rd)</td>
<td>Loop road (Coves Bay Rd).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Road to Shelley Beach Rd</td>
<td>Road to Shelley Beach Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Road to Shelley Beach Rd</td>
<td>Road to Shelley Beach Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Road to Shelley Beach Rd</td>
<td>Road to Shelley Beach Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Road to Shelley Beach Rd</td>
<td>Road to Shelley Beach Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Road to Shelley Beach Rd</td>
<td>Road to Shelley Beach Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Road to Shelley Beach Rd</td>
<td>Road to Shelley Beach Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref Number</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Original Rank</td>
<td>Final Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>New footpath along section of Brown Rd</td>
<td>Install a new footpath along Brown Rd (Sea View Rd to the end).</td>
<td>Brown Rd (Seaview Rd to end)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - Alison Park</td>
<td>Complete missing sections of cycle lanes along Alison Park.</td>
<td>Alison Park, Oceanview Rd, Oneroa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>New footpath along section of Goodwin Ave</td>
<td>Install a new footpath between Little Oneroa shops to connect with existing pathway on Goodwin Ave.</td>
<td>Goodwin Ave (Little Oneroa shops to existing pathway)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - Belgium Street</td>
<td>Create cycle lane and widen footpath on Belgium St.</td>
<td>Belgium St</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>New footpath on section of Waiheke Rd</td>
<td>Install new footpath between Onetangi Road and 72 Waiheke Road.</td>
<td>Waiheke Rd (Onetangi Rd to 72 Waiheke Rd)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>New footpath on section of Church Bay Rd</td>
<td>Install new footpath from 61 Church Bay Rd to 127 Church Bay Rd.</td>
<td>Church Bay Rd (61 Church Bay Rd to 127 Church Bay Rd)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Improve storm water quality</td>
<td>Improve storm water quality on the island by upgrading pipes in road reserves.</td>
<td>Island-wide</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Road erosion prevention measures</td>
<td>Put measures in place to prevent road erosion and protect beaches.</td>
<td>Fourth Ave, The Strand, Natzka Rd, The Esplanade, Blackpool Bay</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Upgrade unsealed roads</td>
<td>Improve the quality of various unsealed roads around the island.</td>
<td>Island-wide</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Little Oneroa bridge</td>
<td>Improve safety on Little Oneroa bridge and ensure multi-modal function.</td>
<td>Little Oneroa Bridge (Goodwin Ave)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Intersection upgrade - Donald Bruce Rd/Causeway Rd/Alison Rd</td>
<td>Improve safety at Donald Bruce Rd/Causeway Rd/Alison Rd intersection and enhance multi-modal function.</td>
<td>Donald Bruce Rd/Causeway Rd/Alison Rd</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Secure cycle parking at Matiatia</td>
<td>Provide secure cycle parking at Matiatia wharf.</td>
<td>Matiatia</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Road sealing on Man O'War Bay Rd</td>
<td>Seal the first 200m of Man O'War Bay Rd.</td>
<td>Man O'War Bay Rd (first 200m)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Surfdale Park and Ride - Hamilton Rd</td>
<td>Investigate the need for a Park and Ride on Hamilton Rd (Surfdale).</td>
<td>Hamilton Rd</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref Number</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Original Rank</td>
<td>Final Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Road re-engineering on Awaawaroa Rd</td>
<td>Re-engineer Awaawaroa Rd to reduce sedimentation into protected wetland.</td>
<td>Awaawaroa Rd</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Accessibility lens</td>
<td>Upgrade footpaths (including lip removals and kerb cut-downs) and audit all mobility parking (bring up to NZ54121 standard).</td>
<td>Island wide</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - Ostend Rd (high end)</td>
<td>Separate shared path into footpath &amp; cycle lane with flat beam between lane and road</td>
<td>Ostend Rd - high end</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>New footpath along section of Ocean Rd</td>
<td>Install new footpath on Ocean Rd (85 Ocean Rd to Kennedy Rd).</td>
<td>Ocean Rd (85 Ocean Rd to Kennedy Rd)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - Tui St/Moa Ave</td>
<td>Extend grass footpath on Tui St and Moa Ave.</td>
<td>Tui St, Moa Ave</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>New footpath along section of Cory Rd</td>
<td>Install new footpath on Cory Rd (44 Cory Rd to Hill Rd).</td>
<td>Cory Rd (44 Cory Rd to Hill Rd)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - Queens Dr/Pacific Parade</td>
<td>Extend grass footpath on Queens Drive and Pacific Parade and complement with concrete footpath where possible.</td>
<td>Queens Drive, Pacific Parade</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>New footpath on section of Sea View Rd</td>
<td>Install new footpath from 63 Sea View Road to Onetangi Road.</td>
<td>Sea View Rd (63 Sea View Rd to Onetangi Rd)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>New footpath on section of Sea View Rd</td>
<td>Install new footpath on Sea View Rd (Brown Rd to Seventh Ave).</td>
<td>Sea View Rd (Brown Rd to Seventh Ave)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coastal Pathways - Esplanade to Te Huruhi School</td>
<td>Upgrade 4.5km pathway to provide safe school and tourist route linking The Esplanade to Donald Bruce Rd.</td>
<td>Esplanade to Donald Bruce Rd</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>New footpath along section of Mako St</td>
<td>Install new footpath on Mako St (Between Ocean View Rd and Tui St).</td>
<td>Mako St (Ocean View Rd to Tui St)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - Sea View Rd</td>
<td>Extend grass footpath where possible; complement with concrete footpath</td>
<td>Sea View Rd</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Coastal Pathways - Owahanake</td>
<td>Upgrade 1.2km of the Owahanake pathway (Korora Rd to Oceanview Rd).</td>
<td>Owahanake (Korora Rd to Oceanview Rd)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Upgrade Brown Rd</td>
<td>Upgrade unsealed road to sealed road</td>
<td>Brown Rd full length</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref Number</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Original Rank</td>
<td>Final Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>New footpath along section of Sea View Rd</td>
<td>Footpath installation along this Sea View Rd (Erua Rd to View Rd).</td>
<td>Sea View Rd (Erua Rd to View Rd)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Footpath improvement - Ostend Rd</td>
<td>Improve the footpath and supermarket parking bays on Ostend Rd (Belgium St to Putiki Rd) and add a cycle lane.</td>
<td>Ostend Rd (Belgium St to Putiki Rd)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - Waiheke Road</td>
<td>Extend grass footpath on Waiheke Rd and complement with concrete footpath where possible.</td>
<td>Waiheke Rd</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Coastal Pathways - Water-right Gully</td>
<td>Upgrade 1.2km of the path (Oceanview Rd to Church Bay Rd) and widen to 2 metres.</td>
<td>Water-right Gully (Oceanview Rd to Church)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>New footpath - Manuka Rd</td>
<td>Install a new footpath along the full length of Manuka Road.</td>
<td>Manuka Rd (full length)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Coastal Pathways - Church Bay to Marae</td>
<td>Upgrade 500m of pathway and widen to 2 metres. Re-gravel existing farm track from Marae.</td>
<td>Church Bay to Marae (Church Bay Rd to)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>New footpath along section of Third Ave</td>
<td>Install a new footpath on Third Ave (Waiheke Rd to existing path opposite 3 Third Ave).</td>
<td>Third Ave (Waiheke Rd to existing path opposite 3 Third Ave)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Coastal Pathways - High route past Church</td>
<td>Upgrade 500m of off-road pathway to concrete.</td>
<td>High route past Church (Beach Pde to Goodwin Ave)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>New footpath along Totara Rd</td>
<td>Install a new footpath along the full length of Totara Rd.</td>
<td>Totara Rd (full length)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Coastal Pathways - Junction Rd to Wilma Rd</td>
<td>Install a new 700m off-road grass connection path.</td>
<td>Junction Rd to Wilma Rd</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Coastal Pathways - Te Toki to Sports Club</td>
<td>Install a new 1km off-road gravel and boardwalk path.</td>
<td>Te Toki to sports club (Wilma Rd to Causeway Rd)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Coastal Pathways - Thompson's Point link</td>
<td>Install a new 1km off-road connection path.</td>
<td>Thompsons Pt link (Hill Rd to Sea View Rd)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Coastal Pathways - Stony Ridge tracks</td>
<td>Install a new 4.4km off-road gravel and grass path.</td>
<td>Stony Ridge (Sea View Rd to Onetangi Rd to Sea View Rd)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Coastal Pathways - Fisher Rd &amp; Forest &amp; Bird</td>
<td>Widen path to 2 metres and upgrade to compacted gravel with a separate bridle path.</td>
<td>Fisher Rd &amp; Forest &amp; Bird</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref Number</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Original Rank</td>
<td>Final Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Coastal Pathways - Sports Park to Trig Hill</td>
<td>Hill Rd to Waiheke Rd</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Coastal Pathways - Te Wihau coastal route</td>
<td>Te Wihau coastal</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>New footpath along Burrell Rd</td>
<td>Burrell Rd (full length)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - Ostend Rd</td>
<td>Ostend Rd</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Waiheke Road Hierarchy</td>
<td>Walkare Rd (between Korora Rd and Oceanview Rd).</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>New footpath along Walkare Rd</td>
<td>Walkare Rd eastern veges</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>Coastal Pathways upgrade - Wharf</td>
<td>Wharf Rd to Ostend Rd</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Coastal Pathways - Central Track to Rocky Bay</td>
<td>Central Track to Rocky Bay (full length)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Coastal Pathways - Central Track to Rocky Bay</td>
<td>Central Track to Rocky Bay (full length)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Waiheke Road Hierarchy</td>
<td>Walkare Rd (between Korora Rd and Oceanview Rd).</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>New footpath along Kennedy Rd</td>
<td>Kennedy Rd (full length)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Wharf Rd improvements</td>
<td>Wharf Rd to Ostend Rd</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Accessibility lens</td>
<td>Oceanview Rd to Whakarewarea</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Accessibility lens</td>
<td>Rocky Bay Rd</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Road Calming along O'Brien Rd</td>
<td>Central Track to O'Brien Rd</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming measures on Manukau Rd</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming measures on Manukau Rd</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming measures on the Esplanade</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming measures on the Esplanade</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Road Calming - Bay Rd</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming measures on Bay Rd</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref Number</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Original Rank</td>
<td>Final Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - Wharf Rd</td>
<td>Separate the footpath from the cycleway on Wharf Rd.</td>
<td>Wharf Road</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - Cory Rd</td>
<td>Create grass footpath on Cory Rd from the lookout to Junction Rd.</td>
<td>Cory Road (the lookout to Junction Rd)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Road Calming - Potai St/Whakarite Rd</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming measures on Potai St/Whakarite Rd.</td>
<td>Potai St/Whakarite Rd</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>New footpath along section of Putiki Rd</td>
<td>Install a new footpath along Putiki Rd (Wharf Rd to Ostend Rd).</td>
<td>Putiki Rd (Wharf Rd to Ostend Rd)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - Erua Rd</td>
<td>Create grass footpath on Erua Rd where possible.</td>
<td>Erua Rd</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Road Calming - Frank St</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming measures on Frank St.</td>
<td>Frank St</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>EV charging stations</td>
<td>Provide charging stations for electric vehicles at key points on the island.</td>
<td>Island-wide</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Road sealing - Taraire St</td>
<td>Seal the first 200m of Taraire St.</td>
<td>Taraire St (first 200m)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Road Calming along Ostend Rd</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming measures between on Ostend Rd (between Erua Rd and O’Brien Rd)</td>
<td>Ostend Rd (Erua Rd to O’Brien Rd)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Road Calming - Coromandel Rd</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming measures on Coromandel Rd.</td>
<td>Coromandel Rd</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>New footpath along section of Tawa St</td>
<td>Install a new footpath on Tawa St (Hua St to Kiwi St).</td>
<td>Tawa St (Hua St to Kiwi St)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - 4th Avenue</td>
<td>Create cycle lane on 4th Avenue (between The Strand and Trig Hill Road).</td>
<td>4th Avenue (The Strand to Trig Hill Rd)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>New footpath along Moana Ave</td>
<td>Install a new footpath along the full length of Moana Ave.</td>
<td>Moana Ave (full length)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>New footpath along section of Seventh Ave</td>
<td>Install a new footpath on Seventh Ave (between Seaview Rd and The Strand)</td>
<td>Seventh Ave (Seaview Rd to The Strand)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Active Transport missing links - Beatty Parade</td>
<td>Create a concrete footpath on Beatty Parade up to the end of industrial area.</td>
<td>Beatty Parade (up to the end of the industrial area)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>New footpath along Beach Parade</td>
<td>Install a new footpath along the full length of Beach Parade.</td>
<td>Beach Parade (full length)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref Number</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Original Rank</td>
<td>Final Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Electric bikes scheme</td>
<td>Install a new electric bikes scheme.</td>
<td>Island-wide</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>New footpath along section of Erua Rd</td>
<td>Install a new footpath on Erua Rd (Ostend Rd to Poho Rd).</td>
<td>Erua Rd (Ostend Rd to Poho Rd)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Waitai Rd improvements</td>
<td>Improve access and safety on Waitai Rd.</td>
<td>Waitai Rd</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Active Transport missing link - Musson Drive</td>
<td>Create a grass footpath along the full length of Musson Drive.</td>
<td>Musson Drive</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Road Calming - Mako St</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming measures on Mako St.</td>
<td>Mako St (Ocean View Rd to Tui St)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Road Calming - Te Whau Dr</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming measures on Te Whau Dr.</td>
<td>Te Whau Dr</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To outline next steps to complete and implement the Mātiatia Plan.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. In July 2019 the Waiheke Local Board (the board) approved the Stage 1 Mātiatia Plan consisting of principles, transport and non-transport outcomes and a broad land-use plan. The board and Auckland Transport are working together on development of a final Mātiatia Plan and its implementation.

3. Auckland Transport has engaged consultants to prepare a business case to advance the transport outcomes which cover land managed by Auckland Transport. This requires both Auckland Transport and NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) approval to access the $15.3m budget sitting in the 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan.

4. Three shortlisted transport options have been developed for discussion with the Waiheke community, involving safety and environmental improvements, carparking and road layout, transport operator activities, use of the keyhole, and connections (walkways, cycling etc). The Mātiatia Plan team expects to consult on these starting in June 2020 with separate key stakeholder sessions.

5. Funding for non-transport outcomes requires a separate business case being developed for approval by Auckland Council. Preliminary work to develop non-transport outcomes is advancing on a slower programme due to COVID-19 procurement delays. It is expected the Waiheke community will be engaged on these after the transport elements although the June consultation is expected to include some questions to support this subsequent work.

6. Business cases for transport and non-transport outcomes will be completed and lodged post consultation on the short-list options then the preferred option. The board will then adopt a final Mātiatia Plan enabling implementation subject to funding being confirmed.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) support community engagement on three transport options for Mātiatia commencing in June 2020 with separate key stakeholder sessions followed by a wider public consultation using public meetings (COVID-19 dependent), an online platform and information distributed to households.

b) note that community engagement on non-transport options for Mātiatia will commence at a later date once COVID-19 procurement delays are resolved with some questions to help inform non-transport outcomes being included in the June 2020 consultation.

c) confirm that a final Mātiatia Plan consisting of all agreed transport and non-transport outcomes following public consultation including on shortlist transport options followed by the preferred option, will be formally adopted by the board.

d) note that Auckland Transport has allocated $15.3m in the 2018/19 to 2021/22 years to implement transport elements of the Mātiatia Plan and that as this budget includes
New Zealand Transport Agency funding, it will also require approval from the agency.

e) note that Auckland Transport expects to commence works to deliver on the transport outcomes for Mātiatia once the business case and the transport elements of the Mātiatia Plan are formally approved and funding is secured.

f) note that the current budget is expected to be inadequate to deliver on all these outcomes, the final Mātiatia Plan is expected to prioritise elements which have the widest community and agency support.

g) confirm its earlier commitment to allocate the bulk of its Transport Capital Fund to support delivery of transport outcomes at Mātiatia.

Horopaki

Context

Mātiatia Plan

7. Developing and implementing a plan for the future use of public land at Mātiatia has been an aspiration of the Waiheke community for a very long time. Current work to progress this follows:

   i) the board being delegated land use and development decisions at Mātiatia

   ii) the board agreeing that Mātiatia was its No.1 priority for funding under Auckland Council’s “One Local Initiative” programme

   iii) Auckland Transport establishing a $15.3m budget in its Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) in 2018/19 to 2021/22

   iv) Auckland Transport and the board working together to deliver and implement the Mātiatia Plan under their agreed Memorandum of Understanding

8. During 2018-19, a Mātiatia Stage 1 Plan consisting of land use areas, principles and transport and non-transport outcomes was developed (see Attachment A). Resolutions approving this at the board’s July 2019 business meeting also confirmed that a Stage 2 final Mātiatia Plan including detailed design and layout proposals would be developed and publicly consulted on once options for development at Mātiatia are identified.

Advancing Mātiatia transport outcomes

9. Work to prepare a business case to advance the transport outcomes has been underway since late 2019 when Auckland Transport engaged WSP Consultants to do this work. WSP has experience in working on transport projects where NZTA part funding is required – 51% of the $15.3m transport budget for Mātiatia is assumed to come from NZTA.

10. WSP developed a long-list of transport options in discussion with Auckland Transport representatives and mana whenua and workshopped this with the board in December 2019. WSP has since developed a shortlist of transport options which was workshopped with the board in April 2020. These are discussed further below

Advancing Mātiatia non-transport outcomes

11. The board has allocated $90,000 to engage a separate team at WSP to prepare a framework plan for non-transport outcomes at Mātiatia. Using WSP provides synergy and coordination between the transport and non-transport workstreams. This work was due to commence just prior to the COVID-19 lockdown and the contract is currently on hold with no date for work to recommence determined.

12. Funding to develop a business case based on the framework plan is still required.

Proposed community engagement approach

13. A consultation plan is currently being developed initially focusing on these three shortlist transport options which will be consulted on first. It is proposed that workshops be held first
with key stakeholders as was done for the Mātiatia Stage 1 Plan, followed by wider community engagement.

14. It is anticipated that a number of community meetings, possibly in different locations on Waiheke and/or for different communities will be held. The timing and approach to these will be informed by COVID-19 regulations. An online platform is also likely. Household mail-outs will also be considered. Community engagement on the non-transport outcomes will commence once the non-transport Mātiatia Framework Plan is complete.

15. It is proposed to include some questions in the transport engagement material seeking the Waiheke community’s views on what land uses and activities it would like to see at Mātiatia alongside transport outcomes. This will help inform the subsequent non-transport work.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Transport options

16. WSP has identified three shortlist transport options that it proposes to engage the Waiheke community on. These were presented to the board at its April 2020 workshop.

17. These options are not addressed in detail in this report, or shown as attachments, as they are still being refined and drawn up. In addition, they need to be explained and supported by commentary and discussion which can’t easily be done in this report. This detail will be provided as part of the community engagement process and associated engagement materials.

18. The key elements of these options are that they:
   i) are based on and consistent with the Mātiatia Stage 1 Plan’s approved transport outcomes
   ii) cover public land at Mātiatia currently used for transport activity
   iii) include parking in the bay and the Owhanake carpark, transport operator needs, functions and use of the keyhole, and supporting infrastructure such as the road network, walkways, cycleways and stormwater management
   iv) support mana whenua aspirations by removing carparks from the site of significance to Maori on the foreshore, which is now formally included in the Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan (see land use plan at Attachment A)

19. The options also take into account the results of the recent ferry users’ travel behavior survey which talks about how people currently travel to Mātiatia and what changes they might make under different circumstances. The following is a snapshot of the key headlines from this survey which will be formally presented and included in business cases at a later date
   - Driving alone (29%) and bus (22%) are most frequently used modes to get to ferry
   - More than half of the surveyed ferry passengers would prefer to arrive by bus or active modes
   - Of those who drove, 81% travelled from within the 10km radius with approximately 60% from within the 5km radius
   - Both bus and cycle users are motivated by a desire to be socially responsible.
   - Safer, dedicated cycleways would encourage more people to cycle.

   Source: Understanding Travel Behaviour of Morning Peak Waiheke Ferry Users Auckland Transport March 2019

20. All three options include the matters listed above. The main difference is that the amount of carparking and associated infrastructure proposed differs based on different levels of bus use, cycling and walking. Developing new carparking at Owhanake is expensive due to terrain and earthworks requirements. The options indicate the level of car parking that could be provided while at the same time providing increased travel mode choice.
Non-Transport outcomes

21. A framework plan approach is planned for the non-transport elements using a landscape and urban design approach to show how the non-transport elements at Mātiatia might be located and developed.

22. The intention had been to progress both transport and non-transport workstreams in parallel so that the Waiheke community could be engaged on a holistic plan. As the non-transport workstream is on hold due to COVID-19 expenditure restrictions, achieving this would require the transport workstream being delayed. This would incur unbudgeted costs and isn’t recommended.

23. Non-transport elements include cultural, environmental/ecological, commercial and open space matters. More work is needed with mana whenua to define cultural aspects and the commercial trial in the Harbourmasters hasn’t made the progress initially anticipated over summer. Delays in the non-transport workstream is therefore not seen as a significant issue in this context.

24. Transport has always been the main issue at Mātiatia and so focusing on this in these circumstances is considered to be necessary and acceptable.

Community engagement

25. Alongside robust content, a comprehensive and well publicised Waiheke community engagement approach is critical to achieving outcomes that can be widely supported. An engagement plan is currently being developed and this will be considered by the board once available.

26. Engagement is expected to be undertaken in a number of stages as follows.

27. Stage 1 will include key stakeholder and subsequent public engagement on these three shortlisted transport options and questions on non-transport ideas. The pre-engagement might repeat the previous stakeholder engagement approach undertaken for the Mātiatia Stage 1 Plan. The summer trail and associated configuration changes attracted a lot of attention and working directly with groups such as transport operators is expected to assist with designing and refining transport options which can then be tested with the wider community.

28. Stage 2 will include consultation on the non-transport options and Stage 3 will include consultation on the preferred transport option. The timing of these might be interchanged depending on progress with the non-transport workstream.

29. The board will then determine what if any further consultation it wishes to undertake to complete the final Mātiatia Plan.

Implementation

30. Implementation of both the transport and non-transport outcomes requires completion and approval of separate business cases. Approval of the transport business case by Auckland Transport and NZTA will unlock budgets already provided in the RLTP.

31. The non-transport business case is yet to be funded and the case for funding will be made to Auckland Council as part of reporting on the One Local Initiative programme. Under this programme each local board was asked to identify one priority project for funding, with Mātiatia being the board’s request.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

32. The Auckland Unitary Plan identifies parts of the foreshore, keyhole area and main stream/wetland at Mātiatia as being susceptible to flooding and coastal inundation under a range of scenarios. It contains provisions for addressing these issues when developments, including roads and carparks are being considered. The transport and non-transport business cases and outcomes will take these into account.
33. The extent to which Mātiatia Plan outcomes address greenhouse gas emissions will also be considered by both workstreams. Promoting transport modes other than single occupancy fossil fuel private car use is expected to be addressed in the transport business case.

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

34. Completion and implementation of the Mātiatia Plan would draw to a close past unsuccessful efforts to develop the Mātiatia bay post its public purchase in 2005. It would also demonstrate the value of the board obtaining the delegation for land-use and development decisions at Mātiatia in 2018.

35. Activities on public land at Mātiatia are under the management of various council units including Auckland Transport (funding and implementation of transport developments), Community Facilities (leases and open space), Healthy Waters (stormwater and wastewater systems) and Community Services (placemaking and service levels). Plans and Places is leading on the development of the Waiheke Area Plan and Mātiatia is a precinct in that plan.

36. All these entities are working with the board on development and implementation of the Mātiatia Plan.

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

37. The Mātiatia Plan is led by the board which is the decision-maker over land owned by Auckland Council at Mātiatia. The board is working in partnership with Auckland Transport which is the decision-maker for the road reserve. This partnership will ensure transport and non-transport activities are integrated.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

38. Mana whenua and tangata whenua are and have been engaged as part of the Mātiatia Plan development and implementation. Most recently the long-list of transport outcomes has been taken to the Auckland Transport Mana Whenua hui.

39. Ngati Paoa has been represented on the Mātiatia Plan project team since 2017 and has a key role due to the existence of a site of significance to Maori covering a significant part of the Mātiatia foreshore and bay. It is anticipated that decisions on recognition, use and development of that area will be made in agreement with Maori. It is expected that removal of carparking within that area will be confirmed when the final Mātiatia Plan is approved and implemented.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

40. Development and implementation of the transport business case is already budgeted by Auckland Transport, subject to NZTA agreeing to its funding contribution. It is proposed that the bulk of the board’s available transport capital fund of $2.2m will be allocated to support these outcomes.


42. It is anticipated that not all parts of the final Mātiatia Plan can be implemented under the above funding. It is expected that the Mātiatia Plan will prioritise implementation using a staged approach as further funding is sought and confirmed.
Risks and mitigations

43. The biggest risk is considered to be that sufficient support or a consensus is not achieved from the Waiheke community to enable completion and implementation of the Mātiatia Plan post community engagement. Work to develop and seek agreement to implementation of interim transport solutions at Mātiatia has already highlighted some of these difficulties.

44. Leadership of this process by the board, in partnership with Auckland Transport is seen as a key element to achieving this and a comprehensive community engagement process reaching all key stakeholders and the wider Waiheke community is essential.

45. If agreement isn’t reached, this would potentially place available funding, and that being sought in doubt. Funding for other stages of the Mātiatia Plan that is expected to be needed in future years will also be considered through the lens of how well the above progresses and delivers. This risk could be exacerbated by COVID-19 budget impacts which are as yet unknown.

46. Reaching agreement with mana whenua and the Waiheke community on the use of land at the Mātiatia foreshore now included as a site of significance to Maori in the Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan, may also be challenging. This matter will be addressed via consultation on implementing final Mātiatia Plan outcomes.

Next steps

47. Consultation on Mātiatia Plan transport outcomes is expected to commence in June. Consultation on non-transport outcomes will follow at a date yet to be determined.

48. This consultation will enable respective business cases to be completed, a final Mātiatia Plan to be approved and funding of its implementation sought and approved. Funding for transport outcomes is included in the RLTP in 2020/21 and 2021/22. Funding for non-transport outcomes will be sought in 2020.
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Mātiatia Plan Stage 1 – Principles and Outcomes

Principles - Mātiatia is:

a. An efficient, safe and accessible multi-modal transport hub for Waiheke
b. An attractive and welcoming gateway to Waiheke with a 'sense of arrival'
c. A significant coastal landscape where the natural environment and ecology is sustainably protected and enhanced
d. A place of special cultural, historic and spiritual value to Ngāti Paoa and other Mana Whenua
e. A place where development is sustainable and reflects the economic, social, cultural and environmental well-beings

Transport Outcomes

a. The Mātiatia Plan's primary focus will be the safe and efficient movement of people and a gateway to Waiheke
b. All public carparking will be user pays to manage demand and encourage more sustainable transport choices
c. Public carpark development will be focused at the Owahake carpark serviced by frequent public transport at peak commuter times and well connected to ferry services, and in the bay away from the immediate foreshore
d. Transport activities nearest the foreshore and terminal will ensure accessibility needs are met, and prioritise the needs of Metro buses and other transport operators, pick up and drop off, mobility parking, cycling and walking, and water access

Other outcomes

e. The foreshore area will be predominantly open space
f. Ngāti Pāoa cultural values will be recognised and reflected in future development
g. No public land will be sold
h. Options for a visitor/cultural centre will be explored
i. Existing bush, wetland and stream areas will be protected and enhanced
j. Off road walkway connections will be created or upgraded
k. Stormwater, erosion and associated issues will be improved to support the above outcomes
l. Commercial development at the bay will be focused on, and located where it supports the above outcomes. It will be lease only and include private parking infrastructure if supported, but exclude residential and visitor accommodation
Stage 1 Matiatia Plan - Landuse Areas

- Movement 1 (general vehicle movement - design & layout to be determined in Stage 2)
- Commercial activity (where it meets Matiatia Plan Outcomes)
- Movement 2 (constricted shared space with vehicle use determined in Stage 2)
- Conservation area (bush, wetlands, streams, walkways)
- Place area (foreshore, generally undeveloped)
- Scheduled Maori heritage site (Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan)
Local board feedback on Plan Change 22 and Plan Modification 12 – additions of places of significance to Mana Whenua

File No.: CP2020/05804

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To request the views of the local board on:
   - Plan Change 22 (PC22) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP)
   - Plan Modification 12 (PM12) to the Auckland Council District Plan – Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2018 (Inner Islands) (HGI).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. In 2014, in collaboration with 19 Mana Whenua entities, Auckland Council (the council) initiated the Māori Cultural Heritage Programme (MCHP) 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 MCHP, the council has proposed two plan changes in order to appropriately recognise and protect culturally significant sites within both the AUP and HGI. 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 AUP and four in the HGI. Note that one site, Te Rangihoua (Te Putiki o Kahumatamomoe), is included in both the AUP and HGI to represent its landward and coastal extents.

5. 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.

6. The details of the sites related to the local board are listed in Attachment A.

7. Key themes of the submissions received are to:
   - support PC22 as notified
   - support PC22 with a 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.

8. On 8 August 2019, the Regulatory Committee appointed three independent hearing commissioners to hear and make decisions on PC22 and PM12 (REG/2019/49). This included at least two independent commissioners with expertise in planning and tikanga Māori.
9. This report is the mechanism for the local board to provide its formal views on PC22 and PM12 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 Waiheke Local Board:

a) provide 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 views at a hearing on the plan changes.

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

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. The AUP currently contains 75 scheduled Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua. There are no Māori Heritage sites currently identified in the HGI Plan.

13. 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.

14. On 27 November 2018, the Planning Committee resolved to approve the proposed plan changes for notification (PLA/2018/128).

15. 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; and

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.
16. 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.

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

18. This report provides an overview of PC22 and 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**

19. The AUP and the 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.

20. 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).

21. 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:**

22. 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.


24. 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.
25. 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.

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

Themes from submissions received

27. 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.

28. 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.

29. 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.

30. 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.

31. One submitter is opposing the scheduling of Rangihoua Park / Onetangi Sports Fields 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.

32. 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-strategies/unitary-plan/auckland-unitary-plan-modifications/proposed-plan-changes/pc22summarydecisions/summary-of-decisions-requested-and-submissions.pdf

33. 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: https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plans-strategies/unitary-plan/auckland-unitary-plan-modifications/proposed-plan-changes/docspc22/pm-12-renotification.pdf

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

34. 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.

35. 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**

36. 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.

37. 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.

38. 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.

39. 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.

40. 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.

41. 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.

42. 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**

43. Further detail such as a map showing the location of the sites relevant to the local board and previous involvement by the board are in Attachment A.

44. 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.

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

46. 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.

47. This report is the mechanism for obtaining formal local board views so the decision-makers on PC22 and PM12 can consider those views.
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Local board feedback on Plan Change 22 and Plan Modification 12 – additions of places of significance to Mana Whenua

Item 20

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

48. 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.

49. 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.

50. 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.

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

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

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

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

53. 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

54. 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>A1</td>
<td>Sites proposed in the local board area and local board views</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Matthew Gouge - Planner AUPIHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>John Duguid - General Manager - Plans and Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louise Mason - General Manager - Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janine Geddes - Acting Relationship Manager - Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local board feedback on Plan Change 22 and Plan Modification 12 – additions of places of significance to Mana Whenua
Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachment A: Waiheke Local Board

1. Of the 33 sites proposed to be scheduled, six¹ nominated sites are located within the Waiheke Local Board area. Council officers met with local board members on 25 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 Waiheke Local Board area are included below.

¹ Noting that one site, Te Rangihoua (Te Pūtiki o Kahumatamomoe) is included in both the HGI and AUP(OIP) to represent its landward and coastal sections.
Figure 2: MHS 2 - Ahipao
Figure 3: MHS 3 - Mātātua
Figure 4: MHS 4 - Te Rangihoia (Te Putiki o Kahumatsamoe)
Figure 5: Site 106 - Te Rangihoua (Te Putiki o Kahumatamoe)

Figure 6: Site 92 - Te Toka a Kapelaua (Bean Rock)
Previous involvement of Waiheke Local Board in PC22 and PM12


4. On 25 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.

---

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 WHK/2018/202

MOVED by Member J Meeuwen, seconded by Member B Upchurch:

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) support the proposed plan changes for Mokemoke and Ahipao (Matietie Historic Reserve), and Te Toka & Kapetua (Bean Rock).

b) request that the proposed plan changes for Matiatia and Te Rangihoa (Te Putiki o Kahumatamo moe) be progressed as part of the formal discussions the Waiheke Local Board and Ngati Paoa that are commencing on these two areas of land.

c) note that the report, resolutions and the feedback remain confidential until the plan change is publicly notified.

CARRIED

6.31 pm

The Chairperson thanked Members for their attendance and attention to business and declared the meeting closed.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD AT A MEETING OF THE WAIHEKE LOCAL BOARD HELD ON

DATE: 

CHAIRPERSON: 

Waiheke Local Parks - Additional Classifications

File No.: CP2020/04479

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To confirm land to be held under the Local Government Act 2002, to make decisions on land status and classification of land under the Reserves Act 1977 and approve public notification where required.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. As part of the classification programme and development of the local parks management plan under the Reserves Act 1977 (RA), additional classification decisions are needed for some local parks in the Waiheke Local Board area (the local board area). The reasons for this are:

- Some parcels were excluded from earlier reports to the local board, including new parks that were acquired over the past eighteen months.
- Technical advice has confirmed that 33 parcels that were thought to be automatically classified under section 16(11b) of the RA still require a resolution of the local board under section 16(2A).
- Correction of errors made on the reclassification of parcels in Belle Terrace Reserve, Hekerua Bay Reserve and Putiki Reserve and the classification of Mawhitipana and Pōhutukawa Reserves.
- Correction of errors made on the classification of 12 parcels that were part of the former Waiheke Domain.

3. Criteria have been used to assess the classification of each land parcel, including consideration of the local park’s values, current and likely future use of the local park, workshop feedback from the local board and consultation with mana whenua.

4. The status and recommendations for parcels of land included in this report are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land status</th>
<th>Recommended actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Eight parcels held under the LGA | - Publicly notify the proposal to declare as reserve and classify under s14(1) of the RA parcels off Awaawaroa and Oraipu Roads (Attachment A).  
- Declare and classify two parcels in Nikau Reserve under s14(1) of the RA. No public notification is required. |
| Two parcels incorrectly classified relating to purpose and section of the RA | For Mawhitipana Reserve and Pōhutukawa Reserve:  
- These reserves are subject to Treaty settlements and are required to be transferred as recreation reserves.  
- Revoke the previous resolution classifying these parcels as scenic reserves under s16(2A) of the RA.  
- A resolution classifying these parcels as recreation reserves under s16(1) is required; refer Attachment C. |
| 12 parcels from former | - Revoke the previous resolution classifying 12 |
Waiheke Local Board  
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| Waiheke Domain incorrectly classified under s16(2A) of the RA | parcels under s16(2A) of the RA.  
| - Include the correct classification in resolution classifying parcels under s16(1) of the RA (Attachment D). |
| Five parcels incorrectly reclassified under s24 of the RA | - Revoke the previous resolution reclassifying parcels in Belle Terrace Reserve, Hekerua Reserve and Putiki Reserve.  
| - Include the correct classification in resolution classifying parcels under s16(2A), these parcels are identified in Attachment B. |
| 56 unclassified parcels held under the RA | - Classification is required for six parcels under s16(1) and 50 parcels under s16(2A) of the RA (Attachment B).  
| - Public notification is not required for any of these parcels. |

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) approve public notification of the proposal to declare and classify pursuant to section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977 those parcels described in Attachment A of the agenda report (dated 27 May 2020)

b) declare and classify Lots 206 and 207 DP 19224, covering 2433m², held in CTs NA668/41 and NA478/187 and forming part of Nikau Reserve as scenic reserve 19(1b), pursuant to section 14(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

c) revoke the resolution regarding the classification of Lot 444 DP 16816 (Mawhitipana Reserve) and Lot 18 DP 19224 (Pōhutukawa Reserve, Ōmiha Bay), being part of resolution b) WHK/2019/81

d) approve the classification of Lot 444 DP 16816 (Mawhitipana Reserve) and Lot 18 DP 19224 (Pōhutukawa Reserve, Ōmiha Bay) pursuant to section 16(1) of the Reserves Act 1977, as described in Attachment C of the agenda report (dated 27 May 2020)

e) revoke the resolution regarding the classification of 12 parcels that were part of the former Waiheke Domain, as described in Attachment D of the agenda report (dated 27 May 2020), being part of resolution b) WHK/2019/81

f) approve the classification of 12 parcels of reserve land pursuant to section 16(1) of the Reserves Act 1977, as described in Attachment D of the agenda report (dated 27 May 2020)

g) revoke the resolution regarding the reclassification of Lot 170 DP 17146 (Belle Terrace Foreshore Reserve), Lot 1079 DP 16962 (Hekerua Bay Reserve) and Lot 192 DP 24255, Lot 95 DP 29741 and Lot 22 DP 29734 (Putiki Reserve) being part of resolution d) WHK/2019/81

h) approve the classification of 56 parcels of reserve land pursuant to section 16(1) and section 16(2A) of the Reserves Act 1977, as described in Attachment B of the agenda report (dated 27 May 2020).
Horopaki

Context

5. Waiheke Local Board has decision-making responsibility for all local parks in the local board area.

6. On 22 November 2018, the local board resolved to prepare an omnibus open space management plan for all local parks on Waiheke excluding the Rangihoua and Onetangi Sports Park (now known as the local parks management plan) to assist park management and meet obligations for reserve management planning under the RA (resolution number: WHK/2018/227).

7. The local parks management plan will be a statutory reserve management plan prepared in line with section (s.) 41 of the Act. It will cover parkland held under the Act as well as the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA), and include land covered by existing reserve management plans.

8. In November 2018 we completed a comprehensive park land status investigation for all local parks. This was an essential preliminary task in developing the draft local parks management plan and a statutory requirement under the RA. Section 16 of the RA requires all land held as reserve under the Act be classified appropriately.

9. The classification of reserve land in Waiheke has been covered in two previous reports to the local board. One report on 13 December 2018 (CP2018/23924) covered the declaration and classification, classification or reclassification of approximately 141 parcels of park land on Waiheke. A report on 18 April 2019 (CP2019/05050) confirmed classifications or reclassifications that required public notification.

10. In reviewing the information presented in the draft local parks management plan (the draft plan) and completing assessment of further acquisitions of new parks or parcels adjacent to existing parks, we discovered a number of parcels that require further classification decisions.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

Proposed actions for land held under the LGA

11. The local board have the option to hold park land under the LGA or the RA. Any land held under the LGA which the local board wishes to manage under the RA must be declared reserve and classified appropriately in accordance with s.14 of the RA.

12. When reviewing the future land status options for land under the LGA, staff considered the following:
   - Why does the council own the land and how was it acquired?
   - What is the current and likely future purpose of the land?
   - What potential does the land have for protection, enhancement and development?
   - Is there likely to be a need to retain flexibility for future use?
   - What is the status of adjacent parcels of land within the same park?

Proposal to declare and classify land under the LGA

13. Lots 206 and 207 DP 19224, held under the LGA, are located off Glen Brook Road, Rocky Bay. Both parcels were acquired in 2003 as additions to the adjacent Nikau Reserve and are covered in native bush.

14. We propose the land be declared reserve under s.14 of the RA and classified scenic reserve (s.19(1)(b) of the RA) to be consistent with the adjacent land parcels also being classified in this report.
15. Public notification is not required under the RA as these land parcels are zoned open space ecology and landscape.

16. Two other lots held under the LGA, being Section 3 SO 67174 and Part Section 1 SO 64551 (consisting of five small parcels) were vested in council as a land severance resulting from a road realignment or as part of stopped road.

17. These parcels are zoned as Landform 7: forest and bush areas and therefore the proposal to declare and classify these under s.14 of the RA requires public notification. Refer to Attachment A.

Proposed actions for land held under the RA
18. For land held under the RA, the following options have been considered:
   - classify according to its primary purpose
   - reclassify to align to its primary purpose
   - revoke the reserve status and hold the land under the LGA
   - continue to hold the land as unclassified reserve under the RA.

19. The option to continue to hold the land as unclassified reserve has been discounted as it would mean that the local parks management plan would not comply with the RA and the council would not be meeting its statutory obligations under the RA.

20. In the context of this investigation, we have not identified any parcels of local park that warrant revocation of the reserve for management under the LGA.

Classification of land held under the RA 1977
21. Classification involves assigning a reserve (or part of a reserve) a primary purpose, as defined in s.17 to 23 of the Act, that aligns with its present values. Consideration is also given to potential future values and activities and uses.

22. We have identified 56 parcels of unclassified reserve under the RA that require classification.

23. This includes 33 parcels that were thought to be automatically classified. Further technical advice has confirmed those parcels vested under s.44 of Counties Amendments Act 1961 are not automatically classified in accordance with s.16(11b) of the RA and still require a resolution of the local board under s.16(2A) of the RA.

24. Staff have considered the Reserves Act Guide and the following questions when determining the primary purpose and appropriate classification for each parcel:
   - What was the intended purpose of the reserve when it was acquired?
   - What are the main values of the land or potential future values, uses and activities?
   - What potential does the land have for protection, preservation, enhancement or development?
   - What is the status of adjacent parcels of land within the park?
   - Is there likely to be a need to retain flexibility for future use?

25. There are 75 parcels in total that require classification under s.16(1) or s.16(2A) of the RA, made up of 61 parcels in Attachment B, two parcels in Attachment C and 12 parcels in Attachment D. Section 16(1) applies to Crown-owned reserves that have been vested in council, for example any park that was part of the former Waiheke Domain. Section 16(2A) applies to land directly vested in the council.

26. Another eight parcels are to be declared and classified under s.14 of the RA as identified in Attachment A and a variety of classifications are proposed for these reserves. The scenic reserve classification has been proposed particularly for sites of ecological significance,
where these are zoned ecology and landscape, or to align with the classification of adjacent parcels.

27. An historic reserve classification is proposed for recently acquired reserve land in Awaawaroa Historic Reserve (listed in Attachment B) on which Maunganui Pā partially sits, being on the highest point on the island (refer to slide 2 in Attachment E). This is one of only three pā on Waiheke and is significant from an archaeological perspective.

28. A local purpose (community use) classification is proposed for the building footprints of the Waiheke Backpackers Hostel based on Catherine Mitchell Reserve. Other classifications proposed are recreation reserves, or local purpose (esplanade), (accessway) or (landscape and amenity) reserves. The RA does not require public notification of these classification proposals. Refer to the maps in Attachment E for specific details of the parcels.

Correcting decisions on the parcels previously classified that are under Treaty settlements

29. During this investigation, we have determined that two parcels subject to Treaty settlements have been incorrectly classified.

30. The Crown has initialled deeds of settlement with Ngāti Paoa for Mawhitipana Reserve in Palm Beach (Lot 444 DP 16816) and Ngāti Maru for Pōhutukawa Reserve in Ōmiha Bay (Lot 18 DP 19224). The deeds provide that these settlement redress properties are to be transferred as recreation reserves.

31. The local board was not made aware of this requirement and proceeded to classify these reserves as scenic reserves (Resolution b) WHK/2019/81). As these reserves are Crown-owned classification should have been undertaken under s16(1) rather than s.16(2A) of the RA.

32. The Manager Treaty Settlements has confirmed it is preferable that the classification is consistent with the settlement intent. To correct this error, we recommend:

• revoking resolution b) WHK/2019/81 as it relates to the parcels of land in question noting a corrigendum to the gazette notice will also be required classifying the reserve parcels (outlined in Attachment C) as recreation reserves.

33. Further public notification is not required to classify these reserves under s.16(1), as both parcels are zoned open space (ecology and landscape) in the Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan.

Correcting decisions on the land status of parcels previously reclassified

34. During this investigation, it was determined that five parcels that were thought to be automatically classified under s.16(11b), as noted in clause 23 above, were incorrectly reclassified.

35. These parcels are in Belle Terrace Foreshore Reserve (Lot 170 DP 17146), Hekerua Bay Reserve (Lot 1079 P 16962) and Putiki Reserve (Lot 192 DP 24255, Lot 95 DP 29741 and Lot 22 DP 29734).

36. They were publicly notified and subsequently reclassified under s.24(1) of the Reserves Act 1977 by resolution of the local board on the 18 April 2019 (Resolution d) WHK/2019/81).

37. We recommend revoking this earlier resolution as it relates to the parcels of land in question. These parcels are included in recommendation h) classifying the reserve parcels included in Attachment B. Further public notification is not required to classify these reserves under s.16(2A).

Correcting decisions on the classification of parcels that were part of the former Waiheke Domain

38. Parks that were part of the former Waiheke Domain are Crown-owned park land vested in council and require classification under s.16(1) of the RA. Twelve parcels of land contained
in eight parks, as described in Attachment D, were incorrectly classified under s.16(2A) of the RA being part of resolution b) WHK/2019/81. The parks are:

- Matapana Reserve
- Mitchell Reserve
- Palm Beach Reserve
- Park Road Reserve
- Pōhutukawa Reserve Onetangi
- Putiki Reserve
- Third Reserve
- Tin Boat Reserve

39. To correct this administrative error, we recommend revoking the earlier resolution as it relates to the 12 parcels of land and correctly classifying these under s.16(1) of the RA as set out in Attachment D. No public notification is required.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

40. The decisions in this report are largely administrative and we anticipate that they will have no direct impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

41. However future management and potential development of park land, which is determined by its purpose, could have a potential positive or negative impact on greenhouse gas emissions. The degree and nature of the impact is dependent on the specific management and development of each park. Two examples of potential impacts are:

- a potential reduction of emissions by classifying land as scenic reserve. The purpose of a scenic reserve is largely to protect and restore the natural environment; ecological restoration of a site could result in a reduction of emissions and increase in carbon sequestration
- a potential increase in emissions through increased traffic, following the development of a community facility; the development of facilities could be enabled through the classification of local purpose (community use) reserve or recreation reserve.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

42. The land classification investigations that have formed the recommendations in this report have been discussed with relevant council units, including Legal Services, Parks, Sport, and Recreation, Community Facilities (including Leasing and Land Advisory) and Infrastructure and Environmental Services who have provided information and technical advice to inform reserve classification proposals.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

43. Three workshops were held with the local board on 11 December 2019, 6 April 2020 and 29 April 2020 to present the land classification recommendations set out in Attachment E and detailed in this report. The local board were supportive of these recommendations.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

44. All mana whenua with an interest in Waiheke were invited to provide feedback on the proposed classifications including Ngāti Paoa Iwi Trust, Ngāti Paoa Trust Board, Ngāi Tai Ki
Tāmaki Trust, Ngāti Maru Rūnanga Incorporated, Ngāti Tamaterā Settlement Trust, Te Ara Rangatu o Te Iwi o Ngāti Te Ata, Waiohua Ngāti Whanaunga Incorporated and Te Patukirikiri Iwi Incorporated.

45. Ngāti Paoa Trust Board was the only mana whenua that attended a hui and provided a response on the proposed classifications. They were supportive of scenic reserve classifications.

46. For Korara Road Reserve they suggested this be classified as scenic rather than recreation reserve. Due to the high amenity provided by the reserve at the north of Oneroa Beach, this suggestion is reflected in the classification recommendation.

47. They proposed that the parcel on Owhanake Matiatia Walkway be classified as scenic rather than local purpose (esplanade) reserve. The local purpose (esplanade) reserve classification recommendation reflects the ecological and recreational linkage and is consistent with the classification of the adjacent parcel.

48. Ngāti Paoa Iwi Trust and Ngāti Maru have been advised of the intention to correct the classification of the two reserves that will be transferred to them as Treaty settlements.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

49. This report has no financial implications for the local board. The cost for the gazette notices for the classifications will be covered through existing departmental budgets.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

50. No risks have been identified with completing the classification actions as the recommendations reflect current land use and do not add additional restrictions.

51. The revocation of previous resolutions is intended to ensure land is either correctly passed in Treaty settlements as proposed and/or classified under the appropriate section of the Act to avoid any future issues.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

52. Once the local board has approved the classification actions, the next steps are:

- publish notice in the local newspaper for the parcels requiring public notification (for at least one calendar month)
- report back to the local board in June to address any submissions and confirm classification proposals that were publicly notified
- arrange gazette notices for the classifications. Approval of gazette notices has been delegated from the Minister of Conservation to the General Manager Community Facilities. A report will be prepared approval for the gazette notices
- reflect updates to the classifications in the draft Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan
- ensure all classifications are correctly recorded on council’s databases.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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## Attachment A – Proposal to declare as reserve and classify reserve under Section 14 of the Reserves Act 1977
27 May 2020

### Public notification required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve Name</th>
<th>Physical Address</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Survey Area (m²)</th>
<th>Reserve Classification</th>
<th>Applicable section of the Reserves Act</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awaawaroa Road Reserve</td>
<td>95 Awaawaroa Road, Awaawaroa Bay</td>
<td>Section 3 SO 67174</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>Local purpose (amenity) reserve</td>
<td>14(1)</td>
<td>NA100C/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orapiu Road Esplanade</td>
<td>Orapiu Road</td>
<td>Part Section 1 SO 64551 (5 small parcels, A,C,E,F and G)</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>Local purpose (esplanade) reserve</td>
<td>14(1)</td>
<td>NA88C/803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public notification not required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve Name</th>
<th>Physical Address</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Survey Area (m²)</th>
<th>Reserve Classification</th>
<th>Applicable section of the Reserves Act</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nikau Reserve</td>
<td>77 Glen Brook Road</td>
<td>LOT 206 DP 19224</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>Scenic reserve s19(1b)</td>
<td>14(1)</td>
<td>NA478/187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79 Glen Brook Road</td>
<td>LOT 207 DP 19224</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>Scenic reserve s19(1b)</td>
<td>14(1)</td>
<td>NA668/41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Address</td>
<td>Reserve Classification</td>
<td>Survey Area (m²)</td>
<td>Applicable section of the Reserves Act</td>
<td>Reserve Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Replace previous resolution of classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5 DP 462464</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>15325</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>Awaawaroa</td>
<td>Historic Reserve</td>
<td>Replace previous classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC 1 SO 444309</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>85418</td>
<td>18(2A)</td>
<td>Awaawaroa</td>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>NA99D682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5 DP 165463</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>21400</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>Awaawaroa</td>
<td>Wetland Reserve</td>
<td>NA0402277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 170 DP 17146</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>31313</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>Belle Terrace</td>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>NA17B1486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1 SO 541086</td>
<td>Local purpose (community use)</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>18(2A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Mitchell Reserve</td>
<td>419-427 Sea View Road, Onetangi</td>
<td>Section 2 SO 541086</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Local purpose (community use)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>NA17B/1466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 3 SO 541086</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Local purpose (community use)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>NA17B/1466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 4 SO 541086</td>
<td>9627</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>NA17B/1466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory Road to Miro Road Track</td>
<td>39E Miro Road</td>
<td>Lot 446 DP 16816</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>Local purpose (accessway)</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td>NA398/288 part-cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowes Bay Esplanade Reserve</td>
<td>258D Cowes Bay Road, Cowes Bay</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 31180</td>
<td>3212</td>
<td>Local purpose (esplanade)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>NA767/110 cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>380E Cowes Bay Road, Cowes Bay</td>
<td>Lot 100 DP 486384</td>
<td>20654</td>
<td>Local purpose (esplanade)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>695061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day’s Landing Reserve</td>
<td>516 Oraipu Road, Te Matuku Bay</td>
<td>Lot 11 DP 180595</td>
<td>13340</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>NA757/144 cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 13 DP 180595</td>
<td>4531</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>NA757/144 cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 14 DP 180595</td>
<td>3906</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>NA757/144 cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garratt Road Accessway</td>
<td>27A Garratt Road, Onetangi</td>
<td>Lot 15 DP 17146</td>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Local purpose (accessway)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>NA402/277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin South Reserve</td>
<td>235A Ocean View Road, Little Oneroa</td>
<td>Lot 736 DP 16962</td>
<td>3407</td>
<td>Local purpose (accessway)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>NA287/275 cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Road, Reserve or Property</td>
<td>Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>94 Great Barrier Road, Onetangi</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1079 DP</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7461</td>
<td>16962</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5767</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3400</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3973</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3119</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Road, Reserve or Property</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>45 Great Barrier Road, Onetangi</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 462 DP</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5767</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3400</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3973</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3119</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Road, Reserve or Property</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5767</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3400</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3973</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3119</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Road, Reserve or Property</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>18 Empire Avenue, Onetangi</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1214 DP</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19224</td>
<td>Lot 203 DP</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19224</td>
<td>Lot 204 DP</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19224</td>
<td>Lot 205 DP</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waiheke Local Board</strong></td>
<td><strong>27 May 2020</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Oneroa Beach Reserve | Onepu Road |  |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| Part/Lot 127 DP 22848 | Lot 163 DP 22848 |  |
| Lot 138 DP 22848 | Lot 7 DP 445035 |  |
| 159A Ocean View Road, Oneroa | Lot 7 DP 166768 |  |
| 2 Oropu Road | Lot 7 DP 185441 |  |
| Oropu Road Reserves | Lot 6 DP 195441 |  |
| 270 Oropu Road | Lot 43 DP 183455 |  |
| Owhanake Matiatia Walkway | Lot 3 DP 361182 |  |
| Pakiri Point Cemetery Reserve | Lot 2 DP 29734 |  |
| Putiki Reserve | Lot 47 DP 29734 |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waiheke Local Parks - Additional Classifications</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waiheke Local Board</strong></td>
<td><strong>27 May 2020</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Oneroa Beach Reserve | Onepu Road |  |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| Part/Lot 127 DP 22848 | Lot 163 DP 22848 |  |
| Lot 138 DP 22848 | Lot 7 DP 445035 |  |
| 159A Ocean View Road, Oneroa | Lot 7 DP 166768 |  |
| 2 Oropu Road | Lot 7 DP 185441 |  |
| Oropu Road Reserves | Lot 6 DP 195441 |  |
| 270 Oropu Road | Lot 43 DP 183455 |  |
| Owhanake Matiatia Walkway | Lot 3 DP 361182 |  |
| Pakiri Point Cemetery Reserve | Lot 2 DP 29734 |  |
| Putiki Reserve | Lot 47 DP 29734 |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Number</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 58 DP 24255</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>Local purpose (accessway)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>NA492/111 cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 68 DP 24255</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>Local purpose (accessway)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>NA492/111 cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 192 DP 24255</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td>Local purpose (esplanade)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>NA492/111 cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 95 DP 29741</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>Local purpose (esplanade)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>NA492/111 cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 22 DP 29734</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>Local purpose (esplanade)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td>NA492/111 cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1 DP 29734</td>
<td>9611</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td>NA492/111 cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea View Road Reserve</td>
<td>318H Sea View Road, Onetangi</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 490489</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Huruhi Reserve</td>
<td>51 Tahatai Road, Blackpool</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 45886</td>
<td>3731</td>
<td>Local purpose (esplanade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin Boat Reserve</td>
<td>16 Fourth Avenue, Onetangi</td>
<td>Lot 23 DP 14850</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trig Hill Farm Reserve</td>
<td>Trig Hill Road, Onetangi</td>
<td>Lot 345 DP 32221</td>
<td>16663</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 346 DP 32221</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 54 DP</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>18(2A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 34 DP</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 32 DP</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>21(2A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 16 DP</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>18(2A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 10 DP</td>
<td>Local purpose (accessway)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 21 DP</td>
<td>Local purpose (esplanade)</td>
<td>18(2A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 22 DP</td>
<td>NA47/89</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 23 DP</td>
<td>NA27/105</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 24 DP</td>
<td>NA28/775</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 25 DP</td>
<td>NA39/86</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 26 DP</td>
<td>NA20/300</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 27 DP</td>
<td>NA20/300</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 28 DP</td>
<td>NA20/300</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 29 DP</td>
<td>NA20/300</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 30 DP</td>
<td>NA20/300</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 31 DP</td>
<td>NA20/300</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 32 DP</td>
<td>NA20/300</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Victoria Reserve**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot 64 DP</th>
<th>2107</th>
<th>Local purpose (accessway)</th>
<th>16(2A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 34 DP</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>Local purpose (esplanade)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1018 DP</td>
<td>3028</td>
<td>Local purpose (accessway)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 491 DP</td>
<td>NA39/86</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1018 DP</td>
<td>NA20/300</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1018 DP</td>
<td>NA20/300</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1018 DP</td>
<td>NA20/300</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1018 DP</td>
<td>NA20/300</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1018 DP</td>
<td>NA20/300</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Waikare Reserve**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot 64 DP</th>
<th>1424</th>
<th>Scenic s19(1b)</th>
<th>16(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 491 DP</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>18(2A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1018 DP</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>16(2A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1018 DP</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Scenic s19(1b)</td>
<td>18(2A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Lot 1018 DP | 1942 | Local Purpose (landscape and amenity) |}

**Waiheke Local Parks - Additional Classifications**

--

**Waiheke Local Board**

27 May 2020

Attachment B

**Item 21**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2132</td>
<td>Local Purpose (landscape and amenity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA 20/1300</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 465 DP 26969</td>
<td>Wilma Reserve, 19A Wilma Road, Ostend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment C – Parcels subject to Treaty settlements to be classified under Section 16(1) of the Reserves Act 1977

**27 May 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve Name</th>
<th>Physical Address</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Survey Area (m²)</th>
<th>Reserve Classification</th>
<th>Applicable section of the Reserves Act</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mawhitipana Reserve</td>
<td>55 Cory Road, Palm Beach</td>
<td>Lot 444 DP 16816</td>
<td>22814</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td>NA398/288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pōhutukawa Reserve</td>
<td>22 Pohutukawa Avenue, Omiha Bay</td>
<td>Lot 18 DP 19224</td>
<td>3971</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td>NA 274/105 cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Name</td>
<td>Physical Address</td>
<td>Appellation</td>
<td>Survey Area (m²)</td>
<td>Reserve Classification</td>
<td>Applicable section of the Reserves Act</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matapana Reserve</td>
<td>5 The Esplanade</td>
<td>Lot 293 DP 16816</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td>NA398/288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 294 DP 16816</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td>NA398/288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 295 DP 16816</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td>NA398/288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 296 DP16816</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td>NA398/288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 445 DP 16816</td>
<td>10218</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td>NA398/288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Reserve</td>
<td>Mitchell Road</td>
<td>Lot 145 DP16354</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>Local purpose (esplanade)</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td>NA287/275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach Reserve</td>
<td>53 Palm Road</td>
<td>Lot 179 DP 16816</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td>551168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Road Reserve</td>
<td>24 Moana Avenue</td>
<td>Part Lot 13 DP 16354</td>
<td>18127</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td>NA287/275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pōhutukawa Reserve</td>
<td>11 Third Avenue</td>
<td>Allot 130 PSH OF Waiheke</td>
<td>40638</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td>NA368/13 cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>Attachment D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Putiki Reserve</strong></td>
<td>14 Shelley Beach Road, Ostend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Reserve</strong></td>
<td>26 Third Avenue, Chetangi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tin Boat Reserve</strong></td>
<td>16 Fourth Avenue, Chetangi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part Lot 23 DP 29734</strong></td>
<td>NA492/11 cancelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allot 129 PSH OF Waiheke</strong></td>
<td>NA336/204 cancelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot 5 DP 21862</strong></td>
<td>NA460/12 cancelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approval for five new road names at 306 Sea View Road, Ostend, Waiheke Island (Wawata Estate)

File No.: CP2020/06066

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval from the Waiheke Local Board to name five new private roads, all being commonly owned access lots (COALs), created by way of a subdivision development at 306 Sea View Road, Ostend, Waiheke Island, known as ‘Wawata Estate’.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

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

3. On behalf of the developer and applicant, Wawata Estate Limited, agent Hall Surveying Limited have proposed the road names presented in the tables below for consideration by the Local Board. All names were suggested by Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki.

4. The applicant requests that the local board approve the five preferred road name options listed in Table 1 (below), because they are already using these names to market the development for sale and the names are already shown on all their marketing material. They apologise and state that they misunderstood the road naming process and did not realise that formal approval from the Waiheke Local Board was required; they only received confirmation from LINZ that the names were ‘available for use’ and took this for approval. Hence a formal road naming application is now presented in this report.

5. Any of the 14 proposed road name options would be acceptable for the local board to approve for use in this location, having been assessed to ensure that they meet Auckland Council’s Road Naming Guidelines and the National Addressing Standards for road naming. All technical standards are met and the names are not duplicated anywhere else in the region. Mana Whenua were also consulted.

6. The proposed names for the five new private roads (COALs) at 306 Sea View Road, Ostend, Waiheke Island (Wawata Estate) are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Wawata Estate Proposed Road Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Preferred Names</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAL 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAL 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAL 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAL 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAL 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pool of Alternative Names:

These alternative names can be used for any of five:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whakarehu Road</th>
<th>Māpihi Maurea Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aronui Lane</td>
<td>Tūturu Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) Approves the following names for the five new roads (COALs) at 306 Sea View Road, Ostend, Waiheke Island (known as ‘Wawata Estate’), in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974 (resource consent references BUN60078303 and SUB60230995):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COAL 1: Maumahara Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COAL 2: Te Ōhākī Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAL 3: Ipukarea Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAL 4: Pākurakura Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAL 5: Waitohu Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Horopaki
Context

7. Resource consent BUN60078303 (subdivision reference number SUB60230995) was issued in January 2018 for a 25-lot rural residential subdivision, including five private roads in the form of Commonly Owned Access Lots (COALs). The development is being marketed as ‘Wawata Estate’.

8. Site and location plans of the development can be found in Attachments A and B respectively.

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

10. The property at 306 Sea View Road, Waiheke Island has five areas with archaeological features identified. These comprise of pit and terrace complexes and shell midden deposits related to pre-European Maori occupation of the area.

11. The applicant has already been using their five preferred road name options to market the development for sale and the names are already shown on all their marketing material. Therefore, the applicant requests that the local board kindly approve these five names.

12. Reason why the development has already been marketed with road names:

   • In early 2019, the applicant began the road naming process by contacting local iwi for name suggestions for the five new private roads (COALs) to be constructed at the Wawata Estate development.

   • In June 2019, Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki responded with fifteen road name suggestions.

   • The applicant then contacted Council and was informed that confirmation from LINZ was also required to ensure the names were available for use and not duplicated or already in use elsewhere before proceeding any further with the road naming process.
In November 2019, Council staff advised the applicant that LINZ had confirmed the names were available for use and not duplicated anywhere else in the region. A link to Council’s road naming website was sent to the applicant, which included the full road naming process and the requirement for local board approval. However, the applicant misinterpreted the emails from Council and LINZ and thought that the names were already formally approved, even though the emails stated that they had only been checked for duplication and clarity and that more work was required.

The applicant thus erroneously selected their five preferred names from Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki’s suggestions and went ahead in marketing the properties for sale under these new road names.

13. Upon realising that approval from the Waiheke Local board was still required, the applicant submitted a completed road naming application to Council officers in March 2020.

14. All fourteen name options were re-assessed against the national addressing standards by the subdivision team for both duplication and clarity and were found to still be acceptable and available for use.

15. As a result, formal road naming approval for the five new private roads is now sought.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

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

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

18. Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki suggested names to reflect ‘Wawata’, as ‘Wawata Estate’ is the marketing name of the subdivision, which means “to desire earnestly, long for, yearn for, daydream, and aspire”. Names also reference the archaeological sites identified at the development.

19. The Applicant’s proposed names and meanings, as provided by Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki (following consultation), are set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road number</th>
<th>Proposed Name</th>
<th>Meaning (as described by Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COAL 1</td>
<td>Maumahara Road</td>
<td>Paying homage to the whāriki kōrero, the woven stories of the past, to recollect, to remember, to reminisce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation – Mow (the lawn) maa haa raa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAL 2</td>
<td>Te Ōhākī Lane</td>
<td>Dying speech, parting wish, last words – the parting words of a chief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAL 3</td>
<td>Ipukarea Road</td>
<td>Ancestral home, homeland, native land, inherited land - significant water or geographical feature of a tribe’s homeland relating to the tribe’s identity and the source of their livelihood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. The Applicant has also provided a pool of names that can be use as alternatives at Wawata Estate:

| COAL 4 | Pākurakura Way | The colour red, crimson. This word is also associated with the Māori word 'Uenuku’, which is a Māori ancestor of significance, whose residence is in the red clouds of the eastern and western sky; and is also in the rainbow. |
| COAL 5 | Waitohu Close | To mark, signify, indication of significance. Noting the nearby archaeological site. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Turanga Farm Pool of Alternative Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pool of alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakarehu Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aronui Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uki Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pohewa Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohia Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māpihi Maurea Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tūturu Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tānekaha Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōpāpā Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. All fourteen name options listed in the tables above are acceptable for use, having been reassessed by the Council Subdivision team to ensure that they meet Auckland Council’s Road Naming Guidelines and the National Addressing Standards for road naming. All technical standards are met and the names are not duplicated anywhere else in the region, therefore it is up to the local board to decide upon the suitability of the names within the local context.

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

23. The road types are acceptable for the new private roads, suiting the form and layout of the roads, as per the Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines.

24. Mana whenua were consulted in line with agreed processes and requirements – see the ‘Māori Impact Statement’ section of this report for more details.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

25. 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
26. The decision sought for this report has no identified impacts on other parts of the council group. The views of council controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of the report’s advice.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
27. The decision sought for this report does not trigger any significant policy and is not considered to have any immediate local impact beyond those outlined in this report.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
28. The naming of roads is linked to the Auckland Plan Outcome “A Māori identity that is Auckland’s point of difference in the world”. The use of Māori names for roads, buildings and other public places is an opportunity to publicly demonstrate Māori identity. To aid Local Board decision making, the ‘Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines’ includes:

- The Objective of recognising ancestral linkages to areas of land by engagement with mana whenua and the allocation of road names as appropriate, as well as the Principle that Māori road names are actively encouraged, and;
- An agreed process to enable mana whenua to provide timely feedback on all proposed road names in a manner they consider appropriate (through council’s central facilitator).

29. The road names proposed in this report were suggested by Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki following the applicant’s consultation with them. Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki has an ancient footprint in and around the gulf islands spanning back over 1000 years and suggested names that represent their identity within the landscape.

30. Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki originally suggested fifteen road name options: one was a duplicate and not acceptable for use, but the remaining fourteen names have been included in the applicant’s proposal, as detailed in this report.

31. Despite being contacted, no other iwi provided responses or comments, or suggested any other road name options. It is therefore implied that no mana whenua were opposed to the use of any of the proposed names in this location.

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

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
33. 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
34. Approved road names are notified to Land Information New Zealand which records them on its New Zealand wide land information database which includes street addresses issued by local councils.
Approval for five new road names at 306 Sea View Road, Ostend, Waiheke Island (Wawata Estate)
Site Plan for Wawata Estate at 306 Sea View Road, Ostend, Waiheke Island
Attachment B

Item 22

Location of Wawata Estate at 306 Sea View Road, Ostend, Waiheke Island

Approval for five new road names at 306 Sea View Road, Ostend, Waiheke Island (Wawata Estate)
Chairperson's report

File No.: CP2020/05467

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To provide Chairperson Cath Handley with an opportunity to update the local board on the projects and issues she has been involved with and to draw the board's attention to any other matters of interest.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) receive the Chairperson, Cath Handley's update.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Chairperson's report</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Authorisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dileeka Senewiratne</td>
<td>Louise Mason - General Manager - Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janine Geddes - Acting Relationship Manager - Aotea / Great Barrier and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chair's report to 21 May 2020

Waiheke Local Board

Ngā mihi Waiheke

I acknowledge all those who have suffered hardship because of the impacts on employment of Covid-19. I also acknowledge the stress of those whose businesses have suffered great losses and where rebuilding business comes at a great price to personal well-being aside from financial challenges and the inability to project the upturn with accuracy. Kia kaha, kia māia, kia manawanui. The local board office is here, as are board members, to help as we are able to find supports that may be required. Please feel free to make contact.

The government budget offered a range of new funds from which Waiheke individuals, NGOs and charities, and businesses, may draw support and investment in the months ahead. The details are yet to be fleshed out but many look promising.

Next year's budget

The past month’s focus has shifted swiftly from covid-19 management to support of the local economy and the Waiheke Local Board’s budget for the new financial year (1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021). At the same time the local board has kept a close eye on new and emerging hardship in the community.

Council's Emergency Budget

Local Board chairs have participated fully in the Finance and Performance Committee meetings to understand and grapple with Auckland Council’s financial situation. These have involved full day videoconference meetings each week for the past month involving the Mayor, governing body councillors, the 21 chairs of local boards and council’s senior finance team.

The chair, Cr Desley Simpson has led a very open and inclusive process where each board’s issues and feedback have been heard and recorded.

The issue facing Council is the size of the gap that is predicted between planned revenue and actual revenue. There is a much smaller gap between planned expenditure and actual. That gap is compounded by the Auckland drought and the severe impacts on Watercare’s revenue. Whilst government is likely to close part of the gap by directly funding some large capital projects that is not known at this point.

The gap is predicted to be more than $500m.

Council has four main levers by which it might manage that gap – these range in effect from short term major spending cuts which would lead to 100s of job losses including here on Waiheke, to less immediate impacts but over a much longer period.

The four levers are:

- reduce operational spending, which may impact service levels, see some people lose their jobs, and require all of us to focus our energy on doing only what adds the greatest value;
- defer capital projects, focusing that spend on building required infrastructure and targeting it to areas which have the greatest downstream impacts on rebuilding our economy, protecting jobs and supporting the community;
choose to borrow more and accept higher projected debt levels. While this might put the council credit rating at risk a temporary elevation may be a prudent response;

• in order to maintain a capital investment programme, choose to dispose of, or grant concessions over, some assets in order to reinvest the proceeds in higher priority infrastructure.

The board has consistently spoken:

• against an austerity budget,
• in favour of spending for current local council services and jobs,
• against any cuts to the library service,
• for any proposed cuts to our locally driven initiatives budget to be limited to 10% maximum and the local board to retain decision-making over the detailed decisions
• for any council-wide deferral of capital spending to be equitable across the region, and again to be at the discretion of the local board with respect to the selection of projects.
• for investment in favour of climate change/mitigation and the rebuilding of our ecology and biodiversity, including aligning the principles of the Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan.
• for support of ATEED’s budget to help our visitor economy rebuild.
• in favour of all planned flood mitigation projects to be fully-funded as originally budgeted – this has direct bearing on several key projects on Waiheke including Moa Ave and Wilma Road.
• for an acknowledgment that our residents already pay transport-related costs that other Aucklanders do not pay – eg. Park n Ride parking costs, wharf taxes, full commercial ferry fares, with an encouragement for council to increase its revenue by charging Park n Ride across the region. This is in line with council’s funding of integrated fares and its climate change emergency.
• for alignment with the transport benefits of other Aucklanders (integrated ticketing, free travel for children and PTOM),
• for council to make savings, aside from those that emerge from the major CCO review, by stream-lining to core services and reviewing the host of other small Council CCOs that exist below the sight lines,
• for council to support the local board by ring-fencing our Matiatia project and the local board’s accumulated and planned contribution to a community swimming pool,
• for axing the APTR and commercial rating of residential property

The Waiheke board’s position has been acknowledged successively by the chair Cr Simpson and aspects have been openly supported by both the Waitemata Board chair and the board of Puketapapa in its written submission.
**Budget Consultation with the Public**

Waiheke locals can participate and influence the outcome of the budget. There is a clear opportunity which we as a board must support to our utmost, by encouraging maximum participation and feedback from Waiheke people on the outcome of the council budget for ratepayers and for jobs on Waiheke. Public consultation will start on 29 May and will run for three weeks. There will be broad publicity.

There will be no council-funded central mailbox drop and the board may consider reaching its population directly by funding a local mailbox drop to ensure we reach every household. I foreshadow my intention to move a notice of motion accordingly.

Other matters:

**AT helps the Giant Kokopu survive**

I wish to acknowledge and thank both Auckland Transport and Healthy Waters for their willingness and support to pursue funding to seal the section of Awaawaroa Road where sediment run-off into the wetlands has threatened the fragile survival of the endangered Giant Kokopu. The local board has grant-funded the project to protect the Giant Kokopu for a number of years supported by council and the previous local board prioritized the reforming of the road and sealing after a site visit in 2019.

Auckland Transport’s cost of approx. $1/4 million have been sourced from their environmental fund set aside in the Regional Land Transport Plan and Healthy Waters has sourced funding to complete the project.

**Waiheke Visitor economy**

The board has made the case for Waiheke to be actively supported by council and ATEED to support local employment and marketing to help our local visitor economy regenerate after suffering the double effect of covid-19, the effects of business lockdown combined with the end of international tourism.

The chair has been in discussion with ATEED’s Tourism Manager, and the Tourism Forum to explore ATEED’s role in leading the development of a new approach to Waiheke as a sustainable tourism destination.

Nāku i ʻi noa

nā

Cath

Chair

Waiheke Local Board
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To provide local boards with an overview of the Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi) Innovating Streets for People pilot fund (ISPF).

2. To request feedback on projects within your local board area that have been proposed by staff across Auckland Transport (AT), Auckland Council, and Panuku for inclusion in Auckland Council's application to the ISPF.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

3. Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi) announced a pilot fund in April 2020 that supports pilot projects and interim improvements for safe active transport. The Innovating Streets Pilot Fund (ISPF) is intended to help councils create more people-friendly spaces through the application of tactical urbanism techniques such as pilots, pop ups and interim projects. While the fund is intended to support pilots that can be rolled out rapidly and at relatively low cost, projects should also be able to demonstrate a pathway to more permanent status, should they prove successful.

4. Local boards have previously been invited to contribute localised strategic direction and guidance regarding projects that may be suitable to submit for funding. This guidance has been incorporated into the development of a list of potential projects that will be circulated to local boards by 25 May 2020.

5. Local boards are now invited to provide formal feedback on the list of potential projects within their local area, including their view of which projects are the highest priority.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) provide feedback on the list of local projects proposed as suitable for inclusion in Auckland Council’s application to the Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi) Innovating Streets Pilot Fund (ISPF) by 12pm on 29 May 2020, as attached.

Horopaki

Context

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

- temporary, or semi-permanent, physical changes to streets
- improvements that test a permanent fix and prototype a street design
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:
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- reducing vehicle speed (to 30km/hr or less), and/or
- creating more space for people on our streets, and/or
- 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.:
  - adopt a design or project approach founded on Māori principles
  - 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:
  - support from the relevant local board(s) and stakeholders
  - support from local community/stakeholders (e.g. business association)
- display clear process, including milestones, cost, monitoring and evaluation, and identification of risks and mitigation
- demonstrate value for money
- demonstrate opportunity to improve efficiency, or reduce risks associated with future permanent upgrades.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

18. The transport sector is the largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions in the Auckland region with around 40 per cent of Auckland’s total emissions. Increased support and prioritisation of ‘no and low’ emissions modes of transport such as active transport, micro-mobility modes and public transport, will help reduce these emissions.

19. The interventions supported by the Innovating Streets for People pilot fund enable a reduction of transport emissions, which would support Auckland Council’s ability to achieve its climate goals and is well aligned with the draft Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework, and with the in-principle changes to this framework endorsed by the Environment and Climate Change Committee (resolution number ECC/2020/12).

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

20. Auckland Council and AT are following an aligned approach for the ISPF submission and are working together to develop joint application packages.
21. Relevant parts of the council, including Ngā Mātārae; the Auckland Design Office; the Development Programme Office; Libraries; the Southern Initiative; Arts, Community and Events; Parks, Sports and Recreation; Plans and Places, and Panuku, have been engaged to prepare and collate funding proposals for the second round.

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

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

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

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

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

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

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

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

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

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

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

30. There are no financial implications for local boards arising from providing feedback on the list of potential projects, except for those projects proposed by local boards, and which they have proposed to fund themselves.

31. Local boards that submit an expression of interest for a project need to demonstrate both the ability to fund the temporary project and, if the project does not link to an existing AT, Auckland Council or Panuku funded permanent project, that the local board is able to completely fund the permanent project as well.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

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

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

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

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

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

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

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

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

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

40. Completed applications will be submitted to Waka Kotahi prior to the closing date of 3 July 2020.
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Expression of Interest: Innovating Streets project proposal

1. Key information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Re-imagining Surfdale Precinct – co-design for improved safety, cycling and walking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitted by</td>
<td>Waiheke Local Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department / Local Board / CCO</td>
<td>Mark Inglis <a href="mailto:mark.inglis@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz">mark.inglis@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</a> Ph. 021 503 849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you received approval from your department lead to submit this EOI?</td>
<td>Local board services staff do not have department leads; they can send any EOI's developed by their local boards directly through to <a href="mailto:innovatingstreets@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz">innovatingstreets@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes approval from Waiheke Local Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic area</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Streets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>Surfdale</td>
<td>Hamilton Road, Miami Avenue, Mitchell Road, Hooks Lane, The Surfdale Esplanade, and Blake Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate pilot cost</th>
<th>$500,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>facilitation 40 hours</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venue hire and catering</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advertising</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation costs</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consulting costs</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>road remarking</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planters</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>road art</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cycleways</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking redesign</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mobility improvements</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contingency</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$500,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How will the 10% local funding share be met?
AT operational budget
What is the delivery and evaluation timeframe? (must be delivered before June 2021)

- Sept/Oct 2020 - Consultation with businesses, cyclists, all schools on Donald Bruce Road including the Piringākau Bilingual Unit, pedestrians, local residents, Piritahi Marae, people with disabilities, motorists
- Nov/Dec 2020 - Analysis of consultation and plan formulation
- Dec - Feb 2021 - Obtain necessary approvals
- Feb/March - Trial layout implementation including launch and public feedback events
- April - Layout adjustment after feedback
- May 2021 - Final feedback and evaluation report completed

Confidence of meeting local funding share

- High
- Medium
- Low

2. Pilot proposal summary (maximum 400 words)

Proposed Location

- What is the proposed intervention?
- What is the immediate need being addressed?
- How does it align with existing projects, plans or programmes (e.g. Local Board plan)?
- How does it provide a “pathway to permanence”?
- How will the impacts of the intervention be tested and measured?
- What previous work has been done in relation to the existing project or programme?
This project concerns co-design of the Surfdale Precinct to improve safety and liveability for cyclists, pedestrians, residents, motorists and businesses from the western commencement of Hamilton Road through to Hooks Lane, encompassing three cul-de-sacs and an esplanade road/cycleway on the southern side. The roads in Surfdale have been pinpointed in multiple reports and through residents’ complaints as a significant safety hazard, in particular from Surfdale Road where it turns right into Hamilton Road and through to the retail area at Miami Avenue.

The route is Waiheke Island’s main road and is very busy. It is also the main route used by school children cycling and walking from the west of the island. The use of the correct eastbound roadway for most cyclists would mean crossing the busy main road. Many school-aged cyclists use The Esplanade from Oneroa, ride through the Surfde Hall Reserve and up Blake Street to the main road. This is therefore the wrong side of the road to travel east to school on the road. Use of the footpath by school-aged cyclists poses a hazard to pedestrians. A recent survey showed road safety was the main reason for parents driving children to school even though they live within walking or cycling distance.

The other key safety issue is the hazard created by cars reversing into the traffic from the angle parks outside of the shops. This is dangerous for both motorists and cyclists who are coming down the hill, often at speed. Visibility of approaching vehicles is severely hampered by the neighbouring parked cars.

A co-design approach will be utilised to ensure that the Surfdale community is fully engaged in the solution. Potential stakeholders include local residents, businesses, all schools on Donald Bruce Road including the Piringākau Bilingual Unit, commuters, community groups, heavy transport operators, Piritahi Marae Committee and youth groups. In addition to improving safety, there is also an opportunity for the project to help build community connectedness in the Surfdale area through placemaking. Road safety and cycling is a key objective of the 2017 and 2020 Local Board Plans and this project is included in the Waiheke Ten Year Transport Plan (a collaboration between the Waiheke Local Board, its community and Auckland Transport) as number 34 and 35 on a list of 107 projects.

Once a “best” solution has been reached over a 1-2 year period involving feedback, trial solutions and tweaks, a proposal will be developed for implementing a more permanent solution.

The interventions will be tested and measured through focus groups at regular community events, online surveys and feedback from stakeholder representative groups established at the commencement of the project. A project governance group including Waka Kotahi staff will be established to oversee the project and focus on the community partnership and evaluation elements.

Previous design considerations have been investigated by Auckland Council in the Pathways Plan 2019, Auckland Transport and Cycle Action Waiheke. The stretch of road has been identified as a safety risk by the NZ Cycle Trail Safety Report.
3. Assessment criteria

Please use the criteria below to self-rank the project you are submitting.

**Project ranking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Ranking (tick one of the three boxes)</th>
<th>Comments (maximum 50 words per box)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic fit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- with Council, AT and Innovating Streets objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves transport choices and liveability of a place</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>There have been several documented accidents and near misses in the Miami Avenue retail area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps mitigate a clear safety issue (related to Deaths and Serious Injuries at a specific location)*</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>The primary element will be agreeing on a workable design for cycling and walking to school. One which enables pedestrian safety and maximises parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is effective at:</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes this will be an iterative trial and evaluation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reducing vehicle speed (to 30km/hr or less) and/or</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>The precinct currently is car centric. The trial will establish a mode-neutral approach which gives equal priority to all users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creating more space for people on our streets and/or</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>With safer access for cyclists and pedestrians, people will reduce private car use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Making walking and cycling more attractive</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>The precinct is one key link between Piringākau Bicultural Unit and Piritahi Marae, and between the High School and the afterschool youth hub (The Rock) which has predominately Māori attendance. These organisations will be invited to become involved. Representatives of Piritahi Marae Committee have already expressed interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses temporary pilots, pop-ups or treatments as a pathway to</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>The trial will continue until an agreed workable permanent solution is developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permanent change in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to more equitable access to opportunities and essential services, particularly in areas with low levels of travel choice*</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports mode shift to low-carbon modes*</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports Māori outcomes, i.e.:</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- adopts a design or project approach founded on Māori principles</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- helps advance Māori wellbeing, e.g. active Māori participation, improved access to marae, kura, kohanga, papakāinga, employment*</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC projects only</td>
<td>AT projects only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is part of an existing planned and budgeted project *</td>
<td>Importance of the project in the current AT work programme *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ability to deliver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of project delivery by June 2021</td>
<td>Scope is limited and can be completed within the timeframe. Is supported by local board members and is formally prioritised. A co-design approach will be utilised to ensure that the Surfdale community including the local businesses are fully engaged in the solution. Once a “best” solution has been reached and implemented and tweaked over a 1-2 year timeframe involving feedback and trial - then a proposal will be developed for implementing a more permanent solution. The interventions will be tested and measured through focus groups at regular community events, online surveys and feedback from stakeholder representative groups established at the commencement of the project. A project governance group will be established to oversee the project and focus on the community partnership and evaluation elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates co-design approach involving key stakeholders and community, incl.: Support by the relevant Local Board(s) and stakeholders * Support by local community/stakeholders (e.g. business association) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays clear process, including milestones, cost, monitoring and evaluation, and identification of risks and mitigation</td>
<td>Yes the high level programme as stated under “delivery and evaluation timeframe” will be further refined and a risk management plan developed to identify key project risks and mitigation strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Value for money

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount requested is reasonable</td>
<td>Yes a cost effective process for developing an agreed community solution to a complex and difficult problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates opportunity to improve efficiency, or de-risk, future permanent upgrades</td>
<td>Yes, the Waiheke community is highly engaged and will be more accepting and less disruptive of a co-designed solution. The trialled solution will mean that the permanent solution is more likely to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>be workable and not needing further amendments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* Council/AT criteria

**Mandatory requirement**

To be filled out by assessment team

☐ Strong likelihood of covering local funding share (10%)

Previous Auckland Transport Design Concept
Waiheke Local Board Feedback on the Basel Convention Amendment on Plastic Wastes

File No.: CP2020/06361

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide formal feedback on the Basel Convention Amendment on Plastic Wastes.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

3. The Basel Convention is intended to protect human health and the environment from the adverse effects of hazardous waste. The agreed amendment sought to better regulate global trade in plastic waste, recognising the long-term environmental and potential human health impacts of plastic materials.

4. The Ministry for the Environment is now consulting on proposed changes to the national imports and exports process for plastic waste, to align New Zealand with the international agreement.

5. There are two proposals outlined by the Ministry for the Environment. The proposed options are:
   - Option one: permits for mixed plastic waste, without specifics for separated plastic waste
   - Option two: permits for mixed plastic waste with specifications for separated plastic waste (such as a specific maximum rate for contamination).

6. Both options would amend the current legislation to include mixed plastic waste in the permit system.

7. Auckland Council staff have reviewed the consultation document and developed a draft submission. This will be approved by the Chair, Deputy Chair and Independent Maori Statutory Board representative on Environment and Climate Change Committee.

8. The submission is due on 22 May 2020, providing limited time for local boards to submit feedback. Local boards can provide formal feedback on the draft submission through an urgent decision-making process or via delegation. The board feedback will be attached to the council document prior to submission to the Ministry for the Environment.

9. The formal feedback needs to be emailed to the committee advisor by 5pm on Tuesday 19 May 2020 to be considered by the committee members and be appended to the submission. Consequently, the feedback was approved by the Waiheke Local Board Chair in line with resolution number WHK/2020/54.

10. Formal feedback is included as an attachment to this agenda report for noting at the Waiheke Local Board business meeting to be held on 27 May 2020.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) note the formal feedback on the Basel Convention Amendment on Plastic Wastes as included in this agenda report in Attachment A.
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Formal feedback to the Ministry for the Environment on the Basel Convention Amendment 18 May 2020

1. The Waiheke Local Board appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on the Basel Convention Amendment on international trade in plastic waste.

2. The board supports Auckland Council’s recommendation for a third option on the Basel Convention for a staged approach to the required regulatory changes. Auckland Council supports the initial implementation of the Ministry’s preferred option one in January 2021, but recommends that this is followed, no longer than 18 months later, with a more prescriptive specification regarding contamination standards. This would mean that New Zealand had the opportunity to set a clear standard for exporting waste material that has low environment impact.

2. Waiheke’s response on waste issues is driven by the Hauraki Gulf Islands Waste Plan¹ which includes Waiheke Island, Rakino Island and over ten other small islands in the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park.

3. Waiheke Island has a history of proactive leadership regarding waste, which remains strong today. Waiheke was one of the first communities in Auckland to undertake comprehensive community recycling.

4. Keys actions in the waste plan¹ include:
   - Explore options and feasibility to reuse more materials on island and infrastructure to support this, for example a shredder for hard plastics and a glass crusher.
   - Undertake an Engineered composite board (ECB) trial. ECB is a process that converts unwanted and low value waste materials destined for landfill into a viable and saleable product. This avoids transport and disposal costs of waste off island.

5. In view of the actions in the board’s waste plan and of the fact that the international market for waste plastic is contracting, the board strongly recommends that plastic waste is retained in New Zealand, separated early in the collection process and recycled as close to source as possible. The board would like to see more support for innovative local uses of the plastics such as the engineered composite board example detailed above. The carbon produced moving waste plastics offshore works against any gains made from the overseas recycling activity.

6. According to the Auckland Council, 40 percent of the waste plastic processed at Auckland’s Visy plant is coloured HDPE and exported as low-grade mixed plastics.

---

Given its large proportion of the waste stream, the board supports council’s call for HDPE plastic to become a fourth stream which is processed separately. There need to be effective deterrents to producing plastic products which have low recycling value such as the triple-layered light-proof milk bottles which are more expensive to recycle. Future possible markets or the need to export offshore are not the answer to today’s plastic mountains. A simple swap out from the current light-proof bottles to the transparent/semi-opaque bottle is the better option.

7. The board would prefer to see plastic products subject to the provisions of the government’s proposed product stewardship scheme for single-use plastic consumer goods packaging. The scheme would ensure that producers take responsibility for the end-to-end design, production and reuse of the packaging they create.

8. The board notes that plastics with resin numbers #3-7 are not recycled in New Zealand and we should therefore not be importing anything that cannot be recycled in our own country.

Cath Handley
Chair
Waiheke Local Board

1. Auckland Council "Hauraki Gulf Islands Waste Plan 2018"
Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
Attached are the lists of resource consent applications related to Waiheke Island received from 12 April to 7 May 2020.

Te tūtohunga
Recommendation
That the Waiheke Local Board:
a) note the lists of resource consents lodged related to Waiheke Island from 12 April to 7 May 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Resource Consent Applications</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Dileeka Senewiratne - Democracy Advisor Waiheke Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Janine Geddes - Acting Relationship Manager - Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Date Lodged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUC60355875</td>
<td>Apr 15, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUC60355981</td>
<td>Apr 16, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS60356305</td>
<td>Apr 23, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Date Lodged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUC60356558</td>
<td>May 1, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUC60356761</td>
<td>May 5, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRE60356888</td>
<td>May 7, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To present the Waiheke Local Board with its updated governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Waiheke Local Board Governance Forward Work Calendar 2019 - 2022 is appended to the report as Attachment A. The calendar is updated monthly, reported to business meetings and distributed to council staff for reference and information only.
3. The governance forward work calendars were introduced in 2016 as part of Auckland Council’s quality advice programme and aim to support local boards’ governance role by:
   • ensuring advice on meeting agendas is driven by local board priorities
   • clarifying what advice is expected and when
   • clarifying the rationale for reports.
4. The calendar also aims to provide guidance for staff supporting local boards and greater transparency for the public.

Te tūtohunga
Recommendation
That the Waiheke Local Board:
a) receive its Governance Forward Work Calendar for the political term 2019 - 2022 dated May 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Governance Forward Work Calendar</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Dileeka Senewiratne - Democracy Advisor Waiheke Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Janine Geddes - Acting Relationship Manager - Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting (workshop or business meeting)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo  
Purpose of the report

1. To note the Waiheke Local Board proceedings taken at the workshops held on 8 April, 22 April, 29 April and 13 May 2020.

2. Whakarāpopototanga matua  
Executive summary

3. Under section 12.1 of the current Standing Orders of the Waiheke Local Board, workshops convened by the local board shall be closed to the public. However, the proceedings of every workshop shall record the names of members attending and a statement summarising the nature of the information received, and nature of matters discussed.

4. The purpose of the local board’s workshops is for the provision of information and local board members discussion. No resolutions or formal decisions are made during the local board’s workshops.

5. The record of proceedings for the local board’s workshops held on 8 April, 22 April, 29 April and 13 May 2020 are appended to the report.


Te tūtohunga  
Recommendation

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) note the record of proceedings for the local board workshops held on 8 April, 22 April, 29 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 proceedings of 8 April 2020</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Workshop proceedings of 22 April 2020</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Workshop proceedings of 29 April 2020</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>workshop proceedings of 13 May 2020</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ngā kaihaina

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Dileeka Senewiratne - Democracy Advisor Waiheke Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Janine Geddes - Acting Relationship Manager - Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waiheke Local Board Workshop proceedings

Workshop record of the Waiheke Local Board held via skype on Wednesday 8 April 2020 commencing at 9:00am

**PRESENT**

**Chairperson:** Cath Handley  
**Members:** Bob Upchurch, Kylee Matthews, Robin Tucker  
**Absent:** Paul Walden  
**Apologies:** Helgard Wagener  
**Also present:** Janine Geddes, Mark Inglis, Dileeka Senewiratne John Nash and Fiona Gregory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Auckland Transport  | Informal dissemination  | The transport team provided an update to the board on a number of issues.  
| Update              |                          | Bus network. Driver availability on the island – AT has a good pool of drivers and if not for the covid-19 situation, the 50B route would have restarted. Now 50B will remain on hold. The route that AT is running at the moment with significant reduced patronage and demand on the island.  
|                     |                          | Electric Buses - Manufacturing plant overseas has been affected and there will be a few months of delay. At this point the blue buses will continue.  
|                     |                          | Customer Satisfaction Survey in Feb had pretty good numbers – 450. Overall satisfaction was 80% comparatively to 90% across Auckland. 40% were residence and 60% were visitors.  
|                     |                          | 28% of residents are using the bus services.  
|                     |                          | Pete took the board members through the survey result presentation.  
|                     |                          | 50B and Kennedy Point service will not be running during winter from May 2020.  
|                     |                          | Ostend loop going forward will go live at the same time the 50B go live.  
<p>|                     |                          | Trailing the usage of Ostend road, on average every 7 trips they pick up 1 passenger. Costing |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Youth Hub Update</strong></th>
<th>Informal dissemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Gregory – Strategic Broker, Doris Aoina - Waiheke Youth Centre Trust &amp; Mel Lelo - Youth Empowerment Team</td>
<td>Doris gave an update on the Surfdale Hall Waiheke Youth Centre Trust took over the management of the hall on 1st Feb 2019. Since then 60+ groups have had bookings. A variety of youth events like Yoga, Cooking Classes, pizza nights, workshops, are some of the events had. Managing the hall has been quite busy with admin and maintenance. Currently getting quotes for furniture for an upgrade to apply for the funding. Open day for the Youth Group will have been pushed back towards the end of the year, due to the current situation. Doris has been coordinating lots of activities from different organizations who support youth activities, which has presented some challenges. Planning a Youth Hui and invite all the different groups who have youth events. Cath suggested marketing to increase community visibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Additional classifications and volume two</strong></th>
<th>Informal dissemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annette Campion – Parks Sports and Recreation, Jessica Morris – Service Asset Planner</td>
<td>Officers took the board through a presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Update from Community Facilities</strong></th>
<th>Informal dissemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Kunzendorff – Area Manager Project Delivery,</td>
<td>Bridget is getting Dogs on Lead signage by end of the tomorrow. Executive Leaders are looking at the financial aspects of covid-19.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 3.28pm
Waiheke Local Board Workshop proceedings

Workshop record of the Waiheke Local Board held in via Skype on Wednesday, 22 April 2020, commencing at 9.00am

PRESENT
Chairperson: Cath Handley
Members: Bob Upchurch, Kylee Matthews, Robin Tucker
Absent: Paul Walden
Also present: Janine Geddes, Mark Inglis, Dileeka Senewiratne, John Nash, Jestine Joseph and Fiona Gregory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Informal dissemination</td>
<td>Members used this time to discuss a number of local issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Plan Change 22/Plan Modification 12 - Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua | Informal dissemination | Matthew introduced the team, Matthew Gouge from the planning team within the Plans and Places Department, Sheri-Ann Atuahiva the team leader of the Māori Heritage Team within Plans and Places, and Craig Cairncross – Team Leader and senior technical reviewer for the plan changes. This plan change is the first tranche in a series of plan changes to protect sites and places of significance to Mana Whenua as part of the Plans and Places’ Māori Heritage Programme. Topics of discussion:  
  * Matthew stated he is not able to discuss details but can assist the board in a discussion of the technical planning provisions, process followed, submissions received.  
  * Matthew briefed the members about the mana whenua entities involved in this plan change. He noted that Ngāti Paoa is currently represented by two entities: the Ngāti Paoa Iwi Trust and the Trust Board. The plan change has been engaging with both of these entities.  
  * The plan change was originally notified on the 31st of March. As a result of submissions received, the plan change has been subject to some |
amendments and was limited re-notified to some directly affected parties (such as the Waiheke Golf Club) to allow them an opportunity to submit.

- Submissions on the site – raised concern regarding the ongoing viability of sports facilities within the Rangihoua Reserve / Onetangi Sports Park post scheduling.
- Rangihoua Reserve / Onetangi Sports Park - Query raised regarding how do the boundaries of the Rangihoua Kaitiaki and LPMP align. Reserves management plan is only the reserves land, not the maunga and landscape amenity.
  - Scheduling will highlight the significance of the area for any future development. This will be considered in subsequent reserves management plans and area plans.
  - Bob noted he was a member of the golf club and former president.
  - Mechanism for global consents do exist where business as usual conditions may be applied. Consultation with mana whenua would still be likely prior to consenting.

- Ground disturbances go from having a certain level of permitted activity to being Discretionary Activities.
- Bob wanted to check requirement for consent for any ground disturbance and toilets. No prohibitive conditions proposed, however a consenting process would need to be undertaken under the new scheduling for such activities.
- Matthew noted the existence of houseboats in Putiki Bay (off Onetangi Sports Park). Submissions have been received by two of the boat owners as a result of the limited renotation of the plan changes.
- Iwi feedback may be required on such matters as location, size, lighting, toilet facilities etc.
- Ngāti Paoa and the Crown are currently working on a Treaty Claims settlement. Their Deed of Settlement is yet to be ratified by the iwi.
- Matthew noted that the Bean Rock site is also within the Waiheke Local Board area. No submissions have been received specifically relating to that site even though Ports of Auckland was directly notified.
- Officers will draft a report and aim for the 27 May Business Meeting to present to the board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Transport Update</th>
<th>Informal Dissemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jonathan Anyon &amp; Lorna Stewart – Elected Member Relationship Managers</strong></td>
<td>Take any questions from the Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John and Jonathan spoke to the coming workshop on the AT led Mātatiā Transport Business. A lot of work has gone into getting the presentation for next Wednesday’s workshop. John asked that board members to take time to read the presentation ahead of the workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robin will do a follow up meeting with Pete Moth from AT to go through the Metro bus use survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan noted that removing the buildings behind the Harbormasters continued to present challenges. In particular H&amp;S certification requirements mean the preferred local supplier needs to sub-contract to an entity that meet AT’s requirements. Jonathan expected that to be resolved this week so work could start post lockdown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan updated the board on the tree at the Placemakers bus stop which would need to be removed for the bus stop to be extended, which is needed to meet the new bus services increased frequencies and routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Car at the esplanade</strong> – Cath suggested Jonathan to look into removing vehicles especially the vehicle at the esplanade as some of the parts are falling off into the water and the community is worried about the oil and fuel spillage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note from Mark Waiheke Towing has a depot at 34 Tahi Rd where these vehicles can be stored and has offered to do so once designated for legal removal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Agenda run-through | Informal Dissemination | The board had a pre meeting agenda catch up. |

The workshop concluded at 12.47pm
Waiheke Local Board Workshop proceedings

Workshop record of the Waiheke Local Board held via Skype on Wednesday 29 April 2020, commencing at 9.00am

PRESENT
Chairperson: Cath Handley
Members: Bob Upchurch
Kylee Matthews
Robin Tucker
Absent: Paul Walden
Also present: Janine Geddes, Mark Inglis, Dileeka Senewiratne, John Nash and Fiona Gregory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Parks Management Plan - Volume 1</td>
<td>Informal dissemination</td>
<td>Nicki Malone clarified the changes proposed with regard to classifications. Next steps: Report to the board’s May business meeting to approve classifications discussed over the last three workshops. Feedback for the Volume 1 – Nicki Malone went through with the amendments in Part B on feedback on outcomes that the Board requested.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Jessica Morris – Service and Asset Planner, Nicki Malone – Service and Asset Planning Specialist | Informal dissemination | • Board agreed to add ‘restore’ to the outcome “protected and enhanced natural environment”.  
• Board supported elevating Te ao Maori as a separate outcome  
• Amend Heritage – separating out character and separating out heritage.  
• The wording to be: There is provision for needs of visitors.  
• Climate Change – Board happy with the changes.  
• Parks value ‘economic’– added some wording around highlighting on the positive impact on the surrounding areas of the neighbourhood. Board happy with the wording.  
• The board were comfortable with waiting within a reasonable timeframe for the policy on Maori heritage but they did not |
want this to significantly delay approval of the draft plan for public consultation.
- Park naming – Policy says give priority to Maori naming for parks. Board is happy to give priority to Maori names for new parks.
- Board support strengthening the connection to the Hauraki Gulf in the plan as this is important local context.
- Rangihoua Onetangi Sports Park - Lot 6 to be included in the Rangihoua scope. Nicki will be reporting back to the board at the next board meeting so this could be confirmed at that point.
- Next steps – June Review with memo and email.
- June Business Meeting for final approval depending on the public consultation

**Action:**

- Nicki to look at, Council-owned bush reserve located north of the site and contains a walking access leading down to Neil Avenue (which then connects to Hunterville Road). 33 Anzac Road, Oraipu
- Feedback on Volume 2 will be workshoped later in May. Dilly to confirm a date for workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop 4 Local Board Agreement (LBA) consultation feedback</th>
<th>Janine took the board through a presentation to review the consultation feedback received from the Local Board Agreement. Report will be presented to the 13 May extraordinary business meeting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janine Geddes – Acting Relationship Manager, Mark Inglis – Advisor, Jastine Joseph – Financial Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 2.04pm
Waiheke Local Board Workshop proceedings

Workshop record of the Waiheke Local Board held via Skype for Business, on Wednesday 13 May 2020, commencing at 9.00am

**PRESENT**

**Chairperson:** Cath Handley  
**Members:** Bob Upchurch, Kylee Matthews, Robin Tucker  
**Absent:** Paul Walden  
**Also present:** Janine Geddes, John Nash, Mark Inglis, Dileeka Senewiratne and Fiona Gregory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agenda run-through</td>
<td>Informal dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Waiheke Pathways Plan – Recommendations and Implementation Programme | Informal dissemination   | Topics of discussion  
The workshop discussion included a review of the memo and the Waiheke Pathways Plan. The plan proposes 14 priorities for greenways, and 4 of the 14 priorities were identified in the plan as ‘quick wins’.  
Board members discussed the criteria to apply when considering priorities for the greenways network as follows:  
- Access and connectivity to schools (noting the high usage these links would enable)  
- High usage (with consideration for paths utilised by locals and/or visitors)  
- Essential vs ‘nice to have’ (with consideration for public perception and potential cost implications)  
- Safety improvements  
- Coastal implications  
Members also raised concerns about safety issues in the road corridor, including Wharf Rd to Belgium Street, where the footpath
Attachment D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Comes to an abrupt end. Issues of safety for pedestrians and cyclists in the road corridor should be addressed with AT and included in the Waiheke 10-Year AT Plan. Another concern addressed the closing of tracks. Both roading and closed track issues should be referenced when drafting the strategic assessment and in the final report to be submitted for board approval. It was noted that public perception does not distinguish between council and AT responsibilities, and a clear explanation of the programmes of work will be required: greenways, tracks, cycle lanes and footpaths.

**Actions:**
- **Jacqui:** Liaise with AT Relationship Manager and Community Facilities to ensure that proposed greenways priorities align with the proposed programme of works for both AT and CF.
- **Jacqui:** Draft a strategic assessment to refine the list of greenways projects to be prioritised.

The workshop concluded at 11.00am
Re-establishment of the Waiheke Transport Forum

File No.: CP2020/06095

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To re-establish the Waiheke Transport Forum (the transport forum) which will provide community input on transport matters to the Waiheke Local Board.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The Waiheke Local Board wishes to re-establish the transport forum to enable the community to give meaningful input on transport matters on Waiheke Island.

3. The forum will comprise two members of the local board, an ex-officio Auckland Transport representative, an ex-officio representative of the New Zealand Police, an accessibility representative and up to six community representatives.

4. The forum will be a formal sub-committee of the board, act as an advisory body, have the power to make recommendations and have no budgetary allocation.

5. The first meeting is proposed for Wednesday, 17 June 2020 at 5pm, with the agenda closing on Monday, 8 June 2020.

6. Applications for community representatives on the transport forum were publicly advertised and closed on 30 March 2020.

7. Applications were considered at a workshop using an agreed set of selection criteria (Attachment B – under confidential cover).

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendations

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) approve the re-establishment of the Waiheke Transport Forum as a sub-committee of the Waiheke Local Board.

b) approve the proposed terms of reference of the transport forum (Attachment A).

c) appoint up to six community representatives and an accessibility representative to the Waiheke Transport Forum.

d) set the first meeting of the Transport Forum for 17 June 2020 at 5pm.

Horopaki
Context

8. The request to establish a transport forum was made at the public forum of the Waiheke Local Board business meeting in August 2017. Reference was made to a defunct transport forum on Waiheke that was wound up in 2013 which met on a monthly basis to discuss better roading solutions. The transport forum met on a two-monthly basis during 2019 until the local body election and the board now wishes to re-establish the sub-committee for the new political term.

9. The transport forum enables community members to make proposals to the local board on transport-related issues. The transport forum recognises local expertise and empowers
community members to contribute to solutions to local problems. The forum also contributes to community “ownership” of the transport network.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

10. After discussion with Auckland Transport, the local board supports the re-establishment of a new transport forum which will meet on a two-monthly basis. The new members of the transport forum will decide on the meeting schedule and meeting times for the rest of 2020 at its first meeting which is scheduled for 17 June 2020 at 5pm.

11. The purpose of the forum will be to:
   - Consider presentations on transport issues and propose transport-related projects on Waiheke.
   - Provide community input on design and planning of access to the island, its roads, cycleways and footpaths.
   - Advise on community engagement on local transport projects.

12. The forum will be constituted as a sub-committee under Auckland Council Standing Orders for the Waiheke Local Board 2017, section 2.7. The sub-committee will make recommendations to the Waiheke Local Board for its consideration. The forum will be made up of an ex-officio Auckland Transport representative, an ex-officio representative of the New Zealand Police, an accessibility representative, up to six co-opted community representatives, and two members of the local board. A mana whenua representative and subject matter experts, including Auckland Council Healthy Waters staff, can be co-opted on an as-needed basis.

13. The subcommittee will be subject to the standing orders of the Waiheke Local Board. Members of the community will be invited to request deputations and attendance at public forum as per standing orders.

14. Applications for community representatives and an accessibility representative were advertised in the Gulf News in March 2020 and in local social media. Applications closed on Monday 30 March 2020.

15. Nine applications were received, and the recommended applicants shall be selected using the following criteria:
   - Specific transport-related skills and expertise.
   - High level communication skills and collaboration skills.
   - Selection will increase the ability of the Transport Forum to represent the broadest range of transport interests on Waiheke.

18. Sergeant Raymond Matthews of the Waiheke Police will take up the ex-officio New Zealand Police role and Richard La Ville, Operations Manager Waiheke and Gulf Islands Airfields will take up the ex-officio Auckland Transport role.

19. Deputy Chair Bob Upchurch and Member Robin Tucker will take up the board member roles.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

20. The re-establishment of the transport forum has no direct impact on council’s climate strategy; however the new group may propose low carbon initiatives during the coming term in line with the Local Board Plan.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

21. The transport forum has the support of Auckland Transport which is detailed in the signed Memorandum of Understanding between the council-controlled organisation and the Waiheke Local Board.

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

22. The board has considered the need for a transport forum and has requested that Auckland Council staff work with Auckland Transport to re-establish the subcommittee for the new political term.

23. Board members have indicated support for this proposal and believe that the transport forum would provide meaningful community input into transport matters on Waiheke.

24. Agreement has also been reached that the proposals presented at the forum can contribute to the Waiheke Ten-Year Transport Plan.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

25. Development of transport initiatives on Waiheke is an area of interest for mana whenua - consequently minutes of the transport forum will be circulated to mana whenua representatives.

26. Mana whenua representatives may be invited to attend the transport forum on a case by case basis.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

27. There is no budgetary allocation required for the transport forum. Any financial resources required to support approved recommendations will be approved by the board from existing budgets.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

28. The re-establishment of the transport forum will minimise board decision-making risks by creating a community forum for broader consideration of transport initiatives.

29. There is a risk that the transport forum may come to a different view on transport issues than the local board. This risk is mitigated by the membership of the two local board members on the forum and the status of the transport forum as a sub-committee of the board. All recommendations must be approved by the Waiheke Local Board.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

30. The next step is the convening of the inaugural meeting of the transport forum on 17 June 2020.

31. Should the board consider that there are significant knowledge or skill gaps in the subcommittee, it may take one of three following actions:
   • Subject matter experts may be co-opted as necessary depending upon expertise required for each agenda, as per page one of the attached terms of reference.
As a subcommittee, the board has the power to appoint people who have the skills, attributes and knowledge required for the subcommittee as per Clause 4.2.2 below:

**4.2.2 Appointed members on committees and subcommittees**
The members of a committee or subcommittee may, but need not be, elected members of the local board. The local board or committee may appoint to a committee or subcommittee a person who is not a member of the local board if, in the opinion of the local board or the committee, that person has the skills, attributes or knowledge that will assist the work of the committee or subcommittee. At least one member of a committee must be an elected member of the local board. [cl 31(3) & (4), sch 7, LGA 2002] [s85, Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009]

The board may decide to reopen expressions of interest and advertise through the usual channels.

**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Waiheke Transport Forum Terms of Reference</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Transport Forum Applications Selection Process May 2020 - CONFIDENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina / Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Mark Inglis - Local Board Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - General Manager - Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janine Geddes - Acting Relationship Manager - Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waiheke Transport Forum – Terms of Reference

Purpose
To provide advice and input to the Waiheke Local Board on transport matters and initiatives.

Proposed Scope:
To provide:
- a forum to consider presentations on transport issues and proposed projects on Waiheke.
- community input on design and planning of access to the island, roads, cycleways and footpaths.
- advice on community engagement on local transport projects.

Persons able to make presentations to the forum include:
- members of the community
- members of transport organisations
- officers of council family organisations
- elected members.

Structure
The Waiheke Transport Forum is constituted as a subcommittee of the Waiheke Local Board made up of the following members:

- two members of the Waiheke Local Board
- as an ex-officio member, the Auckland Transport Operations Manager or Elected Member Relationship Manager
- as an ex-officio member, the Waiheke Officer in Charge, New Zealand Police
- one accessibility representative
- up to six community members to be selected from public applications and invitations to community organisations including, but not limited to, the following:
  - Cycle Action Waiheke
  - Transport Operators
  - Walking Groups
  - School representatives
  - Residents Associations
- other council or Auckland Transport staff may be invited to contribute specialist knowledge and/or input as necessary
- subject matter experts may be co-opted as necessary depending upon expertise required for each agenda
Meeting Structure
- Transport Forum meets once every 2 months at a date which would enable its recommendations to be submitted to the Waiheke Local Board business meeting by the agenda closing date of the same month.
- It may also at its discretion approve times and dates of extraordinary business meetings and/or additional workshops subject to compliance with Waiheke Local Board standing orders.
- The Transport Forum may appoint a chairperson and a deputy chairperson from its membership by simple majority vote of the members present at the meeting.

Staff Support
Staff support will be provided by the following council staff:
- Relationship Manager, Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards
- Programme Manager, Waiheke and Gulf Islands
- Local Board Advisor, Waiheke Local Board
- Waiheke Local Board Democracy Advisor

Administration
- The Waiheke Transport Forum is subject to standing orders of the Waiheke Local Board.
- The administration of reports, resolutions and minutes will be undertaken using the council’s Infocouncil application and are subject to the relevant timelines prescribed in that application.
- Written proposals and reports must be submitted by the agenda closing date to the Waiheke Local Board email address using the prescribed format and documentation.
- Notice of ordinary and extraordinary business meetings must be given in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.
- Recommendations for proposed actions will be submitted to the Waiheke Local Board business meeting by means of formal resolution of the Waiheke Transport Forum.

Quorum
- A quorum is made up of fifty per cent plus one of the appointed committee members.

Budget and Delegated Authority
- There is no allocated budget for the Waiheke Transport Forum.
- Delegated Authority – nil (advisory only).
- Waiheke Local Board Office facilities, staff and catering may be available as necessary to support the activities of the forum.

Mana Whenua Involvement
- Mana Whenua Organisations and Piritahi Marae Committee to be sent the minutes of each meeting and invited on a case-by-case basis.

Review
- The operations of the forum will be reviewed on an annual basis

Last updated 1 May 2020
Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Waiheke Local Board

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

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


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
<td>s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of a deceased person. In particular, the report contains personal information and this will enable the local board to deliberate on its decision or recommendation.</td>
<td>s48(1)(a) - The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>