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1 Welcome

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

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

4 Confirmation of Minutes
   That the Howick Local Board:
   a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Monday, 17 August 2020, as a true and correct record.

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

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

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

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

8.1 Manukau Beautification Charitable Trust update to Howick Local Board

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Members of the Manukau Beautification Charitable Trust will be in attendance to present to Howick Local Board on the work of the trust for the 2019/2020 financial year.
2. The deputation will also include an introduction to the trust’s incoming Chief Executive, Daniel Barhow.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:

a) receive the deputation from the Manukau Beautification Charitable Trust and thank Barbara Carney, Dawn Edwards and Daniel Barhow for their attendance.

9 Public Forum

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

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

10 Extraordinary Business

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

(a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and

(b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-

(i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and

(ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.”

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:
“Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

(a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-

(i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and

(ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion."
Chairperson's Report

File No.: CP2020/12503

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. This item gives the local board chairperson an opportunity to update the local board on any announcements and note the chairperson’s written report.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Providing the local board chairperson with an opportunity to update the local board on the projects and issues they have been involved with since the last meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:
   a) note the chairperson’s verbal update and written report.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Vanessa Phillips - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager for Franklin and Howick Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. A period of time (10 minutes) has been set aside for the Howick Ward Councillors to have an opportunity to update the local board on regional matters.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Providing the Howick Ward Councillors with an opportunity to update the local board on regional matters they have been involved with since the last meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:
a) receive the verbal reports from Cr Paul Young and Cr Sharon Stewart.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Vanessa Phillips - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager for Franklin and Howick Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Transport September 2020 monthly update to Howick Local Board

File No.: CP2020/13255

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the Howick Local Board on transport related matters in their local board area, including the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) and the Community Safety Fund.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. A decision is required this month. A separate report containing this decision is included in the agenda. This report provides an opportunity to highlight Auckland Transport (AT) activities in the Howick Local Board area and contains information about the following:
   a) the wider context involving a summary of the strategic projects delivered in the Howick Local Board area and about Auckland Transport’s response to COVID-19
   b) an update on the Community Safety Fund (CSF)
   c) updates on local transport projects in the Howick Local Board area.

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

Horopaki
Context
3. Auckland Transport is responsible for all of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways. Auckland Transport reports monthly to local boards, as set out in the Local Board Engagement Plan.
4. Monthly reporting acknowledges the important engagement role local boards play within and on behalf of their local communities.
5. Auckland Transport is currently delivering three key strategic projects in the Howick Local Board area and these are discussed within this report.
6. Recently, the strategic environment has changed because of the impacts of COVID-19 pandemic. Information on Auckland Transport’s response is provided below.

Auckland Transport’s response to COVID-19
7. Throughout New Zealand’s response to the COVID 19 pandemic, Auckland Transport has played a key role providing essential public transport services, keeping roads open and ensuring planning continued on projects for when restrictions lifted work could begin or re-start.
8. On 12 August 2020, the government announced Auckland would move to Alert Level 3 which saw Auckland Transport responding to support this announcement similar to its approach during the first lockdown.

9. At Alert Level 3, Auckland Transport is able to continue work on most projects, although work on some projects is slowed down by the requirement to work in ‘bubbles’. Work continues on planning and design work for projects for work to commence once the alert level is lowered.

10. A key part of Auckland Transport’s response is an effective transport network. Public transport provides lower cost transport options for people working in essential services. An additional measure was implemented by the government for when Auckland moved to Alert Level 2 (from 24 August 2020) the wearing of face coverings (facemasks) is mandatory on all public transport in New Zealand.

**Airport to Botany – Rapid Transport Network (RTN)**

11. The Airport to Botany – Rapid Transport Network (RTN) projects aim is to create a RTN linking the Airport and Botany.

12. Auckland Council’s long-term goal for public transport is to have rapid transit networks region wide with services that run at least every 15 minutes and more frequently during peak hours. Some examples of RTNs are the rail network and the Northern Busway. Auckland Transport’s role is delivering this vision.

13. The project continues to progress and a public summary report for the second round of public consultation for the Southwest Gateway Programme / Airport to Botany RTN which took place from November to December 2020 will be published in early September 2020.

14. In addition to outlining feedback from engagement, the public summary report also discusses the next steps for the project. Construction on short-term work for the Puhinui Road and Lambie Drive, Manukau improvements is scheduled to start in late September 2020, with an expected completion date of either May or June 2021.

15. Howick Local Board will be briefed in an upcoming workshop on the projects current progress.

**Eastern Rail Line closure**

16. Last month, Kiwi Rail announced the Auckland rail network requires work to improve services and future proof the rail network for when the Central Rail Link opens. Currently, trains are running at slower than normal speeds to help maintain the network until these works.

17. The plan is to close sections of the network completely for short times rather than doing lots of piecemeal work. Using this plan, the aim is to achieve the same amount of work on the Eastern Rail Line in one 14-day closure as it would take more than 100 days working at night and over weekends. The Eastern Rail Line will not operate between Britomart and Otahuhu in order for this section of the network to be upgraded.


19. Stopping the trains for an extended period allows a considerably more productive work programme, enables quicker completion of work and a return to normal operations in the shortest possible period. This minimises overall disruption for commuters and corridor neighbours.

20. Auckland Transport are communicating these changes via:

   a) ensuring train services are replaced by buses and publishing this new timetable on the Auckland Transport website

   b) updating the Journey Planner and AT Mobile App with the new timetables
c) One Com – the public transport text alert system for rail customers will send messages to all subscribers
d) alerts will be published on the Journey Planner and AT Mobile app
e) targeted social media posts to those living in the Eastern Rail Line vicinity advising of the closure
f) social media posts will also target the wider Auckland region
g) Britomart Towers and LCD screen messaging will go-live when available
h) scrolling messages will run on the Public Information Displays (PIDs) at stations
i) regular announcements will be made at all stations.

21. Between Kiwi Rail, Auckland Transport and Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Authority the overall aim is to ensure the Auckland rail network is ready and ‘fit for purpose’ for when the Central Rail Link is opened as there will be many more trains running on the tracks.

**AMETI - Eastern Busway**

22. The AMETI - Eastern Busway is a $1.4 billion project and is New Zealand’s first urban busway. The busway will provide congestion free, bus only lanes for commuters from Botany to Panmure. Recently, Auckland Council confirmed its commitment to this project, and it is unlikely that the changes confirmed in the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 will have a significant effect on the project’s timeline, scope or design.

23. In August 2020, the steel frame that will support the new bridge over the Tamaki River started to move into location. The artist’s impression below shows the new lanes (on the right) being built. This event was marked with a ceremony and an opportunity for all local elected representatives to gather and celebrate this milestone in the project’s progress.

*Figure One: Artist’s impression of the bridge over the Tamaki River*

24. In late August 2020, Auckland Transport re-established the ability to drive directly from Queens Road across the Panmure intersection (former Panmure roundabout) into Ireland Road, Panmure. The movement controlled by signals and driver behaviour will determine whether this connection remains in place during construction. The long-term goal being that the new fully, signalised, four-road intersection will allow this movement. See figure two below.
25. Although, the vast majority of motorists travelling through the intersection follow the traffic management rules, Auckland Transport staff have witnessed unsafe driver behavior, resulting in this change being implemented to increase safety.

26. Auckland Transport are not looking to re-establish the connection from Ireland Road, Panmure directly into Queens Road and Jellicoe Road, Panmure. For safety reasons the connection is only possible in one direction, Queens Road into Ireland Road, Panmure.

27. It is important to note, this is a trial and if unsafe driver behaviour continues, it will need to close once more until the Panmure intersection works are completed in October 2020.

28. Auckland Transport also advises that a major closure is planned at the intersection of Pakuranga Road and Ti Rakau Drive, Pakuranga that will cause three to four days of re-routing. The dates are not yet confirmed; however the closure is planned for Labour weekend with the intention that having large impact for short time over a small holiday period outweighs having long running intermittent closures.

Community Safety Fund (CSF)

29. Over two years, the CSF planned to deliver a total of $20 million distributed across all 21 local boards. It is strictly for road safety initiatives and is designed to deliver safety projects identified by the local board and ward councilors.

30. A local board’s share of the fund is derived from a formula that assesses the number of deaths and serious injuries in that area.

31. The Howick Local Board’s share of the CSF is $985,896.

32. Howick Local Board has two CSF projects and progress is reported below:

   a) Botany Downs Secondary College Crossing Point – The project to improve crossing facilities for Botany Downs Secondary College students crossing Chapel Road, Botany.

   b) Flatbush School Road Temporary Pedestrian Bridge – Building a temporary bridge over the Flat Bush Culvert (on Flatbush School Road, Botany).

33. As the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 has been confirmed, Auckland Transport reviewed all CSF projects.

34. With regards to Howick Local Board’s two projects, funding is not available for the Botany Downs Secondary College Crossing Point. The Flatbush School Road pedestrian bridge is
funded, and public consultation is underway. A plan of the proposed pedestrian bridge that will run parallel with the existing bridge is included below as Figure Three.

35. Completion of the pedestrian bridge is planned for either December 2020 or January 2021. Completion of this bridge will allow local traffic controls that are currently in place to allow pedestrians to cross safety to be removed.

*Figure Three: Flatbush School Road Bridge plans*

### Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

**Analysis and advice**

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

### Local Board Transport Capital Fund

37. 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:

   a) be safe
   
   b) not impede network efficiency
   
   c) be in the road corridor (although projects running through parks may be considered if they support a transport outcome).

38. The fund allows local boards to build transport focused local improvements in their areas.
39. Auckland Transport has assessed the financial impacts realised from the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 and is able to provide advice to all local board’s in relation to re-structuring their LBTCF programmes to meet the reduction in funding from the budget.

40. A workshop was held with the board on 3 September 2020. Auckland Transport provided advice to the board for their consideration. In a separate decision report on the agenda, the board will confirm their priorities for LBTCF funding. This will be reported on via monthly updates to the board on progress.

**Change to 714 bus service**

41. A new school bus, route 424, will replace public bus route 714 (Bucklands Beach to Half Moon Bay, Pakuranga) from 12 October 2020. The 714 route is to cease operating after 10 October 2020.

42. The purpose of this change is a result of low public usage on the 714 public bus service with the exception of Bucklands Beach Intermediate School students at school times. The key points are:
   a) The 714 service operates roughly hourly on weekdays (13 trips a day in each direction with two extra trips on a Friday) and about half as frequently on weekends
   b) during February 2020, the 714 service averaged 91 boardings per weekday of which 45 were school students on the 7:53am and 3:10pm trips. Students make up half of weekday patronage, using just two of the 26 daily trips
   c) it is evident that if the remaining 46 non-student passengers spread across 26 daily trips the existing 714 route is not a well patronised service.

43. Auckland Transport has made the decision to replace the under-utilised 714 service with a dedicated school bus for the benefit of Bucklands Beach Intermediate School students and ratepayers.

44. After the 714 service is withdrawn, residents in Bucklands Beach will continue to be served by all-day all-week routes 712 (to Pakuranga and Panmure) and 733 (to Highland Park and Botany). The customers impacted are those travelling between Bucklands Beach and the Half Moon Bay ferry terminal will now need to take two buses, current usage indicates this will only affect a limited number of customers.

**Botany Road Intersection Upgrades**

45. In July 2020, an Auckland Transport engineer discussed proposed upgrades to the intersections of Botany Road and:
   a) Cascades Road, Pakuranga
   b) Millhouse Road, Botany.

46. Given the projects size, Auckland Transport in keen to ensure that the board is well-informed. Recently, public consultation has completed, and senior management will now consider this and confirm the final design. Once completed, the project will start construction. Construction dates still need to be confirmed and will be communicated as soon as they are available. Maps of the proposals are included in Attachment A and B respectively.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement**

47. Auckland Transport engages closely with the council on developing strategy, actions and measures to support the outcomes sought by the Auckland Plan 2050, the Auckland Climate Action Plan and Auckland Council’s priorities.
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48. 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

49. Auckland Transport continues to liaise and work with Community Facilities to deliver sections of the Howick Walking and Cycling Network Plan using LBTCF funding.

50. Auckland Transport assessed impacts of the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 and is working with Community Facilities to provide quality advice and discuss impacts from the reduced budget with the board.

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

Auckland Transport consultations

51. Over the last reporting period, Auckland Transport liaised with the local board on two local projects, a summary is included as Attachment A.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

52. There are no specific impacts on Māori for this reporting period. Auckland Transport is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty of Waitangi) and its broader legal obligations in being more responsible or effective to Māori. Our Māori Responsiveness Plan outlines the commitment to 19 mana whenua tribes in delivering effective and well-designed transport policy and solutions for Auckland. We also recognise mataawaka and their representative bodies and our desire to foster a relationship with them. This plan is available on the Auckland Transport website - https://at.govt.nz/about-us/transport-plans-strategies/māori-responsiveness-plan/#about

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

53. Receiving this report has no direct financial implications.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurarutanga
Risks and mitigations

54. The proposed decision to receive the report has no risks. Auckland Transport has risk management strategies in place for all of its projects.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

55. Auckland Transport will provide another update report to the local board next month.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
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<td>Detailed design plans of Botany Road intersection updates - Cascades Road</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Summary of consultation information sent to Howick Local Board in August/September 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Proposal</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fencible Drive Buslayover</td>
<td>Howick Local Board’s transport representatives have stated that board does not support this project and that information has been provided to the project team.</td>
<td>This project was discussed throughout August 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleakhouse Road Broken Yellow Lines</td>
<td>Broken yellow lines to improve visibility exiting Bleakhouse Road.</td>
<td>11 August 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Yellow Lines Burswood Drive</td>
<td>Broken yellow lines to allow vehicles easier movement onto Ti Rakau Drive.</td>
<td>8 September 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To support and record decisions for Howick Local Board’s Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) projects.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Auckland Transport manages the LBTCF on behalf of Howick Local Board. On an as required basis Auckland Transport reports to the board to provide advice and support their decision-making.
3. This month a decision relating to the LBTCF is required.
4. Since the beginning of Howick Local Board’s current electoral term, the board has reviewed a wide selection of possible project ideas. The ideas were workshopped on 20 February 2020, and at their March 2020 meeting, the board requested Auckland Transport investigate a selection of these projects. Information regarding potential costs was reported at the board’s June 2020 meeting.
5. Auckland Council’s Emergency Budget 2020/2021 has reduced the size of the LBTCF from approximately $20 million per annum spread across 21 local board’s to approximately $5 million.
6. This month the local board is requested to consider reprioritising their LBTCF to match the updated financial situation.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:

a) approve $550,000 from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund to complete the development of detailed design and community consultation for the Howick Village Centre Plan.

b) approve $570,000 from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund to complete the Cascades Pathway, an element of the Howick Walking and Cycling Plan.

c) approve $83,000 from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund to install four new electronic speed warning signs on Point View Drive to improve safety by encouraging drivers to slow down.

d) approve $37,000 from the Local Board Transport Capital Fund to build an information plinth at Half Moon Bay Ferry terminal.

Horopaki
Context
7. 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:

a) be safe
b) not impede network efficiency
c) be in the road corridor (although projects running through parks may be considered if they support a transport outcome).

8. The fund allows local boards to build transport focused local improvements in their areas.

9. Auckland Transport assessed impacts of the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 which has resulted in a reduction to Howick Local Board’s portion of their LBTCF to approximately $400,000 for the 2020/2021 financial year. Auckland Transport has advised the local board that for planning purposes it should work on the basis of approximately $800,000 per financial year for the following two years. Therefore, Howick Local Board has a total of approximately $2 million to be utilised for the remainder of this electoral term.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Background to decision-making

10. In November 2019, at the beginning of the new electoral term, Auckland Transport workshoped potential projects with the Howick Local Board and outlined a plan for delivery of projects. Auckland Transport officers provided advice about maximising the potential of the fund by working with other strategies delivered by Auckland Transport and Auckland Council.

11. On 20 February 2020, Auckland Transport and Auckland Council staff discussed projects with the local board. Subsequently, all projects were prioritised by the members and staff advice was provided by memorandum to the Chair and Transport lead.

12. At its meeting on 20 April 2020 the Howick Local Board resolved (resolution HW/2020/47) the following in relation to the LBTCF decisions:

That the Howick Local Board:

a) request Auckland Transport investigate the following projects and provide rough orders of cost for:

i) options for a section of The Parade (between Laings Road and Whitcombe Road) at Bucklands Beach to provide better pedestrian safety, for example a one way system, within a budget envelope of up to $3,000,000

ii) installing speed indicator variable message signs (VMS) on Point View Drive

iii) installing an information plinth at Half Moon Bay, and potentially other locations

iv) building a better walking route between the Half Moon Bay Ferry Terminal and the coastal walkway in front of the Bucklands Beach Yacht Club.

b) request Auckland Transport provide options to utilise up to $4,000,000 of the Local Board Transport Capital Fund to deliver projects identified in the Howick Walking and Cycling Plan, following advice from Community Facilities and prioritised as follows:

i) maximise pedestrian and cycling connectivity to public transport and employment hubs and schools

ii) speed of delivery

iii) as recommended in the Howick Walking and Cycling Plan.

c) Note $3,000,000 unspent of the Local Board Transport Capital Fund reserved in anticipation of recommendations of projects from the Steering Group on the Howick Village Centre Plan.
13. Auckland Council’s Community Facilities team led workshops with Howick Local Board on 28 May and 11 June 2020 with Auckland Transport staff in attendance to discuss Howick Walking and Cycling Network Plan. These workshops enabled the board to identify a package of work they would like advanced to detailed design and formally requested this at their June 2020 meeting.

Advice about responding to Auckland Council’s Emergency Budget 2020/2021

14. In July 2020, Auckland Council confirmed its Emergency Budget 2020/2021. This budget considers the effects of COVID-19 on the council’s ability to borrow money used to fund their capital programme, which includes the LBTF.

15. Auckland Transport provided updated advice to the board regarding the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 in writing and at a workshop with additional Auckland Council staff on 3 September 2020.

16. Auckland Transport’s advice to the board can be summarised as follows;
   a) Auckland Council’s Emergency Budget 2020/2021 reduces the amount of LBTF available in the current financial year to approximately $400,000
   b) budgets for the 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 financial years are unknown and may be affected by COVID-19
   c) local boards cannot combine future year’s allocations into a single project, unless it can be delivered in stages but advice from Auckland Transport is for Howick Local Board to plan on the basis of approximately $800,000 per annum. (However, there is no guarantee of this money being available)
   d) Howick Local Board’s share of the LBTF is approximately $2 million to use this electoral term.
   e) local boards are encouraged to target delivery of smaller projects or complete design and documentation for a project that can be physically delivered in the 2021/2022 financial year.

17. Auckland Transport and Auckland Council staff provided a proposed programme of work that they felt met the board’s objectives. The projects in the programme are listed below with considerations:
   a) 2017 Howick Village Centre Plan - upgrade - This project is a board priority. It is mentioned in local board plan and a considerable amount of concept design work is completed (i.e. the 2017 Howick Village Centre Plan). This is a large project but can be broken into smaller projects that can be delivered as funding becomes available.
   b) Howick Walking and Cycling Network Plan – Cascades Pathway - The original plan involved an investment of approximately $4 million across a range of projects within this plan. Auckland Council staff advise that the Cascades Pathway is the most cost-effective part of the original package and can be delivered reasonably quickly. Based on this advice and the board’s previous high prioritisation of this project, staff support delivering this project.
   c) Point View Drive Electronic Warning Signs - Staff supported installing four new electronic speed warning signs on Point View Drive, Botany because of the relatively low cost, ease of delivery and contribution to safety.
   d) Information Plinth at Half Moon Bay Ferry terminal - This project meets a long-term request from the local board and was sufficiently simple and low cost that delivery could easily be guaranteed. It also improves accessibility to the public transport network.

18. Table One (below) summarises the programme and funding allocations.
### Table One: Suggested LBTCF Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Estimated Cost to Complete</th>
<th>2020/2021 Budget</th>
<th>2021/2022 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 Howick Village Centre Plan - upgrade</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick Walking and Cycling Network Plan – Cascades pathway</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point View Drive Electronic warning signs</td>
<td>$83,000</td>
<td>$83,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information plinth at Half Moon Bay Ferry terminal</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POTENTIAL BUDGETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$406,971</strong></td>
<td><strong>$838,589</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. This report’s recommendations are derived from the suggested LBTCF programme in Table One.

20. The board considered other projects that are listed below with a summary of the advice provided by staff at the board’s workshop. Included is advice as to why staff do not support these projects at this time.

   a) **Bucklands Beach – The Parade one-way and safety improvements** - In Auckland Transport’s written and verbal discussions with the local board in June 2020, the technical difficulties of establishing a one-way system were extensively canvassed and are insurmountable at any reasonable cost. The cost of building new walking facilities along Buckland’s Beach is between $2.2 - $2.7 million. This is a large project that could be delivered in small pieces similar to both the 2017 Howick Village Centre Plan and the Howick Walking and Cycling Network Plan. However, this project is different because the Howick Local Board did not prioritise this by developing a concept plan and having this ratified by board resolution. Therefore, staff have advised the board to focus on the 2017 Howick Village Centre Plan and the Howick Walking and Cycling Network Plan.

   b) **Half Moon Bay Walkway** - This project involves building a walkway linking the ferry terminal to the existing Rotary Walkway. This project is difficult to deliver. Cars, boat trailers and pedestrians use the area. Resolving competing uses between the different users and creating a safe walkway will be difficult. The recommended option has an estimated cost of approximately $250,000. Therefore, delivery of this project would result in the board reprioritising funding away from either the 2017 Howick Village Centre Plan or the Howick Walking and Cycling Network Plan. Based on local board priorities staff do not recommend this option.

21. This suggested LBTCF programme provides a mix of small local projects that can be delivered in the 2020/2021 financial year (Point View Drive electronic warning signs and the information plinth at Halfmoon Bay) and steady progress on the board’s two larger projects. It is realistically deliverable and is supported by both Auckland Council and Auckland Transport staff.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

22. Auckland Transport engages closely with the council on developing strategy, actions and measures to support the outcomes sought by the Auckland Plan 2050, the Auckland Climate Action Plan and Auckland Council’s priorities.
23. 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

24. This package of work was developed in conjunction with Auckland Council’s Community Facilities team who will lead the design process. Auckland Transport will continue to work closely with the council to deliver the design work.

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

25. At the local board’s 3 September 2020 workshop, there was considerable discussion with some local board members testing the advice provided by Auckland Transport staff. There was a preference stated by a number of local board members for safety to be the local board’s primary concern.

26. The local board members referenced recent consultation in which the community stated road safety as a high priority. The members requested consideration of two projects:

a) Botany Downs Secondary College Pedestrian Crossing Improvements - The school is located on Chapel Road, Botany which is very busy. See Figure One below. Students are required to cross at a signalised crossing identified by the red circle. With a large number of students attending the school, this crossing point has become difficult to manage. In June 2019, the board requested this project be delivered using Auckland Transport’s Community Safety Fund. The Emergency Budget 2020/2021 has paused this fund. The project will cost approximately $500,000.

Figure One: Location of Botany Downs Secondary College Crossing
b) **Little Buckland’s Beach Traffic Calming** - This project is part of the larger project on The Parade, Bucklands Beach discussed in the analysis section of this report. This project involves building a raised crossing and speed tables on The Parade, Bucklands Beach to slow traffic and create a more pedestrian-friendly environment. See Figure Two below. The project cost is approximately $150,000.

*Figure Two: Traffic Calming and Crossing at Little Buckland Beach*

27. Auckland Transport’s advice is that either or both of these projects can be brought into the programme at the board’s request. The key consideration for the board is the financial implications that would be required resulting in a project or projects being substituted from the suggested LBTCF programme.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

28. Study of the options indicates that there may be significant decisions in relation to land or a body of water. Therefore, iwi consultation will be required and included in the design process.

29. Auckland Transport is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty of Waitangi) and its broader legal obligations in being more responsible or effective to Māori. Our Maori Responsiveness Plan outlines the commitment to 19 mana whenua tribes in delivering effective and well-designed transport policy and solutions for Auckland. We also recognise mataawaka and their representative bodies and our desire to foster a relationship with them. This plan is available on the Auckland Transport website - [https://at.govt.nz/about-us/transport-plans-strategies/maori-responsiveness-plan/#about](https://at.govt.nz/about-us/transport-plans-strategies/maori-responsiveness-plan/#about)

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

30. Should the report’s recommendation be supported then financial implications of this report are clear and easily understood. The LBTCF will all be utilised delivering the projects listed.

31. If the board wishes to change the recommendations and establish a different programme there may be some financial implications including timing of LBTCF fund utilisation.

32. For instance, the board has two options:
   
a) Delivery of the two suggested safety projects (Botany Downs Secondary School Crossing Point and Little Bucklands Beach traffic calming) with cost of approximately $650,000. This option will result in not delivering both the 2017 Howick Village Centre Plan upgrade work and the Howick Walking and Cycling Network Plan - Cascades Pathway.
b) Delivery of either one of the new projects in paragraph 19 however; this will also mean not completing either the 2017 Howick Village Centre Plan upgrade or the Howick Walking and Cycling Network Plan - Cascades Pathway.

33. The financial implications of either option will likely mean a sum of unallocated LBTCF will remain. If the board wishes to fully utilise the LBTCF, new projects will need to be identified, then developed, taking time and increasing the risk of delivery not being completed.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

34. Although the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 is confirmed, capital and operating budgets will continue to be reviewed and may be reduced depending on the ongoing impacts of COVID 19. This risk should be considered when analysing the options presented in this report.

35. Auckland Transport advice for mitigating this risk is to accept the financial uncertainty and deliver projects that:

a) are already in the programme. Introducing a new project has considerable risk. Every project must go through series of processes before delivery all of which takes time. By focusing on projects that are already developed the board limits the risk of having unallocated funds in the next budget round

b) are linked to a long-term strategic programme of the board therefore can be delivered in small chunks as funds become available.

36. It is suggested that the board minimises the amount of unallocated LBTCF. In the coming years’ budget rounds may become very competitive and large amounts of unallocated funds might be a signal that money is not required, so may be removed.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

37. Auckland Transport’s monthly update report to the local board will be used to keep the board up to date with progress. Once firm cost estimates have been prepared, another decision report will be made so the board can review the situation and authorise construction.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
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Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide the Howick Local Board with an integrated quarterly performance report for quarter four, 1 April – 30 June 2020, and the overall performance for the financial year, against the agreed 2019/2020 local board work programme.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report provides an integrated view of performance for the Howick Local Board and includes financial performance and delivery against work programmes for the 2019/2020 financial year. The Work Programme 2019/2020 quarter four report is included as Attachment A.

3. The COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in significant pressure on council’s financial position. In response to the Ministry of Health’s orders and to ensure prudent financial management council’s focus and expenditure shifted to essential services. A pause on spending on non-essential services has had a significant impact on the delivery of work programme activities.

4. Ninety-six activities within the agreed work programmes were delivered including multi-year projects that have progressed as expected. Sixty-four activities were undelivered, cancelled, put on hold or deferred.

5. Key activity achievements from the 2019/2020 work programme include:
   - Cockle Bay seawall renewal
   - lighting development in the northern and southern sections of Barry Curtis Park
   - Waste Minimisation in Schools
   - Pest Free Howick
   - Mellons Bay toilet renewal
   - activation of parks, places and open spaces
   - the continued delivery of seasonal events
   - Botany Library relocation opening
   - Raphoe Park playground renewal
   - Mangemangemaroa and Point View walkway and car park renewal
   - Howick Tourism Development.

6. Key activities not delivered / not progressed as expected include:
   - the delivery of the Ti Rakau Park playground renewal
   - progressing the Flat Bush Library & Community Centre and the Aquatic Centre
   - progressing public access to the closed Greenmount Landfill
   - the delivery of Barry Curtis Park skate park renewal
   - the deliveries of the Cockle Bay Reserve play assets and fence renewal.
7. Budgets of unfinished activities have been carried forward into the 2020/2021 work programmes.

8. The 2019/2020 financial performance report is included in this report as Attachment B but is excluded from the public. This is due to restrictions on releasing annual financial reports and results until the Auckland Council Group results are released to the NZX – on or about 30 September 2020.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Howick Local Board:

a) receive the performance report for the financial quarter four and year ending 30 June 2020.

b) note the financial performance report in Attachment B of the report will remain confidential until after the Auckland Council Group results for 2019/2020 are released to the New Zealand’s Exchange (NZX) which are expected to be made public 30 September 2020.

c) note that COVID19 has resulted in significant pressure on council’s financial position and ability to deliver agreed 2019/2020 work programme activities because:
   i) asset based services were significantly impacted. Regional and community facilities were either fully or partially closed.
   ii) spending on contracts was restricted to essential services only.

d) note that quarter three reporting was not supplied to the local board as there was limited capacity to access information.

Horopaki Context

9. The Howick Local Board has an approved 2019/2020 work programme for the following operating departments:
   - Arts, Community and Events;
   - Parks, Sport and Recreation;
   - Libraries;
   - Community Services: Service, Strategy and Integration;
   - Community Facilities: Build Maintain Renew;
   - Community Leases;
   - Infrastructure and Environmental Services;
   - Plans and Places;
   - ATEED;
   - External Partnerships.

10. The graph below shows how the work programme activities meet Local Board Plan outcomes. Activities that are not part of the approved work programme but contribute towards the local board outcomes, such as advocacy by the local board, are not captured in this graph.
11. The COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in significant pressure on council’s financial position and ability to deliver agreed 2019/2020 work programme activities. In response to the orders made by the Director-General of Health on 25 March 2020 under s 70 of the Health Act 1956, the council’s focus and expenditure shifted to essential services only. Physical distancing requirements and measures to ensure prudent financial management meant that only essential activities and services could continue.

12. Asset based services were significantly impacted as all regional and community facilities were either fully or partially closed depending on the Ministry of Health’s guidelines for each COVID-19 alert level.

13. Spending on contracts was restricted to essential services while in Alert Level 4. These restrictions were reviewed as alert levels changed. There are currently no restrictions, however, there continues to be extra spending approvals in place to ensure prudent spending and delivery of value for money for ratepayers.

14. Reporting on quarter three reporting was not supplied to the local board as council staff working from home during the lockdown had limited capacity to access information and systems which affected their ability to deliver reports in a robust and meaningful way.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Howick Local Board Work Programme snapshot

15. The graph below identifies work programme activity by RAG status (red, amber, green and grey) which measures the performance of the activity. It shows the percentage of work programme activities that have been delivered as expected (completed by the end of July 2020) or multi-year activities which have progressed as planned (green), in progress but with issues that are being managed (amber), and activities that are undelivered or have significant issues (red) and activities that have been cancelled/deferred/merged (grey).
16. The graph below shows the activity status of activities which shows the stage of the activity in each department the work programmes. The number of activity lines differ by department as approved in the local board work programmes.

**Graph Three: Work Programme activity by activity status and department**

**Key activity achievements from the 2019/2020 work programme**

17. The key achievements in the delivery of the local board work programmes for 2019/2020 include:

- a 66-meter-long rock revetment was constructed in front of the existing masonry seawall on the western side of the beach at Cockle Bay, and the existing concrete ramp was extended to improve pedestrian access directly onto the beach
- lighting was completed at the north and southern sectors of Barry Curtis Park
- twenty-four Howick schools remain actively engaged in their aim to reduce their waste by 40 per cent for the rest of the 2020 academic year through the 2019/2020 Waste Minimisation in Schools initiative
- Howick Youth Council (HYC) held get-to-know-your-candidates events and organised the Recruit Your Mayor event.
- students from Sancta Maria primary and intermediate schools and Mission Heights Primary School planted approximately 6000 trees through the Pest free Howick initiative
• held a number of successful events, including the annual Movies in the Park and Kiwi Anthems music concert.

Overview of work programme performance by department

Arts, Community and Events work programme

18. In the Arts, Community and Events work programme, there are 25 activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2020 (green), two activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber), two activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and four activities that have been cancelled and deferred in quarter four (grey).

19. All amber, red and grey activities in the Arts, Community and Events work programme were significantly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and the ability to deliver these work programme activities.

Parks, Sport and Recreation work programme

20. In the Parks, Sport and Recreation work programme, there are two activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2020 (green), ten activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber), no activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and no activities that have been cancelled and deferred in quarter four (grey).

21. All amber activities in the Parks, Sport and Recreation work programme were significantly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and the ability to deliver these work programme activities.

Libraries work programme

22. In the Libraries work programme, there are seven activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2020 (green), no activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber), no activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and no activities that have been cancelled and deferred in quarter four (grey).

Service Strategy and Integration work programme

23. In the Service Strategy and Integration work programme, one activity was completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2020 (green), no activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber), no activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and no activities that have been cancelled and deferred in quarter four (grey).

Community Facilities: Build Maintain Renew work programme

24. In the Community Facilities: Build Maintain Renew work programme, there are 21 activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2020 (green), 13 activities approved and in progress (green), eight activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber), 22 activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and six activities that have been cancelled and deferred in quarter four (grey).

25. All red, amber and grey activities in the Community Facilities: Build Maintain Renew work programme were significantly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, with the exception of:

Table One: Community Facilities activities with significant impact other than COVID-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity name</th>
<th>RAG status</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Explanation and mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macleans Park - renew park paths</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>The first stage of track work, excluding the boardwalk has been completed.</td>
<td>Scoping is underway to determine the full extent of renewals for the tracks in Macleans Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and culverts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Howick beaches - renew and top up shells | Amber | Assessment to determine works required for both Howick and Bucklands beaches is still ongoing. | This project to be on hold until the full scope of works has been identified. |
| Macleans Park - install exercise equipment | Amber | Two of the three pieces of exercise equipment have been installed. The third piece of fitness equipment could not be installed due to issues with the equipment supply. | Complete installation of the third fitness equipment item by mid-August 2021. |
| Ti Rakau Park - renew playground | Amber | Project on hold until Community Services and Auckland Transport agree on best options for the playground renewal, taking into consideration the AMETI Stage 2 works, the playground strategy being developed for the Howick Local Board area and the concept plans proposed by the Active Recreation team. | The proposed concept plan and the playground strategy in development will inform the confirmed location for the playground. |
| Greenmount Development - develop public access | Grey | Landfill operator to complete site works to meet resource consent requirements. Subject to closed landfill approval, the land is expected to be vested in 2020. Detailed design work, consenting and revegetation of the area will follow. | Handover of land to Community Facilities is anticipated by mid-2021 to allow for development to begin. Timing subject to Auckland Council Closed Landfill team being satisfied that site is suitable for public use. |

### Community Leases work programme

26. In the Community Leases work programme, there are 15 activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2020 (green), one activity that is in progress but are delayed (amber), no activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and no activities that have been cancelled and deferred in quarter four (grey).

27. Activities with significant impact other than COVID-19 are discussed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Two: Community Leases activities with significant impact other than COVID-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick Beach, 4R Granger Road: Lease to Howick Sailing Club Incorporated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Infrastructure and Environment Services work programme

28. In the Infrastructure and Environment Services work programme, there are seven activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2020 (green), no activities that are in progress were delayed (amber), one activity has been significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and no activities that have been cancelled and deferred in quarter four (grey).

29. The red activity in the Infrastructure and Environment Services work programme was significantly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and the ability to deliver the work programme activity.

Plans and Places work programme

30. In the Plans and Places work programme, there was two activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2020 (green), no activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber), no activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and no activities that have been cancelled and deferred in quarter four (grey).

ATEED work programme

31. In the ATEED work programme, there was two activities that were completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2020 (green), no activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber), no activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and no activities that have been cancelled and deferred in quarter four (grey).

External Partnerships work programme

32. In the External Partnerships work programme, there was one activity that was completed by the end of the year or will be by end of July 2020 (green), no activities that are in progress but are delayed (amber), no activities that are significantly delayed, on hold or not delivered (red) and no activities that have been cancelled and deferred in quarter four (grey).

Deferred activities

33. 2019/2020 The Corporate and Local Board Performance team have identified projects from the local boards locally driven initiatives (LDI) operational budget 2019/2020 where there was an agreed scope and cost which were not been delivered. These have been added to the work programme to be delivered in 2020/2021.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi

Climate impact statement

34. Receiving performance monitoring reports will not result in any identifiable changes to greenhouse gas emissions.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

35. When developing the work programmes, council group impacts and views are presented to the boards. As this is an information only report there are no further impacts identified.

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

Local impacts and local board views

36. This report informs the Howick Local Board of the performance for the quarter ending 30 June 2020 and the performance for the 2019/2020 financial year.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

37. Staff continued to support Te Tahawai Marae to achieve their aspirations and to seek opportunities that will enhance kaupapa Māori initiatives in the local board area, as identified through the development of their strategic plan.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

38. Auckland Council (Council) currently has a number of bonds quoted on the NZ Stock Exchange (NZX). As a result, the Council is subject to obligations under the NZX Main Board & Debt Market Listing Rules and the Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013 sections 97 and 461H. These obligations restrict the release of annual financial reports and results until the Auckland Council Group results are released to the NZX – on or about 30 September 2020. Due to these obligations the financial performance attached to the quarterly report is excluded from the public.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

39. Information about any significant risks and how they are being managed and/or mitigated is addressed in the ‘Overview of work programme performance by department’ section.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

40. The Emergency Budget was adopted on 30 July 2020. Work programmes for the 2020/2021 financial year were approved at the board’s business meeting on 17 August 2020.

41. Delivery of the activities in the 2020/2021 work programme has commenced. There is a reduced timeframe to deliver these work programmes (ten months).

42. As the delivery timeframe for the 2020/2021 work programmes is reduced, the reporting timeframe is likely to change.

43. Resourcing of the 2020/2021 work programmes was based on the current staff capacity within departments. If changes to staff capacity have an impact on work programme delivery, this will be signalled to the local board at the earliest opportunity.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Work Programme 2019/2020 quarter four report (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2019/2020 financial performance report - CONFIDENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

Author | Nichola Painter - Local Board Advisor - Howick

Authoriser | Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager for Franklin and Howick Local Boards
Local Board Annual Report 2019/2020

File No.: CP2020/12490

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek local board adoption of the 2019/2020 Annual Report for the Howick Local Board, prior to it being adopted by the Governing Body on 29 October 2020

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Auckland Council Annual Report 2019/2020 is being prepared and needs to be adopted by the Governing Body by 29 October 2020. As part of the overall report package, individual reports for each local board are prepared.
3. Auckland Council currently has a series of bonds quoted on the New Zealand Stock Exchange (NZX) Debt Market maintained by NZX Limited. As council is subject to obligations under the NZX Main Board and Debt Market Listing Rules and the Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013 (FMCA), local boards may not release annual financial results in any form. Therefore, the attached annual report (see Attachment A) is being presented as confidential.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:

a) adopt the 2019/2020 Howick Local Board Annual Report as set out in Attachment A of the agenda report.

b) note that any proposed changes after the adoption will be clearly communicated and agreed with the chairperson before the report is submitted for adoption by the Governing Body by 29 October 2020.

c) note that the draft 2019/2020 Howick Local Board Annual Report (refer to Attachment A of the agenda report) will remain confidential until after the Auckland Council group results for 2019/2020 are released to the New Zealand Stock Exchange which are expected to be made public by 30 October 2020.

Horopaki
Context
4. In accordance with the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 and the Local Government Act 2002, each local board is required to monitor and report on the implementation of its Local Board Agreement. This includes reporting on the performance measures for local activities, and the overall Financial Impact Statement for the local board.

5. In addition to the compliance purpose, local board annual reports are an opportunity to tell the wider performance story with a strong local flavour, including how the local board is working towards the outcomes of their local board plan.

6. This story is particularly important this year in light of the impacts COVID-19 had on communities and the council in the third quarter of the 2019/2020 financial year.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

7. The annual report contains the following sections:

Table One: Sections contained within the annual report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mihi</td>
<td>The mihi relates to the local board area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message from the chairperson</td>
<td>An overall message introducing the report, highlighting achievements and challenges, including both financial and non-financial performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local board members</td>
<td>A group photo of the local board members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our area</td>
<td>A visual layout of the local board area, summarising key demographic information and showing key projects and facilities in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance report</td>
<td>Provides performance measure results for each activity, providing explanations where targeted service levels have not been achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding information</td>
<td>Financial performance results compared to long-term plan and annual plan budgets, together with explanations about variances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local flavour</td>
<td>A profile of either an outstanding resident, grant, project or facility that benefits the local community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

8. The Auckland Council Climate Change disclosures are covered in Volume four of the Annual Report 2019/2020 and sections within the summary of the annual report.

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

9. Council departments and council-controlled organisations comments and views have been considered and included in the annual report in relation to activities they are responsible for delivering on behalf of local boards.

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

10. Local board feedback will be included where possible. Any changes to the content of the final annual report will be discussed with the chairperson.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

11. The annual report provides information on how Auckland Council has progressed its agreed priorities in the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 over the past 12 months. This includes engagement with Māori, as well as projects that benefit various population groups, including Māori.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

13. The annual report is a legislatively required document. It is audited by Audit New Zealand who assess if the report represents information fairly and consistently, and that the financial statements comply with accounting standard PBE FRS-43: Summary Financial Statements. Failure to demonstrate this could result in a qualified audit opinion.

14. The annual report is a key communication to residents. It is important to tell a clear and balanced performance story, in plain English, and in a form that is accessible, to ensure that council meets its obligations to be open with the public it serves.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Next steps

15. The next steps for the draft 2019/2020 Annual Report for the local board are:
   • Audit NZ review during August and September 2020
   • report to the Governing Body for adoption on 29 October 2020
   • release to stock exchanges and publication online on 30 October 2020
   • physical copies provided to local board offices, council service centres and libraries by the end of October 2020.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
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<th>Author</th>
<th>Audrey Gan - Lead Financial Advisor Local Boards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>David Gurney - Manager Corporate Performance &amp; Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager for Franklin and Howick Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek feedback from Howick Local Board on the recommended regional methodology to edge and maintain weeds on footpaths, berms and the kerb and channel on more than 5000km of urban roads in the Auckland region.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Auckland Council manages edges and weeds on footpaths, berms and the kerb and channel in the urban road corridor for statutory, asset protection, amenity, and health and safety outcomes.

3. The service level for weed management on berms and in the kerb and channel is the same across Auckland. However, the methodologies for edging and weed control on hard surfaces, either plant-based, synthetic herbicides or thermal, e.g. hot water/steam, differ between local board areas. In some cases, different methods are used within the same local board boundaries. This reflects the continuation of legacy council approaches.

4. In April 2019, Auckland Transport transferred services and budget to the council’s Community Facilities department to manage weeds within the road corridor on their behalf. Auckland Transport retains responsibility for the road corridor as per the Local Government Act 1974 and the Land Transport Act 1998.

5. The transfer was completed as part of Project Streetscapes (which did not include the Hauraki Gulf Islands), a variation to the Community Facilities outcome-based maintenance contracts. Part of the project included developing recommendations for a regionally consistent approach for edging and weed control on hard surfaces in the road corridor.

6. Community Facilities has continued with the legacy approach to weed control while completing a review of weed management methodologies. The scope of the review and recommendations are for edging and weed control on hard surfaces within the urban road corridor, excluding the Hauraki Gulf Islands. Rural roads are not included due to differences in population, roading infrastructure and land use in rural areas.

7. The evaluation criteria for the review’s recommendations include environmental impacts, community input, the council’s commitment to reduce carbon emissions in Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan and the objectives of the council Weed Management Policy for effective, efficient, and sustainable outcomes.

8. A council People’s Panel survey was conducted in October 2019 as one mechanism to gauge how Aucklanders feel about managing weeds on footpaths and kerbs (see Attachment A).

9. The recommendation of this review is for a combination of plant-based herbicide with spot spraying of glyphosate for difficult to manage weeds. This is estimated to lead to a reduction in glyphosate, carbon emissions and water usage across the region while achieving effective control. This approach is estimated to be achievable within existing operational budgets.

10. Feedback is sought from local boards to be included in the recommendation to the Governing Body on a standardised approach for edging and weed control on hard surfaces in the road corridor (see Attachment B). This will be presented at the Environment and Climate Change Committee on 12 November 2020.
11. Should a local board choose to utilise alternative methodologies to those agreed, they have the option of using locally driven initiative (LDI) funding to cover the cost difference between the agreed regional weed management method and the alternative.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:

a) provide feedback on the recommended approach to a standardised methodology to managing weeds on footpaths, berms and the kerb and channel across more than 5000km of urban roads.

Horopaki Context

12. Community Facilities carries out edging and weed management on footpaths, berms and the kerb and channel across more than 5000km of Auckland urban roads. This is done for asset protection and amenity, as well as health and safety outcomes, including:

- preventing root intrusion causing damage to the road surface, kerb and channel, footpaths and other road assets
- ensuring vegetation growing in the kerb and channel does not interfere with water flow
- ensuring the safety of pedestrians and road users by maintaining clear sight-lines and minimising trip hazards
- maintaining the streetscape in a tidy and aesthetically pleasing condition.

13. Auckland’s moderate and wet climate makes the area particularly vulnerable to the detrimental effects of weeds. The climate causes vigorous growth, easy establishment, and increased infestation of weeds. The road corridor provides a dynamic environment for the spread of weeds including through vehicle and water dispersal.\(^1\)

14. Uncontrolled weeds on footpaths and the kerb and channel cause damage that can lead to increased repairs and renewals with a funding and environmental impact. This damage may create trip hazards, putting people at risk.

Figure One: Images of uncontrolled weeds causing damage and safety risks

15. Agrichemicals are used for edging and weed control in the urban road corridor. Edging is required on both sides of the road, which is over 10,000km of footpaths and berms. The Auckland Council Weed Management Policy guides the use of herbicide by the council and supports best practice weed control.\(^2\) All agrichemical use must follow the rules of the Auckland Unitary Plan, which ensures that, when used correctly, agrichemicals can make a positive contribution to sustainable land use.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Waitākere Ranges Strategic Weed Management Plan 2015
\(^2\) Auckland Council Weed Management Policy
\(^3\) E34 Agrichemicals and vertebrate toxic agents - Unitary Plan
16. The outcome-based contract specifications for the road corridor do not permit herbicide application outside schools or early learning services on days that these institutions are in use. There are limitations on the time of spraying in urban areas and the contract specifications include instructions to not complete weed control where the berm is clearly being maintained by the adjacent property owner.4

17. All of Auckland is covered by a ‘no-spray register’ for berms adjacent to private property. Any resident who agrees to manage weeds to a specified standard can apply to ‘opt out’ of weed management completed by the council, through recording their intent on the no-spray register. Residents can register through a dedicated form on the council website or through the council call centre.

_Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu_

_Analysis and advice_

_Weed management in the road corridor_

18. The service level outcomes for weed management on berms and in the kerb and channel are the same across Auckland. However, the methodologies for their maintenance, either plant-based, synthetic herbicides or thermal, e.g. hot water/steam, differs between local board areas. In some cases, different methods are used within the same local board boundaries. These differences reflect the weed control methods and herbicides that were used by the legacy councils of Auckland City Council, Manukau City Council, Waitākere City Council, North Shore City Council, Papakura District Council, Rodney District Council and Franklin District Council prior to amalgamation.


20. Weed management on footpaths, berms and the kerb and channel is now part of the outcome-based Full Facilities contract for streetscapes. These include pest plant control, mowing, town centre cleaning, and waste removal completed on behalf of Auckland Transport.

21. Community Facilities has continued with the legacy approach for edging and weed control on hard surfaces, while completing a review of the methodologies with a view to making recommendations to the Environment and Climate Change Committee for a consistent regional approach. The scope of the review and recommendations is only for the urban road corridor and does not include rural areas or the Hauraki Gulf Islands. This reflects the differences in population, roading infrastructure and land use in rural areas.

4 Streetscapes Specifications - 19 March 2019__
Comparison of weed management methodologies

Synthetic herbicide – glyphosate

22. The synthetic herbicide used for edging and weed management on footpaths, berms and the kerb and channel in the urban road corridor in Auckland is glyphosate. Glyphosate is used by the council for weed management on parks and reserves, and by most road controlling authorities in New Zealand to control vegetation in the road corridor.\(^5\)

23. Glyphosate is a low toxicity broad-spectrum non-selective herbicide which is particularly effective on broadleaf weeds and grasses. Glyphosate is a systemic herbicide that is absorbed through green plant tissue and is then translocated throughout the plant, including the root system, to kill the entire plant.\(^5\)

24. Glyphosate is diluted with water and applied via foliar spray with a small left-hand steer vehicle in the urban road corridor. It is the most cost-effective method as it needs to be applied less frequently than other methods. In the urban road corridor, spot spraying with glyphosate typically occurs six times per year to achieve the desired level of service.

25. There is some community and international debate about the health risk of glyphosate with several regions no longer using, or minimising the use of, glyphosate for weed control in public areas.

26. Auckland Council’s agrichemical use is guided by the New Zealand Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in their role as the regulator of hazardous substances in New Zealand. The EPA gathers information from multiple credible sources when deciding whether substances are safe to use. The EPA has granted approval for the use of glyphosate-containing substances in accordance with the EPA code of practice. Should the EPA change their position on glyphosate, the council would respond appropriately.

27. In October 2019 the EPA stated the following:

- products containing glyphosate are considered safe, provided that all of the rules around their use are followed
- we are aware that some reports linking glyphosate to health impacts are causing concern. We are in alignment with the vast majority of regulatory bodies around the world – including in the European Union, United States, Australia and Canada - which agree that glyphosate is unlikely to cause cancer.\(^7\)

28. For all agrichemical use, the council complies with the Environmental Protection Agency Code of Practice (NZS 8409:2004 Management of Agrichemicals) for the storage, mixing, use, disposal and certification of contractors.

29. Glyphosate is strongly absorbed into soil and has no residual activity.\(^8\) Community Facilities only uses approved formulations of glyphosate, with no human hazard ratings, within the road corridor.\(^9\) While the formulation being used within the road corridor is also approved for use in the aquatic environment, it does have a hazard rating for toxicity for aquatic life at high concentrations.\(^10\) As per the Code of Practice, glyphosate is only used in appropriate weather conditions to minimise spray drift by rain and wind.

30. A caution for the use of glyphosate is the development of resistance in some weed species.\(^11\)

31. Local boards that use spot spraying of glyphosate for weed management include Franklin, Henderson-Massey, Howick, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Manurewa, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, Papakura, Rodney, Waitākere Ranges, and Whau. All methodologies include some mechanical removal of weeds.

---

\(^5\) Transport Authorities - Glyphosate use
\(^6\) Novachem Manual - Glyphosate 510
\(^8\) Novachem Manual - Glyphosate 510
\(^9\) Product Label Green Glyphosate 510
\(^10\) Supplementary material glyphosate
Plant-based herbicide

32. Plant-based herbicides used in the urban road corridor include Biosafe and Bio Weed Blast. The active ingredient is a fatty acid which is a contact herbicide. When applied to weeds, it burns off the foliage, thus preventing or reducing seed production and restricting growth.

33. As plant-based herbicides are not systemic, i.e. they do not kill down to the root, they must be applied more frequently than glyphosate to meet service levels. Although they can kill annuals, generally they will not kill longer-lived mature perennial weeds, as they re-sprout from specialised (e.g. rhizomes) root tissue after the foliage has been burned off. Fatty acid-based herbicides need to be applied to young or small plants for acceptable weed control.\(^{12}\)

34. Plant-based herbicides are diluted with water and applied via foliar spray with small left-hand steer vehicle in the urban road corridor, approximately 12 times per year. The exclusive use of plant-based herbicide is approximately three times more expensive than glyphosate because of the additional frequency and quantity of product required.\(^{13}\) There is an additional cost consideration due to the corrosive impact of the fatty acid on equipment which needs to be replaced more regularly.

35. While plant-based herbicides are inactivated on contact with the soil and have no residual activity\(^{14}\), there is a health and safety risk to be managed by the operators. The active ingredient is an eye, skin and respiratory irritant. There is a strong notable odour from plant-based herbicide which can be, and has been, the source of complaints from the public.

36. For all agrichemical use, the council complies with the Environmental Protection Agency Code of Practice (NZS 8409:2004 Management of Agrichemicals) for the storage, mixing, use, disposal and certification of contractors.

37. Plant-based herbicide is approved for use in Auckland and has been used since prior to amalgamation. Although there are no restrictions imposed by the EPA for application within the road corridor, the products have a hazard rating for toxicity for aquatic life. Instructions from the manufacturer include applying when conditions are dry, and rain is not expected in the road corridor within the next two hours.\(^{15}\)

38. Local boards that use plant-based herbicide exclusively, include Albert-Eden, Puketāpapa, Waiterimatea (excluding the central business district), Waiheke and Ellerslie in Ōrākei. All methodologies include some mechanical removal of weeds.

Thermal – steam and hot water

39. Thermal technologies include steam and hot water. Water heated to high temperatures is applied to weeds with a hose and lance to destroy the foliage. Thermal weed management leaves the roots primarily untreated.\(^{16}\)

*Figure Three: Thermal weed management in use*
40. Thermal technology requires significant water use, using between 10-12L of water per minute.\textsuperscript{17} Non-potable water sources can be used to mitigate demand on treated water sources, however non-potable water is not currently available in most areas of Auckland. This leaves the implementation of this method vulnerable to water restrictions as we have seen in 2020.\textsuperscript{18}

41. This method utilises mobile diesel boilers to heat water to 98 degrees. Diesel boilers use up to 9L\textsuperscript{19} of diesel an hour with associated carbon emissions of 24kg.\textsuperscript{20} Thermal technology is more expensive than herbicide. A two-person team is required, and the application rate is slower as it requires a prolonged application to cover the foliage. Application speeds are approximately 1.1km/hr\textsuperscript{21} for thermal compared to 1.8km/hr for herbicide.\textsuperscript{22} Like plant-based herbicide, thermal weed management needs to be applied more frequently, approximately 12 times a year, to meet weed management service levels.

42. Local boards that use thermal technology include Devonport-Takapuna, Kaipātiki, parts of Upper Harbour and Hibiscus and Bays. There is some use of spot spraying of glyphosate to address persistent weeds. All methodologies include some mechanical removal of weeds.

**Thermal – hot foam**

43. A product called Foamstream has been trialled in Auckland in 2020. Foamstream is a soluble concentrate which is added to hot water to create a foam and has been used in the United Kingdom for weed management.\textsuperscript{23} The foam acts as an insulator to keep the heat higher for longer. The manufacturer claims that the use of foam could reduce the frequency of treatment cycles compared to using steam/hot water alone. A review of the trial is currently underway and, if the product proves suitable, staff will seek approval from Auckland Transport and Healthy Waters for its use in the road corridor.

**Combination of synthetic and plant-based herbicide**

44. This approach uses a combination of both glyphosate and plant-based herbicide. Plant-based herbicide is applied throughout the year to manage weeds, with the use of glyphosate by spot spraying at peak weed growing times on difficult to control weeds.

45. An integrated approach results in a reduction of both products and provides more effective control of persistent weeds than by using plant-based herbicide alone. This methodology is used in the Auckland Botanic Gardens to reduce the use of glyphosate. The use of herbicide with a different mode of action in combination with glyphosate is one of the main strategies to avoid glyphosate resistance.\textsuperscript{24}

46. Local boards that use a combined approach include Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Ōrākei (except for Ellerslie where only plant-based herbicide is applied). All methodologies include some mechanical removal of weeds.

**Methodology comparison**

47. In 2015, a comparison of methodologies was completed (see Attachment C). The data in the table was reviewed by PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) and the effectiveness, environmental and human health information was independently peer-reviewed by the firm AECOM.

48. For the current review, further analysis was completed to estimate quantities of water, herbicide and operational carbon emissions per methodology. This reflects the council’s commitments within Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan\textsuperscript{25}, the Auckland water efficiency strategy and the Weed Management Policy. The data on herbicide volumes has come from contractor reporting for the urban road corridor (as the data includes pest plant
control, the use for edging and hard surfaces is expected to be lower). Water usage and fuel consumption are from product specification sheets and supplier data. These are estimates only, with volumes of herbicide and water varying by area, season and weed levels.

49. For the purpose of this review, updated supplier costings for a regionally consistent approach were requested. The difference in pricing for alternative methodologies compared to glyphosate was expected, reflecting the different frequencies and volume of product needed. For plant-based weed control to achieve similar outcomes, more frequent treatments are required than glyphosate, thereby increasing the costs of materials, labour and fuel. Thermal technology is applied at the same frequency as plant-based herbicide, 12 times a year, with a slower application rate requiring a two-person team. These are estimates only and may not include costs for change implementation e.g. purchase of machinery etc.

### Table One: Comparison of estimated operational carbon emissions, volume of water, herbicide and cost per km per year for each weed management approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Carbon emissions26</th>
<th>Water usage</th>
<th>Herbicide</th>
<th>Active Ingredient (kg)</th>
<th>Application rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glyphosate (6x per year)</td>
<td>1.1kg</td>
<td>180L</td>
<td>1.8L</td>
<td>0.9kg glyphosate</td>
<td>1.8km per hour (single operator)</td>
<td>$783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of plant-based/glyphosate (10x per year)</td>
<td>1.9kg</td>
<td>870L</td>
<td>0.7L of glyphosate &amp; 8L of plant-based</td>
<td>0.4kg glyphosate 5.6kg fatty acid</td>
<td>1.8km per hour (single operator)</td>
<td>$1293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant-based herbicide (12x per year)</td>
<td>2.3kg</td>
<td>1350L27</td>
<td>13.5L</td>
<td>9.5kg fatty acid</td>
<td>1.8km per hour (single operator)</td>
<td>$2265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal technologies – steam and hot water (12x per year)</td>
<td>264kg</td>
<td>6545L</td>
<td>Approx. 0.5L of glyphosate</td>
<td>0.25kg glyphosate</td>
<td>1.1km per hour (two operators)</td>
<td>$3485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Auckland Council – People’s Panel survey**

50. In October 2019, a People’s Panel survey was conducted as one mechanism to gauge how Aucklanders view management of weeds on footpaths and kerbs. The survey was sent to 39,789 members of the People’s Panel. They were provided with the information on the council website on the different methodologies28. However, at the time of the survey, estimated emissions, volume of herbicide, and cost were not available.

51. Of the 5686 respondents, 66 per cent stated that they ‘care’ about the weeds on our footpaths and kerbs. The results showed that 43 per cent of residents use synthetic herbicide (e.g. glyphosate) for weed management on their own property. Synthetic herbicide (e.g. glyphosate) was the least preferred method for weed management in the road corridor by 52 per cent of respondents.

52. Nineteen per cent were willing to pay higher rates for the council to use alternatives to synthetic herbicide, 42 per cent were not willing to pay extra, and 36 per cent indicated they

---

26 Emissions from direct/production and electricity use, but not including “embodied” or “life cycle emissions”. These emissions do not include fuel for the boiler pump or motorized sprayer.

27 Water use - Bio Blast

may be willing to pay more. There were differences in responses by local board area as detailed in Attachment A (People’s Panel results by local board).

53. There are members of the community that believe glyphosate should not be used by Auckland Council.

**Regional review recommendation**

54. The review of methodologies to manage weeds in the urban road corridor takes into consideration the Auckland Weed Management Policy, Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan and community input.

*Table Two: Summary of the advantages and disadvantages of the different weed management methodologies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synthetic herbicide – glyphosate</strong></td>
<td>- low cost, low frequency of application, effective weed control</td>
<td>- risk of community objection to the use of glyphosate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- reduced carbon emissions.</td>
<td>- restricted weather conditions for application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- herbicide resistance in some species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plant-based herbicide</strong></td>
<td>- reduction in glyphosate used by council for weed control</td>
<td>- increased frequency and therefore a greater volume of herbicide compared to glyphosate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- immediate effect on weeds.</td>
<td>- plant-based herbicide is two to three times more expensive than glyphosate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- the product is corrosive and has a strong odour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- restricted weather conditions for application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thermal technology steam/hot water/hot water with a foam additive</strong></td>
<td>- thermal technology does not use herbicide</td>
<td>- high water usage and carbon emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- can be applied in any weather</td>
<td>- spot spraying glyphosate is still required on high volume roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- immediate effect on weeds.</td>
<td>- and to address persistent weeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- thermal technology is more expensive than glyphosate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combination of plant-based and synthetic herbicide, e.g. glyphosate</strong></td>
<td>- an estimated region-wide reduction in the use of glyphosate, carbon emissions and water use</td>
<td>- an increase in herbicide use in some local board areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- minimising the volume of agrichemical use across the region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- reduction in risk of plants developing glyphosate resistance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
55. The recommendation for a standardised methodology is a combination of plant-based herbicide with spot spraying of glyphosate for difficult weeds. This is estimated to lead to a reduction in glyphosate, carbon emissions and water usage across the region. There would be an increase in the use of plant-based herbicide. This approach is estimated to be achievable within current operational budgets.

56. Thermal methodologies, including hot foam, could be used for sensitive areas but are not recommended for a region-wide approach due to their high emissions, water usage and cost. The exclusive use of plant-based herbicide is not recommended due to the additional volume of herbicide required and its cost.

57. Local board feedback is sought on the standardised regional recommendation and on local priorities for weed control on footpath and kerb and channel (see Attachment B). Local board priorities will be included for consideration by the Environment and Climate Change Committee on 12 November 2020.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

58. Climate change adaptation – changes in Auckland’s climate may alter the prevalence and spread of weeds within the road corridor. In the future, different methodologies and products may need to be considered depending on weed species.

59. Climate change mitigation – Auckland Council adopted Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan on 21 July 2020, which includes the reduction target for council to halve its carbon emissions by 2030 and reach zero net emissions by 2050.

60. The choice of weed management methodologies has an impact on the council’s carbon emissions. The region-wide adoption of thermal would lead to an increase in carbon emissions at an estimated 1335 tons or approximately five per cent of the council’s operational emissions for 2018/2019. This reflects the energy required to heat large volumes of water to 98 degrees with diesel boilers. The increase for the regional adoption of this methodology would impact on the council’s ability to meet the reduction targets of the Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan.

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


62. Auckland Council adopted a Weed Management Policy for parks and open spaces in August 2013 (resolution number RDO/2013/137). The Weed Management Policy is to guide the management of weeds in Auckland’s parks and open spaces, including the road corridor.

63. The recommendation for a standardised approach has been provided in consultation with Auckland Transport and with consideration of the objectives of the Weed Management Policy.

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

64. The recommendations of this report will have differing impacts on local boards (except the Hauraki Gulf local boards which are excluded from the regional approach) given the

---

30 264 kg x 5,055km road corridor. This could be mitigated by the use of battery power, there are no options currently available in New Zealand.
different approaches currently in place. This report is to request feedback from local boards regarding their priorities for an effective, efficient, and sustainable standardised regional weed management methodology (see Attachment B).

65. Should a local board choose to utilise alternative methodologies to those adopted as the region-wide approach, they are able to use locally-driven initiative (LDI) funding to cover the cost difference between the agreed regional weed management method and their preferred alternative.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

66. The recommendations of the review take into consideration the Weed Management Policy, with the objective to minimise agrichemicals, and Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework which were developed in consultation with mana whenua.

67. An overview of the current methodologies and the priorities of the review were presented at the Infrastructure and Environmental Services Mana Whenua hui. The analysis and recommendations of the review will be presented to mana whenua for feedback in September 2020.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

68. Different methodologies to manage weeds have different financial implications. This reflects the associated costs of the methodologies to achieve weed management outcomes.

*Table Three: Estimated cost of weed management methodologies per km per annum*[^1]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Estimated cost per km (per annum)</th>
<th>Estimated cost (per annum) across 5055km</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic herbicide, e.g. glyphosate</td>
<td>$783</td>
<td>$3,958,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of plant-based and synthetic herbicide</td>
<td>$1293</td>
<td>$6,536,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant-based herbicide, e.g. biosafe</td>
<td>$2265</td>
<td>$11,499,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal technology steam/hot water</td>
<td>$3485</td>
<td>$17,616,675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69. The recommended approach, a combination of plant-based herbicide and spot spraying of glyphosate for difficult weeds, is estimated to be able to be delivered within the existing operational budgets.

70. To standardise thermal and plant-based methodologies across the region would require an increase in budget to meet weed management service levels. As there is no additional operational budget for streetscape maintenance, methodologies requiring additional expenditure could impact on other Full Facilities services delivered to local boards e.g. town centre and park maintenance, replanting of gardens, and ability to respond to a request for service.

71. Should a local board choose to utilise alternate methodologies to those adopted as the region-wide approach, they could use LDI funding to cover the cost difference between the agreed regional weed management method and their preferred alternative.

[^1]: Costings should not be treated a final pricing but as an indication of pricing differences between methodology.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

72. The outcomes of this project have the following risks:

Table Four: Risks and mitigations for the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Continuing with legacy arrangements, with inconsistent funding</td>
<td>Communication on the rationale for any decision to continue with legacy weed management methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardising a regional weed methodology</td>
<td>Depending on the choice of the methodology, there would be different environmental and social impacts, including community concern</td>
<td>Local board decision-making enables the prioritisation of funding for local priorities and the services that their communities most value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

73. Local boards provide feedback on the recommended approach to weed management in the kerb and channel and footpaths and rank their priorities for weed management in the road corridor.

74. Once the feedback is received, it will be collated and included in a report to the Environment and Climate Change Committee on 12 November 2020.

75. At the meeting of the Environment and Climate Change Committee, a decision will be made on the methodology to be applied across the Auckland region for weed management.

Change author to Jenny Gargiulo, Principal Environmental Specialist
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October 2019 - Weed Management Survey Summary

Which of the following weed control methods do you use at home?

* Please select all that apply.

- None of these - I don't do any weeding at home (1%)
- Other (please specify) (7%)
- Hot water treatment e.g. boiling water (17%)
- Weed killer e.g. synthetic or plant-based / organic herbicide (63%)
- Weed eating / mowing (69%)
- Removal by hand / hand tool (85%)

Number of responses to this question: 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey: 399
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What kind of weed killer do you use?

Question 1B

* Please select all that apply.

- [ ] 28% Synthetic weed killer e.g. Roundup or other glyphosate products
- [ ] 7% Plant-based herbicide / organic herbicide
- [ ] 7% Not sure - I don't know what kind of weed killer it is
- [ ] 7% I don't know
- [ ] 3% Other (please specify)

Number of responses to this question 275 (69%)
Total number of responses for this survey 399

How do you choose which weed killer to buy in store?

Question 1C

* Please choose no more than 4 things that influence your decision.

https://peoplespanel.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/surveys/printableReport/ZE57RlX44kKsQYkDROQ 2/17
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Number of responses to this question: 275 (69%)
Total number of responses for this survey: 399

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The price / cost</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether it is a well-known brand</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ingredients</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The concentration / effectiveness of managing weeds</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The application method e.g. spray, powder</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just buy what I have bought in the past</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The environmental impact</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of application e.g. monthly, yearly</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The labour / time involved</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety considerations</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these - I don’t buy weed killer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2A In general, are the weeds on our **footpaths and kerbs** something that matters to you?
Question: How much do you care about the weed control methods that Auckland Council uses on footpaths and kerbs?

Number of responses to this question 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey 399

Answer | Count | %
--- | --- | ---
1 - It does not matter to me at all | 12 | 3
2 | 19 | 5
3 | 88 | 22
4 | 120 | 30
5 - It matters to me a lot | 158 | 40
I don't know | 2 | 1

Question: How aware are you of the weed control methods Auckland Council uses on footpaths and kerbs?

Number of responses to this question 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey 399

Answer | Count | %
--- | --- | ---
1 - I don't care at all | 20 | 5
2 | 33 | 8
3 | 89 | 22
4 | 97 | 24
5 - I care very much | 152 | 38
I don't know | 8 | 2
Question 2D: How many weeds are you okay with along Auckland’s footpaths and kerbs?

Number of responses to this question: 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey: 399

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not aware at all</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Very aware</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: Are you on the Auckland Council No Spray Register where you can opt out of weed spraying on your berm or park boundary?

Number of responses to this question: 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey: 399

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No weeds are acceptable – zero weeds</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or two weeds are acceptable</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a few weeds are acceptable</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many weeds are acceptable</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://peoplespanel.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/surveys/printable/report/2E57R+44kKs/QYKEROQ
Number of responses to this question 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey 399

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - but I am planning to apply</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of the following weed control methods have you heard of council using on footpaths and kerbs before?

*Please select all that apply.*

Number of responses to this question 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey 399

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic herbicide (including glyphosate)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot water</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-pressure steam</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant-based herbicide</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical e.g. weed-eating / mowing</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual e.g. removal by hand</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://peoplespanel.aucklandcouncil.gov.nz/surveys/printableReport/ZE57Rlk44kXsQyKIKROQ
What is your **most preferred** method of weed control for Auckland’s **footpaths and kerbs**?

*Please select one only.*

**Number of responses to this question** 399 (100%)

**Total number of responses for this survey** 399

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic herbicide (including glyphosate)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot water</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-pressure steam</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant-based herbicide</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical e.g. weed-eating / mowing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual e.g. removal by hand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None - I don’t know enough to answer this question</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None - I don’t have a preference</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None - I think there should be no weed control at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4C** Which is your **least preferred** method of weed control for Auckland’s **footpaths and kerbs**?
Would you be happy to pay more rates for council to use alternatives to synthetic 4E herbicide (including glyphosate) on footpaths and kerbs?

https://peoplespanel.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/surveys/printableReport/ZE57Rbk4kKsQYKdROQ
Number of responses to this question 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey 399

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe - it depends</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How important you think the following factors are for council to consider when selecting a weed
5A(i) control method for footpaths and kerbs?

- Cost / impact on rates

Number of responses to this question 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey 399

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Very important</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How important you think the following factors are for council to consider when selecting a weed
5A(ii) control method for footpaths and kerbs?

- Environmental impact of the method
Number of responses to this question 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey 399

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not important</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Very important</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How important you think the following factors are for council to consider when selecting a weed control method for footpaths and kerbs?

- Effectiveness at managing weeds

Number of responses to this question 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey 399

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Very important</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5A(iv)
How important you think the following factors are for council to consider when selecting a weed control method for footpaths and kerbs?

https://peoplespanel.aucklandcouncil.gov.nz/surveys/printablereport/ZE57Rix44KksQYKDR0Q
- Frequency of application required

Number of responses to this question 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey 399
Answer  Count %
1 - Not important  9  2
2  19  5
3  72  18
4  147  37
5 - Very important 146  37
I don't know  6  2

How important you think the following factors are for council to consider when selecting a weed SA(v) control method for footpaths and kerbs?

- The labour / time involved

Number of responses to this question 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey 399
Answer  Count %
1 - Not important  12  3
2  24  6
3  108  27
4  121  30
5 - Very important 131  33
I don't know  3  1
SA(vi)
How important you think the following factors are for council to consider when selecting a weed control method for footpaths and kerbs?

- Energy used and carbon emissions

Number of responses to this question: 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey: 399

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not important</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Very important</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How important you think the following factors are for council to consider when selecting a weed control method for footpaths and kerbs?

- Health and safety

Number of responses to this question: 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey: 399

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Very important</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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How important you think the following factors are for council to consider when selecting a weed SA(viii) control method for footpaths and kerbs?

- Preferences of the local community

Number of responses to this question 399 (100%)  
Total number of responses for this survey 399

Answer  
Count %
I don't know 2  1

Number of responses to this question 399 (100%)  
Total number of responses for this survey 399

Answer  
Count %
1 - Not important 23  6
2  35  9
3  110  28
4  110  28
5 - Very important 111  28
I don't know 10  3

Across the urban Auckland road network, the difference in weed control methodologies is millions of dollars.

Question 5B  
Would you be willing to pay a local rate for a particular methodology to be used in your local board?

Number of responses to this question 399 (100%)  
Total number of responses for this survey 399

Answer  
Yes – I would be happy to pay more to get the weed control method I want 56  14
No – I’m happy to use the same weed control method as the rest of the region 158  40
Not applicable – I shouldn’t have to pay more for the weed control method I want 152  38

https://peoplespanel.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/surveys/printablereport/ZE57RwX44K6sQYK1DROQ
Question 6B Are you:

- Male 51%
- Female 48%
- Gender diverse 1%
- I prefer not to say 1%

Number of responses to this question 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey 399

Answer  Count %
Male 202 51
Female 192 48
Gender diverse 1 0
I prefer not to say 4 1

Which of the following age groups do you belong to?

Question 6C
Please select one only.
Number of responses to this question: 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey: 399

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 - 17 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 64 years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 69 years</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 74 years</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 years and over</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer not to say</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 6E: Which of the following ethnic groups do you belong to? Please select all that apply.

https://peoplespanel.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/surveys/printablereport/2E57Rm4K9sQYKIDROQ
Number of responses to this question: 399 (100%)
Total number of responses for this survey: 399

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand European / Pākehā</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands Māori</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://peoplespanel.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/surveys/printablereport/ZE57RkB444KtQY6KDROQ
And on a different note...

Would you be interested in participating in further research (e.g. focus groups or interviews) with other young people to talk about living in Auckland and what is important to you?

*You will be rewarded for your time.*

Number of responses to this question 7 (2%)
Total number of responses for this survey 399

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe - send me more information and I'll decide</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No thanks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://peoplespanel.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/surveys/printablereport/2E57Rh44kKskQyKIDROQ
### Attachment B – Local Board Feedback on Weed Management Impact Priorities

Estimated impact by methodology from existing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing (estimated)</th>
<th>glyphosate only</th>
<th>Combination Plant-based and glyphosate</th>
<th>Plant-based herbicide</th>
<th>Thermal (glyphosate for spot spraying)</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Carbon emissions (KG)</strong></td>
<td>207.26 7</td>
<td>(201.5 55)</td>
<td>9.554</td>
<td>(197.7 13)</td>
<td>(195.7 92)</td>
<td>1,334, 580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>glyphosate (L)</strong></td>
<td>6.471</td>
<td>9.084</td>
<td>2.593</td>
<td>3.412</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(6.471)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>active ingredient glyphosate - (KG)</strong></td>
<td>3.300</td>
<td>4.622</td>
<td>1.322</td>
<td>1.740</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(3.300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plant-based herbicide (L)</strong></td>
<td>11.728</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(11.72 8)</td>
<td>40.215</td>
<td>28.486</td>
<td>67.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Use (L)</strong></td>
<td>6.774, 302</td>
<td>906, 357</td>
<td>(5.867, 945)</td>
<td>4.382, 693</td>
<td>(2.411, 609)</td>
<td>6.710, 591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Decrease</th>
<th>Estimated Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Feedback is sought from local boards regarding their priorities for an effective, efficient and sustainable standardised edging and weed control on hard surfaces across 5,055km of urban road corridor.

   - **Standardise to glyphosate.** Compared to the existing practices there would be a reduction in operational carbon emissions, water use, cost and plant-based herbicide. There would be an estimated 150% increase in glyphosate use. Non-target effects would be minimised by adherence to the contract specifications. EPA code of practice and manufacturer instructions. However, a potential impact of glyphosate use is increased herbicide resistance. There may be an increased risk of community objection to the use of glyphosate. All residents can opt out of weed control completed by council through the no-spray register.
• **Standardise to plant-based herbicide.** Compared to the existing practices there would be a reduction in glyphosate use. There would be an estimated 600% increase in the volume of plant based active ingredient, fatty acids, used to manage weeds. Non-target effects would be minimised by contractor adherence to contract specifications, the EPA code of practice and manufacturer instructions. All residents can opt out of weed control completed by council through the no-spray register. The delivery of this methodology is approximately three times the cost if glyphosate and would require additional budget. This could impact the delivery of the full facilities maintenance services to local boards.

• **Standardise to thermal.** This would lead to a reduction in glyphosate (some glyphosate would still be required for spot spraying) and plant-based herbicide with an increase in water, operational carbon emissions and cost. The regionwide adoption of this methodology could lead to an increase in carbon emissions, at 1,335 tons. This accounted for approximately 5% of council’s operational emissions for 2018/2019. The increase would impact the council’s ability to meet the targets of Te Tāruke-a-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan, which was adopted on 21 July 2020. This methodology is approximately five times the cost of glyphosate and would require additional budget.

• **Standardise to a combination of plant-based and glyphosate.** The adoption of this methodology would result in a regional reduction in glyphosate use. Compared to the other standardised options (except for glyphosate) there would be an estimated reduction in operational carbon emissions and water use. There would be an increase in the use of plant-based herbicide. The reduction in glyphosate reflects community feedback and would reduce herbicide resistance. All residents can opt out of weed control completed by council through the no-spray register. This change is estimated to be able to be delivered within the existing operational budget.

**Recommendation methodology**

2. The recommendation for a regionally consistent methodology to manage weeds in the kerb and channel and private berms is a combination of plant-based and spot spraying of glyphosate for difficult weeds.

3. An additional recommendation of the review is a communication plan for the promotion of the no-spray register, supporting residents who conduct weed control on their property boundaries.

4. Should a local board choose to utilise alternate methodologies to those adopted as the region-wide approach, they could use locally-driven initiatives (LDI) funding to cover the cost difference between the agreed regional weed management method and their preferred alternative.

**Local Board Priorities**

5. Please provide feedback on local board priorities for Weed Management in the urban road corridor (Rank 1 – 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority to minimise</th>
<th>Local board priorities (1 – 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic herbicide (glyphosate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant-based – herbicide (fatty acids)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon emissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water usage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback on the recommended approach

6.  <Enter text>
## Attachment C

### Item 17

#### Comparison of weed control methodologies for hard edging in local parks and the urban road corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Costs (average)</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Human health risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No control</strong>&lt;br&gt;Where no weed control is undertaken at a particular site.</td>
<td>In most situations, no control would result in council's failure to meet current level of service. No control can be effective in some parts of the rural road corridor for some species. For example, no control of grass can lead to successful regeneration of native species. In a few other situations where erosion control is more important than species composition, no control of weeds is an effective option.</td>
<td>No immediate direct cost.</td>
<td>Unquantified potential longer-term costs from damage to assets caused by weeds (cracks in footpaths, car parks etc.)</td>
<td>Personnel or actual indirect impact from the growth of weeds: &lt;ul&gt;&lt;li&gt;Species like gorse can trigger hay fever and asthma&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;Other species can present a physical hazard (e.g., <em>methylenecyclcopreis</em> is an ember)*&lt;/li&gt;&lt;/ul&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mechanical**<br>**Weed-eating, mowing, shredding:**<br>Used on 1,815 km of hard edges in local parks, and the road corridor in conjunction with other methods. Mechanical control methods are not effective ways of killing the entire plant including the root system, but they trim foliage and can prevent or reduce weed production and restrict growth. Mechanical control is used most often in combination with other weed control methods in the road corridor (glyphosate, steam and hot water) to increase effectiveness. Mechanical control methods must be undertaken between weekly and monthly, depending on the required level of service, to prevent weeds from resprouting from stems and root fragments. Mechanical control is most effective when it is timed well, e.g., before a plant can set seed.

Mechanical control is used in conjunction with other methods. Mechanical control is used in conjunction with other methods in the different contract areas. The estimated cost for the mechanical cut method in the road corridor is $200.00 per km per year.

For local parks the average cost is $1.20/km (high use rural park) to $2.10/km (Premier Park) depending on location and contract frequency.

Some potential impact on biodiversity, via risk of spreading weeds as fragments can travel on machinery, or re-spread from fragments on site. There is a minor risk of injury to the applicator from equipment, or to passers-by (as e.g., from stones being flicked up by machinery/line trimmers).

**Manual**<br>**Weed control by hand or hand tool:**<br>Manual control is not an effective method for most of the hard edges in local parks, but for much of the road corridor. It can be effective against small shrubs and trees and herbaceous weeds in small infestations. Manual control is best suited to small plants without extensive root systems that can be removed without breakage. It is not recommended for plants with deep underground roots and/or easily broken roots.

Manual control is not an effective method for most of the hard edges in local parks, but for much of the road corridor. It can be effective against small shrubs and trees and herbaceous weeds in small infestations, removing the whole plant. It is best suited to small plants without extensive root systems that can be removed without breakage. It is not recommended for plants with deep underground roots and/or easily broken roots.

Manual control is not an effective method for most of the hard edges in local parks, but for much of the road corridor. It can be effective against small shrubs and trees and herbaceous weeds in small infestations, removing the whole plant. It is best suited to small plants without extensive root systems that can be removed without breakage. It is not recommended for plants with deep underground roots and/or easily broken roots.

Manual control is not an effective method for most of the hard edges in local parks, but for much of the road corridor. It can be effective against small shrubs and trees and herbaceous weeds in small infestations, removing the whole plant. It is best suited to small plants without extensive root systems that can be removed without breakage. It is not recommended for plants with deep underground roots and/or easily broken roots.

**Cost for this method is site specific.**

This method creates soil disturbance, which can lead to weed invasion. Manual control on species that re-spread from fragments can lead to weeds spreading further.

There is risk to the applicator through injury via: over-estimation during operation or injury/loss caused by weed itself (e.g., reaction to sap, or injury from appendages such as thorns). Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), such as long sleeves, pants and gloves, will minimise risk.
High Pressure Steam

Application of high pressure steam, includes supplementary applications of glyphosate or mechanical treatment.

Used in approximately 700km (9%) of the road corridor in north-west urban contract area of legacy North SHare.²²

Steam is not an effective way of killing the entire plant including the root system, but it leaves the foliage and can prevent/reduce used production and restrict growth.²³ The steam destroys the surface foliage of the weeds, leaving the roots primarily untreated as the temperature of the steam decreases (forming liquid water) rapidly upon touching the ground.²³

Steam does not destroy the foliage of some types of weeds (nutgrass and kikuyu for example).

Steam must be repeated on a 6 weekly programmed cycle in combination with or interchanged with mechanical trimming/removal to achieve the required level of service to meet required service standard.²³

To achieve required level of service in this contract area, mechanical control (weed wasters) is used to remove any weeds in the channel or growing over the kerb before high pressure steam is applied to the remainder of the plant. High pressure steam is used every second cycle with the intervening cycle being mechanical only. Weed eaters are also used to trim the edges of the footpath. Glyphosate-based herbicide is used to kill the weeds in the channel on the Level 2 roads as the high pressure steam system (trucks and application system) cannot be used solely on these roads, with mechanical control (weed wasters) and on the road berm. Glyphosate is also used to treat specific weeds such as nut grass.

The current high pressure steam system is too heavy to be accommodated on park infrastructure such as footpaths and lawns, and is only used in this road corridor. Applications involve large, slow moving vehicles which are noisy²² so is limited to non-peak hours in some areas. Traffic management is required for high volume roads (1.2).

$1,561/ha per year in the road corridor.²³

This method uses 2000L to 3000L of water per day of deployment²³. The environmental impacts of this water consumption will be dictated by whether the water is sourced from the mains supply or from roof supply, and has not been quantified.

Similarly the environmental costs from treating the water and powering the vehicles used for transporting the treated water to the site, will depend on the sources of the energy being consumed. If fossil fuels are used there will be associated carbon emissions. These have not been quantified.

Hot Water Treatment

Application of hot water. Supplemented with mechanical removal of larger weeds.

Used in approximately 735km (9%) of road corridor in north-west urban contract area of legacy North SHare.²²

Hot water treatment is not an effective way of killing the entire plant including the root system, but it leaves the foliage and can prevent/reduce used production and restrict growth.²³ The hot water destroys the surface foliage of the weeds, leaving the roots primarily untreated as the temperature of the water decreases rapidly upon touching the ground.²³

Hot water does not destroy the foliage of some types of weeds (nutgrass and kikuyu for example).

In this contract area, hot water is applied directly to the weeds with no mechanical control undertaken prior to application of the hot water. Some mechanical control is used to trim the edges of the footpath. No glyphosate is used in the area where hot water is used.

Control is repeated within an 8 weekly programmed cycle in combination with mechanical trimming/removal. This cycle is not frequent enough to achieve the required level of service.²³

The current hot water treatment system (trucks and disposal unit) is too heavy to be accommodated on park infrastructure such as footpaths and lawns, and can only be used in the road corridor. Application involves large, slow moving vehicles which are noisy²² so is limited to non-peak hours in some areas. Traffic management is required for high volume roads (1.2).

$1,189/ha per year in the road corridor.²³

The current frequency of application does not meet the level of service required. To meet the required service standard, this treatment frequency would need to be doubled with an extrapolated costs is approximately $2,373/ha per year.²³

This method uses 2000L to 6000L of water per day of deployment²³. The environmental impacts of this water consumption will be dictated by whether the water is sourced from the mains supply or from roof supply, and has not been quantified.

Similarly the environmental costs from treating the water and powering the vehicles used for transporting the heated water to the site, will depend on the sources of the energy being consumed. If fossil fuels are used there will be associated carbon emissions. These have not been quantified.

Thermal treatment can reduce soil micro-organisms and invertebrates.²³

Primarily risk to the operator through direct contact with hot water, equipment and proximity to traffic.

Exposure to the steam is minimal and the heat dissipates quickly once the steam contacts the weeds or ground. Risks caused by exhausts have also potential to cause harm²³

In the road corridor, the treatment operator is at risk to moving traffic as they walk beside the truck on the road.
Plant-based herbicide

Waxed control by plant-based herbicide via foliar spray. Includes products like Organic Interceptor (obtained from pine extract) and Agro Bio-safe (obtained from coconut oil). Used in approximately 104.9 km (13%) of road corridor in legacy Auckland City and Whituhe Island area.

Plant-based herbicides are activated on contact with the foliage of weeds and brown off the top as can prevent/reduce seed production and restrict growth. They are usually fast acting, and they can control some weeds that hot water and steam don’t affect (such as kikuyu).

Organic Interceptor is a non-selective contact herbicide that causes rapid defoliation by penetrating plant tissue and disrupting normal membrane permeability and cell physiology. Bio-Safe is a non-selective contact herbicide that causes rapid defoliation of the leaves and is most effective on actively growing weeds and when applied in hot sunny conditions.

To meet service standards they must also be used in combination with other products, and they require more frequent application compared to glyphosate.

Biscoside is used on a 4-week cycle and is supplemented with glyphosate. Interceptor is used on a 12-day cycle in combination with mechanical removal.

A 2023 trial into weed control methods by the legacy Waiheke City Council found that Bio-safe was relatively effective only when vegetation is young especially kikuyu grass. The same trial looked at Organic Interceptor and BioSafe, and found the least effective in the trial at controlling established vegetation especially kikuyu.

Glyphosate-based herbicide

Effective tool for controlling annual broadleaf weeds, grasses and other monocotyledonous weeds in local parks and the road corridor. It kills the entire plant including its root system. It requires less frequent foliar sprays than other methods, with an average of three to four treatments a year.

Glyphosate is absorbed through green plant tissue then translocated throughout the plant including the root system to kill the entire plant. Effectiveness requires weeds to be actively growing and not under drought stress, with clean foliage for best results.

Nitgrass suffers only a knock-down effect from glyphosate due to the mobility of glyphosate to penetrate the plant's thick cuticle. However, experience shows that when mixed with a wetting agent, glyphosate is effective in killing nitgrass.

The application rate is quick (using a small left-hand steer vehicle).

In the urban road corridor the average cost is $542/km per year (within a range of $300 - $710/km per year).

For local parks, the average cost is $413/km per year within a range of $363/km (low use parks) to $710/km (high use parks) per year depending on location and control frequency.

Approved for use by the New Zealand Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Glyphosate is strongly absorbed into soil and has no residual activity in soil. This reduces the risk of the product being transferred due to rain or irrigation, and the risk of the product being taken up by non-target plants. It has a low toxicity to terrestrial animals and wildlife.

Over use can result in increased resistance in some species, and therefore effectiveness could decline over time.

The vehicles used to apply glyphosate use fossil fuels and generate some carbon emissions. These have not been quantified. Similarly the life cycle impacts arising from the manufacturing, transport and storage of glyphosate have not been quantified.

Exposure pathways for occupational and public exposure are managed by compliance with standards and procedures.

Meets national health standards when correct application methods and procedures are adhered to. The EPA has approved Organic Interceptor and Agro Bio-safe as a herbicide for use under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act (HSNO) Act 1996.

Correct application methods are described in the New Zealand Standard on the Management of Agricultural Chemicals (12539:2004). Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (part III 4.9.2.2 and 3), and product label as registered by the EPA. Application must be in accordance with these standards.

Agro Bio-safe carries a health and safety risk to the operator and others who come into contact with the product. The product is corrosive to eye tissue and an eye, skin and respiratory irritant. Protective equipment must be worn.

Biscoside is a coconut-derived fatty acid with a strong, notable odour. This odour persists for some time after treatment, lingering on warm days, and has been the source of complaint from the public.

Exposure pathways for occupational and public exposure are managed by compliance with standards and procedures.

Meets national health standards when correct application methods and procedures are adhered to. The EPA has approved glyphosate as a herbicide for general use under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act (HSNO) Act 1996.

Correct application methods are described in the New Zealand Standard on the Management of Agricultural Chemicals (12539:2004). Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (part III 4.9.2.2 and 3), and product label as registered by the EPA. Application must be in accordance with these standards.

There is some community concern associated with use of glyphosate on crops and entry into food chain however these potential entry points do not occur in the road corridor and hard edges of local parks. There is little evidence off this risk in NZ and appears to be associated with crops that are
Biological control

Biological control is not suited to control weed species typically occurring on hard edges of local parks and many species in the road corridor. It relies on the weed’s natural enemy being free to grow, and in most areas this would confound the weed control standards of local parks and roads. Biological control might mean that areas are not tidy and safe, or could cause nuisance to neighbours or damage to fences.

A study into 43 agents released between 1972 and 2013 showed an average cost of developing an agent for New Zealand was NZ$355,680 (with the average cost per novelty agent being NZ$475,334, more than double the average of NZ$210,603 for repeat agents). The risk of adverse impacts to the environment is low. Before a new biological control agent is released, approval from the EPA is needed and all proposed agents are rigorously tested to assess the risk of damage to non-target plants. They are also tested for disease and evaluated for any other unwanted interactions it might have. A comprehensive cost-benefit analysis is also carried out and the results of all these studies are included in an application to the EPA. The application then goes through a public comment period. All species approved for release must initially come into a containment facility until permission to remove them is granted by MPI pending evidence of their correct identity and freedom from any diseases or other unwanted organisms.

Biocontrol agents rarely pose any risks to humans due to the stringent, pre-cautionary assessment and registration process.

3 Staff experience and in-field observations.
4 https://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0000/770191/Weeds_Biosecurity_Best_practice.pdf
5 https://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0000/770115/colony Pest_status_mohi_plant_Arapo_hortorum.pdf
6 PWC – Review of weed control costs for hard edges in parks, 6 November 2015.
8 Based on current contract analysis by Auckland Transport staff.
9 PWC – Review of weed control costs for hard edges in parks, 6 November 2015.
10 Tu et al., 2001: Weed Control Methods Handbook: Tools & Techniques for Use in Natural Areas.
12 Tu et al., 2001: Weed Control Methods Handbook: Tools & Techniques for Use in Natural Areas.
18 Distance provided by Auckland Transport
19 Staff experience and in-field observations.
20 Staff experience and in-field observations.
22 Auckland Transport and their contractors receive complaints from neighbours due to the high noise level during control work using this method – this has resulted in limited hours for operations in residential areas.
23 PWC – Review of weed control costs for hard edges in parks, 6 November 2015.
24 Staff experience and in-field observations

25 Diesel engine exhaust is a category 1 carcinogen (Carcinogenic to humans) and petrol engine exhaust is a category 2B carcinogen (Possibly carcinogenic to humans). Agents Classified by the IARC Monographs, Volumes 1–112 and http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Classification

26 Distance provided by Auckland Transport
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29 Auckland Transport and their contractors receive complaints from neighbours due to the high noise levels during control work using this method – this has resulted in limited hours for operations in residential areas

30 PWC – Review of weed control costs for hard edges in parts, 16 November 2015

31 Estimation by Auckland Transport staff based on current contract analyses

32 Staff experience and in-field observations

33 http://dep.mrgd.ca/MflagRock/PL/PL27.htm
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66 http://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/science/education/biocontrol-information/biocontrol-safety
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Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval from the Howick Local Board to name a private road, being a commonly owned access lot (COAL), created by way of a subdivision development at 45 & 49 Hilltop Road, Flatbush.

Whakarāpopototangatanga 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, Greenstone Group, agent Maven Associates Limited have proposed the names presented in the tables below for consideration by the local board. The three names were suggested by iwi organisation Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki.

4. Any of the three proposed road name options would be acceptable for the local board to approve for use in this location, having been assessed to ensure that they meet Auckland Council’s Road Naming Guidelines and the National Addressing Standards for road naming. All technical standards are met and the names are not duplicated anywhere else in the region. Mana Whenua have also been consulted.

5. The proposed names for the new private road at 45 & 49 Hilltop Road are:
   - Timo Way (applicant and Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki preferred)
   - Kakau Lane (First alternative)
   - Tāhere Way (Second alternative).

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Howick Local Board:

a) approve the name Timo Way (applicant and Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki preferred name) for the new private road created by way of subdivision at 45 & 49 Hilltop Road, Flatbush in accordance with section 319(1)(j) of the Local Government Act 1974 (resource consent reference BUN60331956 and SUB60333119).

Horopaki

Context

6. Resource consent BUN60331956 (subdivision reference number SUB60333119) was issued in July 2019 for the construction of 15 dwellings and one commonly owned access lot (COAL).

7. In accordance with the National Addressing Standards for road naming (the AS/NZS 4819-2011 standard), the COAL requires a road name because it serves more than five lots.

8. Site and location plans of the development can be found in Attachments A and B respectively.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

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

10. Auckland Council’s road naming criteria typically require that road names try to reflect one of the following local themes, with the use of Māori names being actively encouraged. Themes can include:
   - 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.

11. All three names were suggested by Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki and are themed around natural features. Zaelene Maxwell-Butler from Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki provided the following description for the theme of the names: “Many roads have been named for tree species within the greater rohe of Tāmaki Makaurau. An area overlooked however are the implements made from the hardwoods for weapons and gardening, building and carving tools used by our tūpuna and so Ngāi Tai would like these reflected to show how skilled our people were.”

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed name</th>
<th>Meaning (as described by Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timo Way</td>
<td>A gardening, digging implement made of wood with a sharpened point. Phonetic pronunciation – tea-more, the ‘o’ has a long vowel sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Applicant and Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki preferred)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakau Lane</td>
<td>The stalk of a plant but also ‘toki kakauroa’, a long-handled axe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(First alternative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāhere Way</td>
<td>A snare, to set a snare to capture manu (birds). The area once was ngahere (forest) where manu (birds) were a staple in the diet of Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki’s tūpuna (ancestors).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Second alternative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. All the name options listed in the report are acceptable for use, having been assessed by the Auckland 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.

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

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

16. Mana whenua were consulted in line with agreed processes and requirements – see the ‘Māori Impact Statement’ section of this report for further detail.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

17. The naming of roads has no effect on climate change. Relevant environmental issues have been considered under the provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the associated approved resource consent for the development.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera  
Council group impacts and views

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

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

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

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori  
Māori impact statement

20. The naming of roads is linked to the Auckland Plan Outcome “A Māori identity that is Auckland’s point of difference in the world”. The use of Te Reo Māori names for roads, buildings and other public places is encouraged as an opportunity to publicly demonstrate Māori identity.

21. To aid local board decision making, the Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines include an objective of recognising cultural and ancestral linkages to areas of land through engagement with mana whenua, particularly through the resource consent process, and the allocation of road names where appropriate, as well as a process to enable mana whenua the opportunity to provide feedback on all road naming applications in a manner and scale that they consider appropriate. Depending on the scale of the development and its level of significance, not all road naming applications receive comments from mana whenua.

22. On 7 July 2020, the applicant contacted three local iwi groups which have mana whenua status over the area. These groups were Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki, Ngāti Tamaterā, and Te Ākitai Waiohua. Only Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki responded with interest and suggested three names which the applicant has included in their proposal for the local board’s consideration.

23. No other responses, comments or suggestions were received from the remaining two iwi groups.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea  
Financial implications

24. The road naming process does not raise any financial implications for the council.

25. 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

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

Ngā koringa ā-muri  
Next steps

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Location Plan</td>
<td>91</td>
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Approval for a new road name at 45 & 49 Hilltop Road, Flatbush
Urgent Decision to provide Howick Local Board feedback on the review of Auckland Council’s council-controlled organisations (CCO) report

File No.: CP2020/13267

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To note that an urgent decision was made to provide Howick Local Board feedback on the report of the independent panel’s review of Auckland Council’s council-controlled organisations (CCO).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. At its meeting on 9 December 2019 the Howick Local Board resolved (HW/2019/159) the following in relation to urgent decision-making:

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

3. An urgent decision was required in this instance because the feedback needed to be provided by midday Wednesday 26 August 2020, prior to the next scheduled meeting on Monday 21 September. Delaying the feedback would result in the board’s input not being able to be presented to the Governing Body for their consideration.

4. On 25 August 2020 the chair and deputy chair made an urgent decision on behalf of the board to provide feedback on the report of the independent panel’s review of Auckland Council’s CCO’s. The urgent decision is included in this report as Attachment A.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Howick Local Board:

a) note the urgent decision made on 25 August 2020 to provide feedback on the report of the independent panel’s review of Auckland Council’s CCO’s.

b) note the feedback provided as follows:
   i) support in principle the findings and recommendations in the review of CCOs by the independent panel;
   ii) welcome the proposal in recommendation 34 on how to address CCO-local board engagement and request that this work be started as soon as possible;
iii) support the merger of two CCOs (namely Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development and Regional Facilities Auckland Limited);

iv) request more detailed information about how local boards will provide input to the process of setting expectations and strategic direction for the CCOs;

v) request involvement of local boards in discussions around developing guidance to CCOs on how to balance public and commercial interests;

vi) request more information with regards to Recommendation 2 and the operation of the city’s four stadiums with the Eden Park Trust and that local boards have the opportunity to provide input into any related strategy;

vii) request that any appointments as a consequence of Recommendations 20, 25 and 30 be kept to a minimum and that consideration be given to reallocation of suitable staff who might be facing redundancy;

viii) request that the implementation programme looks at the planning cycles for Auckland Council and CCOs and how they can be better aligned;

ix) request that local boards have input into determining key performance measures as identified in Recommendation 23;

x) request that in terms of Recommendation 41, IT systems be regularly updated - in particular, an up to date staff directory must be maintained;

xi) request that, in terms of Recommendation 44, Auckland Transport immediately implement an organisational culture change to ensure effective operation and a safe working environment;

xii) request more information with regards to Recommendation 62 and what “shared services” refers to - in particular, the Board does not support shared service contracts;

xiii) note that the success of the review lies in its implementation;

xiv) note that Recommendations 6, 34 and 53 will require more detailed input from local boards and would recommend that CCOs use the same reporting format, and report at the same time, as Council;

xv) note that as part of Recommendation 6, Auckland Transport provides increased access to technical experts and emphasizes a partnership approach with local boards;

xvi) note that monitoring and regular updates need to be a part of any project;

xvii) note that, legislative issues notwithstanding, there are obvious benefits for marketing and promotional opportunities if the Auckland War Memorial Museum, Stardome and MOTAT were merged into a single entity;

xviii) note that whilst supporting Recommendation 11, the process must include dialogue with, and approval from, the local board;

xix) note that with regards to Recommendation 43, diversity and experience (including experience working in and with communities) should be part of the skill set of any applicant applying for, and successfully appointed to, these roles;

xx) note that the recommendations do not address the question of whether Governing Body members should be Auckland Transport board members;

xxi) note that the board is of the opinion that current Auckland Council elected members should not be members of any CCO board;

xxii) note that there needs to be parity of salaries between Council and CCOs;

xxiii) note that local boards will be able to provide input on the other relevant CCO
review recommendations as they are further developed for implementation.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
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Memo  
25 August 2020

To: Carol McKenzie-Rex, Relationship Manager, Franklin & Howick Local Boards
   Adele White, Chairperson Howick Local Board
   John Spiller, Deputy Chairperson Howick Local Board

CC: Helgard Wagener, Acting Policy and Planning Manager, Local Board Services

From: Ian Mlines, Senior Local Board Advisor – Howick

Subject: Urgent decision request of the Howick Local Board – CCO Review report feedback

Purpose
To seek Howick Local Board feedback on the report of the independent panel’s review of Auckland Council’s council-controlled organisations (CCO).

Reason for the urgency
At its meeting on 9 December 2019 the Howick Local Board resolved (HW/2019/159):
   c) agree that the relationship manager, chair and deputy chair (or any person’s acting in these roles) will authorise the urgent decision-making process by signing off an authorisation memo.

The board has an opportunity to provide their feedback on the review of Auckland Council’s CCO’s. The deadline for providing feedback is at noon Wednesday, 26 August 2020. The board’s next scheduled meeting is Monday, 21 September 2020.

An urgent decision is required because the deadline for providing feedback is prior to the next scheduled meeting.

Decision sought from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles)
Howick Local Board feedback by urgent decision resolution on the report of the independent panel’s review of Auckland Council’s council-controlled organisations (CCO).

Background
The independent panel that was set up to conduct a review of CCOs concluded its review at the end of July 2020 and has now submitted its findings (hereafter Review). The Review is available online at: https://ourauckland.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/media/35376/coo-review-final.pdf

The Review investigated how effective the CCO model is and whether there were any viable alternatives; whether the council has adequate accountability measures and is using them effectively; and the CCO culture.

The Review found that the CCO model is the right one and clear benefits are evident but there is room for improvement. It found that the lack of strategic direction to CCOs is a key failing and that the council has available mechanisms to ensure accountability but is not using these effectively. The Review highlighted the need for strategic planning and direction, effective use of accountability mechanisms and increased monitoring of CCO performance. In terms of culture, the Review found little evidence of a group culture and highlighted a need for greater collaboration across CCOs (and with the council), especially when working with and responding to the public.

The Review proposes a package of 64 recommendations. One of these recommendations is for a proposed merger of RFA and ATEED.

The Governing Body will be considering the Review at its meeting on 27 August 2020 and is expected to give some direction and make decisions on the package of recommendations from the Review.
Additionally, the Governing Body will be receiving another report at its meeting on seeking a decision on the proposed merger of RFA and ATEED and outlining an implementation process for that work.

Local boards are invited to share their views on this issue in addition to general views about the Review. This was raised at the Howick Local Board workshop on 20 August 2020, and the members indicated their intent to provide feedback.

An urgent decision on behalf of the local board is required to be endorsed by the chair and deputy chair, or any person acting in these roles, as set out in the Howick Local Board urgent decision process (HW/2019/159).
Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process

Carol McKenzie-Rex  
Relationship Manager, Franklin & Howick Local Boards  
25 August 2020

Approval to use the urgent decision-making process

Adele White  
Chairperson, Howick Local Board  
25 August 2020

John Spiller  
Deputy Chairperson, Howick Local Board  
25 August 2020

Howick Local board Resolution/s

That the Howick Local Board:

a) support in principle the findings and recommendations in the review of CCOs by the independent panel;

b) welcome the proposal in recommendation 34 on how to address CCO-local board engagement and request that this work be started as soon as possible;

c) support the merger of two CCOs (namely Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development and Regional Facilities Auckland Limited);

d) request more detailed information about how local boards will provide input to the process of setting expectations and strategic direction for the CCOs;

e) request involvement of local boards in discussions around developing guidance to CCOs on how to balance public and commercial interests;

f) request more information with regards to Recommendation 2 and the operation of the city's four stadiums with the Eden Park Trust and that local boards have the opportunity to provide input into any related strategy;

g) request that any appointments as a consequence of Recommendations 20, 25 and 30 be kept to a minimum and that consideration be given to reallocation of suitable staff who might be facing redundancy;
h) request that the implementation programme looks at the planning cycles for Auckland Council and CCOs and how they can be better aligned;

i) request that local boards have input into determining key performance measures as identified in Recommendation 23;

j) request that in terms of Recommendation 41, IT systems be regularly updated - in particular, an up to date staff directory must be maintained;

k) request that, in terms of Recommendation 44, Auckland Transport immediately implement an organisational culture change to ensure effective operation and a safe working environment;

l) request more information with regards to Recommendation 62 and what “shared services” refers to - in particular, the Board does not support shared service contracts;

m) note that the success of the review lies in its implementation;

n) note that Recommendations 6, 34 and 53 will require more detailed input from local boards and would recommend that CCOs use the same reporting format, and report at the same time, as Council;

o) note that as part of Recommendation 6, Auckland Transport provides increased access to technical experts and emphasizes a partnership approach with local boards;

p) note that monitoring and regular updates need to be a part of any project;

q) note that, legislative issues notwithstanding, there are obvious benefits for marketing and promotional opportunities if the Auckland War Memorial Museum, Stardome and MOTAT were merged into a single entity;

r) note that whilst supporting Recommendation 11, the process must include dialogue with, and approval from, the local board;

s) note that with regards to Recommendation 43, diversity and experience (including experience working in and with communities) should be part of the skill set of any applicant applying for, and successfully appointed to, these roles;

t) note that the recommendations do not address the question of whether Governing Body members should be Auckland Transport board members;

u) note that the board is of the opinion that current Auckland Council elected members should not be members of any CCO board;

v) note that there needs to be parity of salaries between Council and CCOs;

w) note that local boards will be able to provide input on the other relevant CCO review recommendations as they are further developed for implementation.

Adele White
Chairperson, Howick Local Board 25 August 2020

John Spiller
Deputy Chairperson, Howick Local Board 25 August 2020
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To present the Howick Local Board with its updated governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The governance forward work calendar for the Howick Local Board is in Attachment A. The calendar is updated monthly, reported to meetings and distributed to council staff.
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; and
   • clarifying the rationale for reports.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:
a) note the governance forward work calendar included as Attachment A of the agenda report.

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>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>Authoriser</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop / Business Meeting / Review</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop &amp; Business meeting</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>On hold, new timeline TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>On hold, new timeline TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>On hold, new timeline TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>On hold, new timeline TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop &amp; Business meeting</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>On hold, new timeline TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workshop records
File No.: CP2020/08624

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. This item attaches the workshop records taken for the period stated below.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Under Standing Order 12.1 workshop records shall record the names of members attending and a statement summarising the nature of the information received, and nature of matters discussed. No resolutions are passed, or decisions reached but are solely for the provision of information and discussion.
3. This report attaches the workshop records for the period stated below.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Howick Local Board:
a) note the workshop records for workshops held on 6, 13, 20 and 27 August 2020 and included as attachments in the agenda report.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Workshop record 6 August 2020</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Workshop record 13 August 2020</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Workshop record 20 August 2020</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Workshop record 27 August 2020</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Vanessa Phillips - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Carol McKenzie-Rex - Relationship Manager for Franklin and Howick Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Howick Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Howick Local Board held at the Howick Local Board meeting room, Pakuranga Library Complex on Thursday 6 August 2020, commencing at 2pm.

PRESENT
Members: Adele White, John Spiller, Katrina Bungard, Bo Burns, David Collings, Bruce Kendall, Mike Turinsky, Bob Wichman and Peter Young

Apologies:

Also present: Carol McKenzie-Rex (Relationship Manager), Vanessa Phillips (Democracy Advisor), Lucy Stallworthy (Engagement Advisor) and Nichola Painter (Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item and Presenters</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Annual Planning – continuation</td>
<td></td>
<td>A continued discussion was held on the 2020/2021 Work Programmes and direction was sought from the board for the Howick Information Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick Local Board Services team</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Gan, Lead Financial Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prathanthi Cottingham, Relationship Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat Tierney, Senior Project Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otara waterways and lakes update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board were provided an update on the 1 billion trees project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Jones, Resource Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The board were provided an update on Auckland Transport activity and projects in the Howick Local Board area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Stallworthy, Elected Member Relationship Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction Setting</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>Direction was sought from the board on upcoming work programme and other items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick Local Board Services team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 4:49pm
Howick Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Howick Local Board held via Skype for Business on Thursday 13 August 2020, commencing at 2pm.

PRESENT

Members: Adele White, John Spiller, Katrina Bungard, Bo Burns, David Collings, Bruce Kendall, Mike Turinsky, Bob Wichman and Peter Young

Apologies:

Also present: Carol McKenzie-Rex (Relationship Manager), Ian Milhes (Senior Advisor), Vanessa Phillips (Democracy Advisor) and Nichola Painter (Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item and Presenters</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stockade Hill independent planning advice&lt;br&gt;Peter Reaburn, Cato Bolam&lt;br&gt;Craig Cairncross, Team Leader - Planning&lt;br&gt;Celia Davison, Manager - Planning</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budget</td>
<td>Direction was sought from the board to clarify and agree on the area of focus in relation to an independent review of Stockade Hill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Emergency Budget asset recycling - Howick Local Board area properties<br>Ross Chinside, Value for Money Lead<br>Marian Webb, General Manager - Assets & Delivery<br>Ezra Barwell, Senior Policy Advisor | Setting direction, priorities and budgets | The board provided their views regarding the proposed disposal of 12 sites in the Howick Local Board area as part of the Emergency Budget asset recycling programme |

The workshop concluded at 5pm
# Howick Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Howick Local Board held via Skype for Business on Thursday 20 August 2020, commencing at 2pm.

## PRESENT

**Members:** Adele White, John Spiller, Katrina Bungard, Bo Burns, David Collings, Bruce Kendall, Mike Turinsky, Bob Wichman and Peter Young

**Apologies:**

**Also present:** Carol McKenzie-Rex (Relationship Advisor), Ian Milnes (Senior Advisor), Vanessa Phillips (Democracy Advisor) and Nichola Painter (Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item and Presenters</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers recognition 2020 Cici Dwe, Event Organiser (Civic)</td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific directions</td>
<td>Board support was sought on the proposed delivery for the Howick Volunteer recognition event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick Moon Festival 2020 Sammy Johnstone, Event Organiser</td>
<td>Local initiatives and specific directions</td>
<td>Direction was sought from the board on the delivery of the Howick Moon Festival 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities – Project Streetscapes update Marcel Morgan, Area Manager – Operations</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budget</td>
<td>Feedback was sought from the board on their priorities for methodologies to manage weeds on footpaths, berms and the kerbs and channels in the urban road corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Gargiulo, Principal Environmental Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathie Baker, Facilities Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities – Maintenance update Marcel Morgan, Area Manager – Operations</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The board were provided a monthly update on Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathie Baker, Facilities Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft proposal for a Navigation Safety bylaw Fereti Lualua, Policy Advisor</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budget</td>
<td>The board’s views were sought on a draft proposal for a new Navigation Safety Bylaw before it is finalised and adopted for public consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylee Vyle, Policy Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 5pm
Howick Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Howick Local Board held via Skype for Business on Thursday 27 August 2020, commencing at 2pm.

PRESENT
Members: Adele White, John Spiller, Katrina Bungard, Bo Burns, David Collings, Bruce Kendall, Bob Wichman and Peter Young

Apologies: Mike Turinsky

Also present: Carol McKenzie-Rex (Relationship Manager), Ian Milnes (Senior Advisor), Vanessa Phillips (Democracy Advisor) and Nichola Painter (Advisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item and Presenters</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Network Plan</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budget</td>
<td>The board's views and input were sought for inclusion in the Open Space Network Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillon O'Brien, Policy Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick Youth Council</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>The board were provided with an update on the youth council's activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick Local Board Services</td>
<td>Setting direction, priorities and budgets</td>
<td>Direction was sought from the board on upcoming work programme and other items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 3:30pm
Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Howick 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.

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as 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)(j) - The withholding of the information is necessary to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage. In particular, the report contains detailed financial information that have an impact on the financial results of the Auckland Council group as at 31 July 2020 that require release to the New Zealand Stock Exchange.</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>


<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)(j) - The withholding of the information is necessary to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage. In particular, the report contains detailed financial information that have an impact on the financial results of the Auckland Council group as at 31 July 2020 that require release to the New Zealand Stock Exchange.</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>

C1 Statement of proposal for a new Navigation Safety Bylaw

<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>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s7(2)(c)(i)</td>
<td>The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information would be likely to prejudice the supply of similar information or information from the same source and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied. In particular, the report contains a working draft of a bylaw yet to be approved for public consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s7(2)(f)(ii)</td>
<td>The withholding of the information is necessary to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of such members, officers, employees and persons from improper pressure or harassment. In particular, the report contains a working draft of a bylaw yet to be approved for public consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s48(1)(a)</td>
<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></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>