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Item 8
Mihi

Toko ake rā e koutou o te ngākau mahora, o te hinengaro māhaki,
o te whakaaro nui,
o te wairua atawhai.
Tukua hei a tātou ngā reo mō te wahangū me te piringa ā-mahue noa.
Koutou i huakina ai ngā tatau o kāinga-rua ki ngā mōkai a kāinga-tahi
kua kāwhakina ki tāhaki
e whakaaro kore rāua ko manawa poto.
Ki a koutou, ā mātou mihi
me ā mātou whakamānawa.

Welcome to all you of open heart,
humble mind,
kind thought
and caring spirit.
Let us be voices for the voiceless
and give shelter to the abandoned.
To you who gave a second home
to pets of those who cared less
the pets cast out
by negligence and short-term affection.
To you, we express our thanks
and gratitude.

Tēnei mātou te toro atu nei ki a koutou,
kia kotahi mai tātou ki te kawe ake
i te mānuka e piki ai te mātauranga,
e āhuru ai te noho a o tātou hapori
i ngā mōreae atanga o te kirehe mohoa
me te mea anō hoki e piki ai
te aronui o te iwi ki ngā Kawenga o te tiaki kurī.

Again, we reach out to you all,
to act together and help us meet
the challenge that is to increase education,
so that our communities are safe
from the dangers of wayward animals
and to inform
the people of their obligations to dog ownership.

E hora ake nei ko tā mātou pūrongo
mō ngā mahi i oti me ngā archanga
ki ngā mea he i kawe ake ā ngā ra e tū mai nei.
Mauri ora ki a koutou katoa.

The following is our report
of the work that has been completed already
and the work that is yet to be done.
Greetings to you, one and all.
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Executive Summary

This is the Auckland Council Animal Management annual report on dog control activities during the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020, as required by section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996.

The 2019-2020 registration year proved to be remarkably different from the previous year. Our team’s routine work was significantly affected during part of the year by the COVID-19 lockdown period and the progression through the subsequent lower alert levels.

Total dogs
As the Auckland region continues to grow, the 2019-2020 registration year has seen a 1.4% increase in the total number of known dogs in Auckland, which has gone from 110,869 in the previous year to 112,530 in this year – an increase of 1,661 dogs.

Our ongoing focus on dog registration compliance has achieved a 94.4% success rate, which is 1.7% lower than the previous year. This result may be partially attributed to the temporary closure of all service centres, animal shelters, and other places of registration during part of the year, but also to less proactive measures taken due to the lockdown.

Harm caused by dogs
The highest priority for our team is still to keep all Aucklanders and visitors to our city safe from harm caused by dogs. The fantastic effort by our field services teams has seen a reduction in all aggression-related incidents, with 31 fewer attacks on people, and 48 fewer attacks on other animals.

This is a total reduction of 4.7% on all dog attacks. Incidents where dogs behaved aggressively to people or other animals, but didn’t result in an attack, also decreased by 6% from 1,649 in the previous year to 1,547 this year.

New Policy and Bylaw
On 1 November 2019, the new Policy on Dogs 2019 and the Dog Management Bylaw 2019 came into effect. The aim of the new policy and bylaw were mostly to create regionally consistent rules and controls for multiple-dog ownership, ‘time and season’ rules for dog access in public places, and new rules for some of our regional parks.

High-risk dogs
It is a high priority for our team to get full compliance from dog owners with high-risk dogs, which includes menacing and dangerous dogs. At the end of the registration year, a total of 4,745 dogs were classified as menacing, and 26 dogs were classified as dangerous. This is an increase of 7.7% in menacing dogs, but a 10.3% reduction in dangerous dogs.

Overall compliance with the neutering requirement for all menacing and dangerous dog classifications has decreased by 3.3% from the previous year.

This result can likely be attributed to the closure of most veterinary clinics during the lockdown period, as well as the temporary suspension of the council’s subsidised neutering campaign.
Dealing with COVID-19
As essential workers, our field and shelter teams had to find new ways of interacting with customers and other stakeholders, while also keeping their own health and safety a top priority.

Our frontline officers had to wear all required PPE and abide by all safety guidelines during the course of their duties. The majority of dogs that were impounded after been found roaming were returned to their owners, rather than taken to a shelter.

From the start of the lockdown period, no enforcement action was taken against dog owners who could not comply with the neutering requirement of a menacing dog classification due to the unavailability of veterinarians. The reprieve period was extended until the end of the financial year, which caused a result in overall compliance that is 2.8% lower than the target set for the year.

All our animal shelters were closed to the public, but shelter staff continued to provide the best possible care for all dogs and other animals in the shelters, and also very effectively utilised this time to finish outstanding projects and maintenance at the shelters.

During level 3, the shelter staff also put measures in place to keep them and the public safe, and they implemented ‘contactless’ dog returns at the shelter to reunite dogs with their owners in a safe way.

The Barking Complaints team continued to provide advice and assistance to dog owners and complainants during the lockdown period. Other Animal Management specialists also continued to support the team remotely, using various online platforms and tools.

Field services
Field officers responded to 24,636 requests for service during the year, which is 11% lower than the previous year. However, our field teams substantially increased their proactive work relating to beaches, parks, reserves and other public places, and visits to these areas increased from 1,202 to 2,943 – an increase of 145% from the previous year.

The majority of proactive beach patrols during the summertime was conducted by interns, whose services were funded by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE).

Shelters
A total of 5,492 dogs were impounded this year in the Auckland animal shelters. This is a decrease of 19% from the previous year.

A total of 372 dogs were adopted from our shelters, which is another fantastic result. The majority (68%) of all impounded dogs were returned to their owners.

Barking team
Nuisance barking complaints had a sharp decline at the start of the lockdown – this is believed to be due to the fact that most dog owners were home and able to control their dogs better.

Barking complaints decreased by 14.7% compared to the previous year. Our team of Barking Complaint Advisors responded to 5,810 barking complaints and issued 266 nuisance abatement notices during the year.
Community education
During the first part of the year, our team attended several community events, like Pet Expo and Movies in Parks to promote responsible dog ownership, but unfortunately the majority of planned events were cancelled later in the year due to the effects of COVID-19.

Given the new limitations as a result of the ongoing threat of COVID-19, the Animal Management team will be looking at new ways to do community education and to promote responsible dog ownership.

Future projects
Later in the 2020-2021 registration year, Animal Management will facilitate a project to increase compliance with the microchipping requirement of the Dog Control Act 1996 for all dogs born after 1 July 2006. Details of the project will be announced later in the year.

Animal Management is committed to improving processes and work practices – both to ensure a safe Auckland, but also to provide our services at the lowest cost possible. Over the next year we will be looking at all ways that we can assist the organisation to save money and maximise resources.
Part 1: Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Annual Report

Section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996 (the Act) requires each territorial authority to report on its dog control policy and practices and to provide specific statistical information.

This report acts as a medium for this statutory requirement, and to provide an update to all stakeholders on the activities and performance of the Auckland Council Animal Management unit.

1.2 Arrangement of the Report

The structure of this report follows a similar arrangement to previous annual reports, to allow for ease of assessing the success of our service delivery.

The old Policy on Dogs 2012 and the new Policy on Dogs 2019 were both active during this financial year, but the ‘Policy Objectives’ from the Policy on Dogs 2019 will form the basis of this report.

Except for the statistics provided in tables in Part 4 & 5, other statistics provided throughout this report are indicated by a 🐩 symbol.

Each policy objective is addressed with regards to the achievements and activities of the 2019-2020 year. This includes:

- **Registration and Classification**
  *Promote dog registration across all of Auckland.*

- **Responsible Dog Ownership**
  *Educate and inform dog owners how to take care of their dogs.*

- **Dog Access Principles**
  *Provide a balanced approach to dog access in council-controlled public places.*

- **Monitoring measures of success**
  *Annually report to the Governing Body (through a public agenda report) and to the national government as required by the Dog Control Act 1996.*

1.3 Policy on Dogs 2019 & Dog Management Bylaw 2019

On 1 November 2019, the new **Policy on Dogs 2019** and the **Dog Management Bylaw 2019** came into effect.

The objective of the new policy on dogs is to keep dogs as a positive part of the life of Aucklanders by:

- maintaining opportunities for owners to take their dogs into public places,
- adopting measures to minimise the problems caused by dogs, and
- protecting dogs from harm and ensuring their welfare.
Together, the new policy and bylaw will:

- provide a consistent approach to multiple dog ownership,
- provide a consistent definition of the time and season rule that apply at beaches,
- apply a standard lambing season rule in regional parks,
- extend the council’s ability to protect our plant life,
- amend dog access rules for the protection of wildlife in Glenfern Sanctuary, Muriwai Regional Park, Long Bay Regional Park and Whatipū, Waitakere Ranges Regional Park, and
- incentivise responsible dog ownership for owners of dogs that have been classified as menacing due to their behaviour (Section 33A of the Act)

The general and specific schedules for dog access rules have been moved from the bylaw to the policy and they include new, easy-to-follow symbols and definitions, e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Out of Summer Season</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>All times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under control off leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Our Services

The Animal Management unit’s main function is to ensure that dogs and other animals are sufficiently controlled to prevent harm and nuisance to the public.

This helps to fulfil the overall goal of the Licensing and Regulatory Compliance department of protecting the public of Auckland from nuisance and harm, as well as improving, protecting, and promoting the health of the public of Auckland.

These goals are achieved via a number of services:

- Providing information and education to the public relating to dog control and other animal management issues
- Dog registration and database administration
- Dog access to public places
- Dog bite prevention (including the classification and monitoring of menacing and dangerous dogs)
- Complaint response (including aggression, roaming, and barking nuisance complaints)
- Shelter services (including lost and found, adoption and micro-chipping)
1.5 Animal Management Structure – Our Teams

Auckland Council operates a single, regional Animal Management unit and currently has a total of 91 staff (including the Manager).

The unit consists of Field Services teams, Animal Shelter teams, and a Specialists team, which includes the Barking Complaints team.

A ‘dog registration hub’, which operates at the beginning of every new registration year, and a Regulatory Support team within the same department, provide administrative and operational support to the Animal Management unit.

**Field Services**

The unit has four field teams, consisting of 46 Animal Management Officers (AMOs): North, West, Central and South. The Hauraki Gulf Islands personnel form part of the West team.

These teams are responsible for the field services of the unit. This includes a reactive response and investigations into complaints about dogs that are not under control, or that are causing a nuisance.

Other responsibilities include ensuring compliance with the Dog Control Act 1996, encouraging responsible dog ownership, and actively enforcing the registration of all dogs in our region.

Field officers also deal with stray or roaming livestock on all our roads, and sometimes have to deal with stock trespassing on private property.

Our teams provide a 24/7 response to all urgent and high priority requests.

They work closely with the Animal Shelters to provide support for property inspections that are required for adoptions from the shelters.

In addition, the officers also do regular patrols in areas with a high volume of complaints.

Proactive work includes visits to most popular parks, reserves, and beaches used by dog owners.
Animal Shelters

The unit operates five shelters: Henderson, Silverdale, Manukau, Waiheke Island and Great Barrier Island.

The shelters on the two Hauraki Gulf islands are managed by the field officers employed on the islands, and do not have any full-time shelter personnel.

Each of these shelters is responsible for the care and management of impounded animals.

These animals may be the subject of legal prosecutions, or were impounded for being found wandering at large, not registered, or were surrendered by their owners.

Animal Shelters promote the adoption of unclaimed, suitable dogs and work collaboratively with other welfare and rescue agencies to find the best possible outcome for these dogs.

Various de-sexing campaigns and other veterinary services have also been offered to the community through the animal shelters.

Specialists

Animal Management has specialists that provide legal, organisational, and operational support to the Field Services, Animal Shelters, and the Barking Complaints teams.

The Barking Complaints team recently reviewed all their processes and is now operating on a model that has two groups dealing with different parts of the process:

Barking Complaint Advisors deal with the first part when the initial complaint is received. Their process involves providing advice on dog behavioural aspects, methods to correct nuisance barking, and mediation techniques for neighbours to resolve their issues.

Barking Complaint Investigators deal with ongoing or escalated barking complaints, which require further investigation.

If enforcement action is required to resolve any escalated and ongoing complaints, they are supported by the Field Services team.
Part 2: Policy Objectives

2.1 Registration and Classification

“All dogs in Auckland, including dangerous and menacing dogs, will be registered with council.”

2.1.1 Dog registrations

The Act requires all dog owners to register their dogs every year, and it also requires every territorial authority to keep a register of all dogs.

Having dogs registered significantly increases the council’s ability to manage dog-related safety and nuisance issues.

The annual dog registration year runs from 1 July to 30 June the following year. Failure to register a dog can result in a $300 infringement notice, or a court may impose a fine of up to $3,000.

Animal Management continued to focus on dog registration compliance during the 2019-2020 year, which saw an increase in the number of known dogs in the Auckland region from 110,969 in the previous year, to 112,530 in this registration year.

A total of 1,138 infringement notices were issued where dog owners failed to register their dogs as required by the Act.

Dog registration and animal management fees increased by 0.9% on average for the 2020-2021 financial year.

2.1.2 Classification of high-risk dogs

All menacing dogs living in Auckland must be neutered, even if the classification by another territorial authority does not require it.

As at 30 June 2020, a total of 4,745 dogs were classified as menacing. Overall compliance with the classifications decreased by 3.3% compared to the previous year.

The majority of menacing classifications (84%) were issued based on the dogs’ breed or type, which is a requirement in the Act.

A total of 4,446 (93.2%) of all menacing and dangerous dogs are currently neutered.

Due to the COVID-19 restrictions, no enforcement action was taken against dog owners for failing to comply with the neutering requirement in cases where the notice was served during the Level 4 and Level 3 periods.

This reprieve period was extended to the end of the financial year, which contributed to Animal Management not reaching the compliance target for menacing dog classifications.
The Dog Management Bylaw 2019 introduced a new pathway for dog owners with dogs classified as menacing due to their behaviour (Section 33A of the Act) to request a review of the classification after 12 months.

This review is subject to certain conditions, i.e. the owner must provide a behavioural assessment report and must not have obtained any infringements relating to the dog during this 12-month period. Removal of the classification is at the council’s discretion.

Since 1 November 2019, when the new bylaw came into effect, Animal Management has received 12 applications to review menacing dog classifications.

2.1.3 Neutering campaign

After the success of the Txt-2-Desex campaign in 2018 & 2019, which received funding from Central Government, Auckland Council facilitated another subsidised neutering programme, called ‘The De-sex Effect’, during the 2019-2020 year.

This programme was mainly focussed on getting more owners with menacing dogs to comply with the neutering requirement of the classifications, as part of the drive to reduce harm caused by dogs in Auckland.

A total of 40 menacing dogs were neutered during the year, but unfortunately the programme was interrupted by the COVID-19 lockdown.

2.2 Responsible Dog Ownership

“Dog owners will care for their dogs and control them around people to protect wildlife, other animals, property and natural habitats.”

2.2.1 RDOL

The council recognises and rewards responsible dog owners by issuing a Responsible Dog Ownership Licence (RDOL).

The RDOL programme creates an additional incentive for dog registrations and an educational opportunity for dog owners.

Operationally, this is an opportunity to increase awareness of responsibilities and to encourage more people to become responsible dog owners.

There are currently 27,663 RDOL holders in Auckland, who own a total of 36,316 dogs. This is an increase of 854 (3.2%) from the previous year.
2.3 Dog Access Principles

"Provide a balanced use of public places for dogs and their owners that is safe for

Animal Management continues to promote and encourage the safe and responsible presence of
dogs in public places.

2.3.1 Beaches, Parks & Reserves

The new Policy on Dogs 2019 and Dog Management Bylaw 2019 have simplified access to most
beaches, parks, and reserves for dog owners.

New regional 'time and season' rules have been implemented, and there is currently an extensive
project underway to replace all old signage at beaches, parks, and reserves.

Although the signage project is not facilitated by Animal Management, the field staff are assisting
other departments in identifying and documenting inaccurate, missing, or damaged signage.

2.3.2 Working with the community

Animal Management continued to focus primarily on reducing harm caused by dogs. Specific 'high-
risk' areas have been targeted as part of the intelligence-led approach taken by our field officers.

2.4 Monitoring Measures of Success

“Annually report to the Governing Body (through a public agenda report) and to the
national government as required by the Dog Control Act 1996”

This annual report represents a thorough and reliable account of all Animal Management activities
during the 2019-2020 financial year.
Part 3: Service Delivery and Activities

3.1 Education

3.1.1 Community events

Animal Management staff visited several community events this year, including:
- Pet Expo (2019)
- Movies in Parks
- Eukanuba™ Tails & Trails event

Unfortunately, some popular events like Doggy Day out / Big Swim & Silo Park were cancelled due to COVID-19.

3.1.2 At-risk workers

We provided refresher training to agencies and organisations with 'at-risk' workers, including Housing New Zealand, New Zealand Post, Electrix, Just Water and Oranga Tamariki, as part of the Adults @ Risk programme.

In February this year, Animal Management engaged with Counties Manukau Police and delivered four training sessions to frontline police officers in relation to dog safety.

The training sessions received positive feedback from the officers who attended.

During the training sessions, the Animal Management staff demonstrated tools and techniques used by AMOs on a daily basis to keep themselves safe, especially when entering properties with unknown dogs.

Animal Management also assisted the Police Dog Unit to make a video about dog safety, which will be available to all police officers for further training.

The training sessions ended due to the start of the lockdown period, but future sessions may be arranged to further develop the relationship between Animal Management and New Zealand Police.
3.2 Animal Shelter Services

3.2.1 Impounds

The animal shelters have seen a reduction in the number of impounded dogs during the year.

This links directly to the lower number of service requests received, as well as with the lower number of offences detected by our field officers.

- There were 5,492 dogs impounded in Auckland’s five animal shelters throughout the region during the 2019-2020 year.
- A total of 3,732 dogs were returned to their owners, which is 68% of all impounds.

3.2.2 Adoptions

The shelter staff have worked hard throughout the year to find the best possible homes for dogs in their care that were suitable for adoption.

Adoption dogs were taken on pack walks and other outings, while enrichment yards were upgraded and improved – providing valuable daily enrichment to the dogs in the shelters.

A training programme was also started with adoption dogs, and one staff member developed a training plan during the lockdown period that is now being used by all the shelters.

The training involved teaching the dogs basic commands, some tricks, and how to behave around livestock.

- A total of 372 dogs were adopted from the shelters during the 2019-2020 year.

The animal shelters continue to work closely with rescue organisations and utilise other social media or internet platforms, like Facebook, Pets on the Net, etc. to find as many suitable homes as possible.

During the lockdown period, a large number of dogs were placed with foster carers and rescue groups, to avoid having too many dogs in the shelters during this time.

3.2.3 Projects

Projects completed during the year at the shelters involved mostly improving the enrichment areas for the dogs, as well as planting trees, painting fences, and repairing stock yards.

At Silverdale Animal Shelter the staff planted climbers all along a fence, some fruit trees for the staff, and some sensory plants, like lavender and rosemary, for the dogs.

A sandpit was also built for the dogs to play in – all work was done as part of a working bee with Mars and Silverdale shelter staff.
3.2.4 Success stories

‘Jasper’ was impounded at the Henderson shelter and had an old injury to his front paw which needed veterinary attention.

The shelter vet treated him with antibiotics and when he was not claimed, the shelter staff reached out to Chained Dog Rehabilitation & Rehoming NZ, who were quick to help.

Jasper needed to have his foot amputated to relieve the pain – he has been rehomed out of Auckland and is now a happy boy in his new home.

‘Neve’ was impounded in terrible condition. She was not claimed by her owner and was in desperate need of veterinary treatment for her skin condition, and she really needed a groom.

Shelter staff took her to Angels Dog Grooming, and afterwards Chained Dog Rehabilitation & Rehoming NZ once again stepped in to help.

She was sent into foster care where her skin was treated with medication and proper food. She has now been adopted and her skin issue has been resolved.
3.3 Field Services

3.3.1 Proactive work
Field officers proactively visit and patrol most of the popular beaches and parks that have a high volume of visitors. This work continued during the lockdown period.

- A total of 2,943 proactive visits or patrols were done during the year.

3.3.2 Response to requests for service
Field staff experienced another busy year dealing with uncontrolled dogs, but a reduction in serious incidents was seen this year.

- The field staff responded to 24,636 requests for service – this is an 11% decrease from the year before.

- A total of 1,617 dog attacks were investigated, which is 4.7% lower than the previous year, and the teams responded to 1,547 reports of dogs behaving aggressively to people or other animals – this is a 6% reduction compared with the previous year.

- The largest volume of all service requests relates to roaming dogs, and together with requests from the public to collect stray dogs, they account for 49.8% of all requests for service.

- AMOs responded to a total of 7,340 complaints about roaming dogs and were requested to collect 4,973 dogs.

Animal Management Officers – our frontline staff
3.3.3 Enforcement activities

Animal Management operates on a graduated enforcement model, which includes warnings, infringement notices, and in serious cases – prosecutions.

- During the year, field officers issued a total of 3,480 infringement notices and 2,931 formal warnings for all offences under the Act. The total number of infringements notices issued decreased by 32.7% from the previous year.
- A total of 161 prosecutions were brought against dog owners for serious offences against the Act.

Breakdown of prosecutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description of Offence</th>
<th>No. of Prosecutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Dogs causing serious injury</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57(2)</td>
<td>Dogs attacking person, stock, poultry, domestic pet, or protected wildlife</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57A</td>
<td>Dogs rushing at person, animal, or vehicle</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Failure to comply with disqualification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Breach of a nuisance abatement notice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.4 Other duties

Our field officers’ duties also include dealing with stray or roaming livestock on roads and other public places, including the entire Auckland motorway network.

This work is time-consuming and sometimes dangerous, and accounts for a large part of the officers’ after-hours responses.

- Officers responded to 1,109 incidents of stray or roaming stock during the year.
- A total of 36 incidents related to animals roaming at large on the motorway network.

3.4 Nuisance Issues

3.4.1 Barking complaints

Nuisance barking complaints account for the second largest volume of complaints after roaming dogs.

- A total of 5,810 barking complaints were received in the 2019-2020 year, which is 23.6% of all service requests.
- These complaints resulted in 256 nuisance abatement notices issued during the year to dog owners who failed to reduce the barking of their dogs.
3.5 Dealing with COVID-19

Animal Management was significantly impacted by the threat of COVID-19, and the subsequent response to the pandemic through the different alert levels imposed by the government.

Our field and shelter staff were classed as essential workers and continued to provide certain services throughout the lockdown and the subsequent lower alert levels.

The staff’s health, safety and well-being were especially important and safety guidelines were followed at all times.

AMOs had to wear all required PPE, including gloves and masks, and had to use sanitiser every time they entered and exited their vehicles.

The team had to find new ways to interact with dog owners and their dogs, while at the same time following social distancing guidelines and all safety precautions.

Some light moments of the teams practising social distancing and ‘contactless’ returns.

Some of the shelter adoption dogs were fostered by staff, if suitable, and training was done with the dogs during the lockdown period, which helped to prepare them for going to new homes.
Kind act for kaumātua under lockdown
"Above and beyond"

Published in Our Auckland on 17 April 2020 (extract only)

For Animal Management Officer Janine Murdoch, working through the pandemic was challenging – but rewarding.

While on patrol during the lockdown, Janine spoke with the Ōrākei Marae gate warden who admitted the marae’s kaumātua were struggling to get out and buy dog food for their cherished furry friends.

Janine returned to the Manukau Animal Shelter, where she had been based during lockdown, and organised dog food to be delivered safely to the marae.

"With a smaller number of dogs being cared for at the shelter during lockdown, I suggested we donate some of our dog food to the kaumātua, and my manager agreed," Janine says.

"It was just a small gesture, but every little thing helps."

3.6 Supporting Other Agencies

Animal Management sent a team member to Vanuatu as part of a PacificTA programme, which forms part of a larger Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) project to assist the PVMC (Port Vila Municipal Council) in Vanuatu.

One animal management specialist from Auckland Council and another specialist from Whangarei District Council worked with the PVMC Municipal Police to train them in understanding dog behaviour and how to safely enter properties with dogs.

The one-week long training involved classroom presentations and field training.

PacificTA is managed by Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) and funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT)’s New Zealand Aid Programme.
Part 4: The Auckland Region – our people and their dogs

4.1 Dog owners in Auckland

- At 30 June 2020, the Auckland Region had a total of 93,585 known dog owners, which is an increase of 2,043 (2.23%) from the previous year.
- The average age of all dog owners in the region is 48.3 years, and of these owners there are 27,663 (29.6%) who currently hold an RDOL.
- The average age of RDOL holders is 52.1 years, and 83.6% of this group only own one dog. The majority of these licence holders live in Henderson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple dog ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All dog owners</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Dogs in Auckland

- The total number of known dogs in the Auckland Region increased from 110,969 in 2018/19 to 112,530 in 2019-2020 – an increase of 1.4%.
- 52% of all dogs are male, and 48% are female. The average age of all dogs in Auckland is 6 years, 7 months.
- The number of dogs that were registered for the 2019-2020 registration year decreased to 106,182 – this is 1.7% lower than the previous year.

4.2.1 Most preferred dog breeds in Auckland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Primary Breed</th>
<th>No. of dogs in the Auckland Region</th>
<th>Top Dog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Labrador Retriever</td>
<td>13,793</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Staffordshire Bull Terrier</td>
<td>5,924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Border Collie</td>
<td>5,399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shih Tzu</td>
<td>4,337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jack Russell Terrier</td>
<td>4,090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>German Shepherd</td>
<td>3,977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Miniature Schnauzer</td>
<td>3,945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bichon Frise</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Maltese</td>
<td>3,153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>American Pit Bull Terrier</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Labrador Retriever is Auckland’s most preferred breed.
### 4.2.2 Most popular suburbs & dog names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Area / Suburb</th>
<th>No. of dogs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All dog owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>3,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pukekohe</td>
<td>3,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>2,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>2,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Remuera</td>
<td>2,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Waiuku</td>
<td>1,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Massey</td>
<td>1,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDOL holders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Remuera</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tirirangi</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Massey</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.3 Menacing & dangerous dogs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Menacing</th>
<th>Dangerous</th>
<th>Neutered</th>
<th>% of owners compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.33A</td>
<td>S.33C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>2,345</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,771</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>3,988</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4,446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S.33A = Observed or reported behaviour of the dog | S.33C = Breed or type of dog

### Top classified breeds – menacing

#### Section 33A (behaviour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary breed</th>
<th>No. of dogs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire Bull Terrier</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Shepherd</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrador Retriever</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siberian Husky</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rottweiler</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shar Pei</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastiff</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border Collie</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntaway</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Section 33C (breed or type)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary breed</th>
<th>No. of dogs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Pit Bull Terrier</td>
<td>2,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Staffordshire Terrier</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogo Argentino</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**

It is standard practice for Animal Management not to issue a S.33A classification on a dog if the dog is already classified as menacing under S.33C.
### Part 5: Dog Control Statistics – 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020

#### 5.1 Registrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Known dogs</td>
<td>112,530</td>
<td>110,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered dogs</td>
<td>106,182</td>
<td>106,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Known dogs registered</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDOL holders</td>
<td>27,663</td>
<td>26,809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.2 Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dog owners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationary owners</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified owners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Menacing dogs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 33A (observed or reported behaviour)</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 33C (breed or type in Schedule 4)</td>
<td>3,986</td>
<td>3,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dangerous dogs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 31(1)(a) – owner conviction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 31(1)(b) – sworn evidence</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 31(1)(c) – owner admitted in writing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Menacing &amp; Dangerous)</strong></td>
<td>4,771</td>
<td>4,435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Compliance with neutering requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Menacing &amp; Dangerous dogs neutered</td>
<td>4,446</td>
<td>4,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of all Menacing &amp; Dangerous dogs neutered</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.3 Requests for Service (RFS)

#### 5.3.1 Service response times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1 (high priority)</td>
<td>2,785</td>
<td>2,796</td>
<td>3,949</td>
<td>3,304</td>
<td>12,833</td>
<td>13,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># responded to within 1 hour</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>2,791</td>
<td>3,947</td>
<td>3,299</td>
<td>12,817</td>
<td>13,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% responded to within 1 hour</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 (non-priority)</td>
<td>4,448</td>
<td>4,898</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>5,667</td>
<td>19,963</td>
<td>21,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># responded to within 24 hours</td>
<td>3,695</td>
<td>4,122</td>
<td>4,241</td>
<td>4,501</td>
<td>16,559</td>
<td>20,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% responded to within 24 hours</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total RFS (including proactive work in 5.3.3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31,344</td>
<td>35,008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3.2 RFS breakdown by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive behaviour to other animals</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive behaviour to people</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>1,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking</td>
<td>5,810</td>
<td>6,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bylaw breach</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>1,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification breach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog attack on animals</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog attack on people</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog attack on stock</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog / stock on motorway</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous (property visits, dog trap requests, service of notices, etc.)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick up - dog (contained)</td>
<td>4,928</td>
<td>5,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick up - stock (contained)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police / SPCA assistance</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property inspection</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regulatory Committee

13 October 2020

#### Attachments

**Attachment A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Relinquish dog | ↓ 45 | 78 |
| Roaming dog – general | ↓ 3,477 | 4,090 |
| Roaming dog – risk to public | ↓ 3,863 | 4,022 |
| Roaming stock | ↑ 1,109 | 1,069 |
| Welfare | ↓ 127 | 228 |
| **Total** | ↓ 24,636 | 27,677 |

#### 5.3.3 Proactive work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PW1 – Patrolling public areas (inc. bylaw breaches, roaming dogs, etc.)</td>
<td>↑ 2,943</td>
<td>1,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2 – Targeted compliance (monitoring classifications, serving notices, etc.)</td>
<td>↓ 549</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW3 – Unregistered dogs</td>
<td>↓ 4,179</td>
<td>5,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other proactive work (<em>not specified by category</em>)</td>
<td>480</td>
<td><em>Not supplied</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>↑ 8,151</td>
<td>7,331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.4 Enforcement

##### 5.4.1 Prosecutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Court Auckland</td>
<td>20</td>
<td><em>Not supplied</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Court Manukau</td>
<td>52</td>
<td><em>Not supplied</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Court North Shore</td>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>Not supplied</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Court Papakura</td>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>Not supplied</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Court Pukekohe</td>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>Not supplied</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Court Waitakere</td>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>Not supplied</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Court</td>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>Not supplied</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of prosecutions</strong></td>
<td>↓ 161</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.4.2 Infringement notices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infringement notices issued</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Wilful obstruction of dog control officer or ranger</td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(2) Failure or refusal to supply information or wilfully providing false particulars</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19A(2) Failure to supply information or wilfully providing false particulars about dog</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20(5) Failure to comply with any bylaw authorised by the section</td>
<td><strong>1,011</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,557</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23A(2) Failure to undertake dog owner education programme or dog obedience course (or both)</td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Failure to comply with obligations of probationary owner</td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28(5) Failure to comply with the effects of disqualification</td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32(2) Failure to comply with the effects of classification of dog as dangerous dog</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32(4) Fraudulent sale or transfer of dangerous dog</td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33EC(1) Failure to comply with effects of classification of dog as menacing dog</td>
<td><strong>157</strong></td>
<td><strong>217</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33F(3) Failure to advise person of muzzle and leash requirements</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36A(6) Failure to implant microchip transponder in dog</td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 False statement relating to dog registration</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41A Falsely notifying death of dog</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Failure to register dog</td>
<td><strong>1,138</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,028</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46(4) Fraudulent procurement or attempt to procure replacement dog registration label or disc</td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48(3) Failure to advise change of dog ownership</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49(4) Failure to advise change of address</td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51(1) Removal, swapping, or counterfeiting of registration label or disc</td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52A Failure to keep dog controlled or confined</td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53(1) Failure to keep dog under control</td>
<td><strong>980</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,076</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54(2) Failure to provide proper care and attention, to supply proper and sufficient food, and to provide adequate exercise</td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54A Failure to carry leash in public</td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5 Animal Shelters

5.5.1 Impounded dogs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% of all impounds</th>
<th>Manukau</th>
<th>Henderson</th>
<th>Silverdale</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dogs impounded</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>5,492</td>
<td>6,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned to owner</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>3,732</td>
<td>(67.7%) 4,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euthanised</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>1,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.2 Euthanasia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for euthanasia</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did NOT pass a temperament test</td>
<td>↑ 530</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menacing breed or type (S.33C) &amp; Menacing due to behaviour (S.33A)</td>
<td>↓ 669</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Issues</td>
<td>↓ 172</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons (e.g. destruction order from Court)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Not supplied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of all dogs euthanised as menacing</td>
<td>↓ 48%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↑ = up from the previous year  ↓ = down from the previous year  = unchanged from the previous year
## Auckland Council – Animal Management
### Dog Control Annual Report 2019-2020

| Author & data analysis: | Christo van der Merwe  
Principal Specialist, Animal Management |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data provided by:       | Paul Walker  
Senior Business Advisor, Performance & Integration  
Aaron Neary  
Senior Specialist, Animal Management |
| Approved by:            | Sarah Anderson  
Manager, Animal Management |

Find out more:  phone 09 301 0101  
or visit [aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/](http://aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/)
Memorandum

30 September 2020

To: Chair Regulatory Committee, Mayor and Councillors

Subject: Update on Micromobility in Auckland

From: Craig Hobbs – Director, Regulatory Services

Purpose
To provide an update on rental micromobility in Auckland.

Summary
- Auckland Council’s licensing of rental micromobility now includes e-scooters, bikes and e-bikes.
- Successful collaboration between Auckland Council and Auckland Transport in managing rental micromobility in Auckland.
- Six micromobility licences issued for the most recent round of licensing, with an increase in the number of e-bikes and a reduction in the number of e-scooters.
- Awaiting progress on central government’s accessible street’s package and the review of the Trading and Events in Public Places Bylaw, 2015.
- Continued advocacy to central government.

Context
- Rental micromobility is licensed under the Trading and Events in Public Places Bylaw 2015, which is currently under review.
- Auckland Council started licensing rental e-scooters approximately two years ago. This has now expanded and includes the licensing of e-scooters, bikes and e-bikes.
- A draft discussion paper on “the role of Micromobility in Auckland” has been developed by Auckland Council’s policy team with input from Auckland Transport.
- The continued presence of rental micromobility in Auckland is the result of the on-going successful collaboration between Auckland Council and Auckland Transport.
- The attached presentation that was made to the AT Board’s Design and Delivery committee meeting on 15 September 2020.

Discussion
- For this round of licensing, council awarded three rental e-scooter licences, two rental e-bike licences and one bike licence, with a total of 2490 rental e-scooters, 850 e-bikes and 50 bikes being allocated for use across the city. The number of e-bikes have increased, and e-scooters reduced.
- Licences were issued for durations between 6 and 12 months, dependent on the performance and compliance history of the operator.
- Significant improvements made to the Code of Practice (COP) for rental e-scooters, e-bikes and bikes as a result of learnings we gained during the last licensing period.

- Overall, the quality of applications has improved with each new round of licensing. This reflects a healthy drive by the operators to meet our criteria and requirements.

- General observations from successful applications include:
  - A wider range of proposals for incentivising good parking practices.
  - Greater alignment of applications to the Auckland Plan, following the addition of new mobility principles\(^1\) to the application assessment.
  - More proposals to discourage drink-riding – like stickers on scooters, messaging and safety tutorials and tests in apps.
  - Renewed support for slow-speed and no-park zones.
  - The provision of detailed information in regards to their plans and processes for safety and risk management.

- Accessible Streets package - to increase the safety and accessibility of our footpaths and streets, and encourage active modes of transport, the Government sought public feedback on the 'Accessible Streets' rules package. Auckland Council and Auckland Transport made submissions on the proposal. Waka Kotahi NZTA is reviewing the feedback. However, no decisions are expected to be made until after the general election in October.

- Auckland Council is a founding and continued member of the national Micromobility Working group. The group's purpose is to provide a platform for central and local government to discuss the main challenges of micromobility, and to collectively work towards eliminating barriers to a harmonised approach to the operation and regulation of micromobility across New Zealand.

Next steps

- Awaiting the outcome of the Accessible Streets package and the review of the Trading and Events in Public Places bylaw.

- Explore opportunities to optimise customer experience, with increased licence duration. This will provide a consistent ‘transport’ experience and certainty for the operator.

- Continued advocacy to central government on matters not included in the accessible street package.

Attachments

Please see attached copy of the presentation that was made to the AT Board’s Design and Delivery committee meeting on 15 September 2020.

---

\(^1\) Principles based on the outcomes, directions and focus areas described in the Auckland Plan 2050, which are particularly relevant to new mobility modes and operating models.
Update on micromobility in Auckland

Mervyn Chetty – Project Lead
Veronica Lee-Thompson – Operations Lead
Team effort

- Continued collaboration between Auckland Transport and Auckland Council
  - AT Board workshop 2019
- AC/AT Exec Lead Team representatives in Micromobility Steering Committee
- Operational collaboration
  - Application process
  - Data management
  - Nuisance management
  - Supporting and encouraging first and last leg journeys
  - Education
To be covered

- Legal landscape
- Micromobility strategy
- New mobility principles
- Current licensing status
- Journey to present
  - Accidents and incidents
  - Challenges and considerations
  - Evaluation
- Supporting micromobility in Auckland
- Next steps
The legal landscape

Local:

- Power to authorise trading activity on Auckland Transport (AT) system
  - AT Trading and Events in Public Places Bylaw 2015 made under:
    - Local Government Act 2002; and
    - Land Transport Act 1998
  - AT delegation to Auckland Council (AC) to administer and enforce bylaw

Health and Safety at Work Act 2015:
AC/AT does not have obligations to users, pedestrians etc under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 (HSWA).
The legal landscape

National:

Waka Kotahi NZTA

- NZTA Gazette notices define the category for micromobility devices under which they are regulated.
  - E-scooters classified as wheeled recreational device (includes 300W limit)
- Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004 – defines the use of vehicles on the road network;
  - A driver of a mobility device or wheeled recreational device on a footpath—
    - (a) must operate the device in a careful and considerate manner; and
    - (b) must not operate the device at a speed that constitutes a hazard to other footpath users.

Ministry of Transport

- Awaiting Accessible Streets Package
Shift from e-scooters to micromobility

- **Micromobility** refers to a range of small, lightweight vehicles operating at speeds typically below 25 km/h (15 mph) and driven by users personally.
- Micromobility devices include bicycles, E-bikes, electric scooters, electric skateboards, shared bicycles, and electric pedal assisted (pedelec) bicycles.
Micromobility strategy

Draft discussion paper has been developed by AC policy team with input by AT on ‘the role of micromobility in Auckland’ to inform Council’s position

Four key recommendations
1. Develop more and safer infrastructure for micromobility
2. Provide a clear and fit-for-purpose regulatory framework for micromobility
3. Encourage good user behaviour
4. Improve outcomes of rental operations

Once the discussion paper has been finalised it will be presented to AT Board
Where are we now?
New mobility principles

- Incorporation of strategic focus
- Nine principles developed based on the outcomes, directions and focus areas described in the Auckland Plan 2050
- Used to consider and guide various types of new mobility in Auckland
- Used in the assessment of licensing applications to consider the operator’s contribution to Auckland’s strategic objectives
## New licences effective 4\(^{th}\) September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E-scooter total</th>
<th>E-bike/Bike total</th>
<th>Device total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total device</strong></td>
<td><strong>2490</strong></td>
<td><strong>950</strong></td>
<td><strong>3440</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total devices (Previous licence)</td>
<td>3125 ((&lt;300 deployed))</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>3780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Duration: 6 and 12-month licences
### New licences effective 4th September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beam</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuron</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lime</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam e-bike</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lime e-bike</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nextbike</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Updates and improvements

Licensing process
- Application review process
- Development and incorporation of new mobility principles

Codes of Practice
- Operator responsibility and safety expectations
- Learnings from ELIGA report
- Increased requirements for nuisance reduction:
  - Minimum parking compliance requirements increased from 85 to 90%
  - Response time requirement for toppled devices
- Additional education and communication requirements
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Negotiated initiatives

- Geofencing - slow speed and curfew zones
- Helmets and bells on every device
- Incentives to use AT parklets
- Initiatives to discourage drink-riding
- Lower speed options for new riders
- Incentives for good parking behaviour
- Downhill speed governance
Current approach to fees

- Application deposit
- Rental fee per device
- Hourly compliance monitoring fee
- Concerns raised re e-bike fees in comparison to e-scooter fees
  - E-scooters: 2 per m² E-bikes: 1 per m²
- Supporting active modes
  - Updated: 2 micromobility devices per m²
- Future work: researching future fee structure
Item 15

Attachment B

How did we get here?
E-scooters in Auckland

- AT/AC approached by several e-scooter companies in 2018
- Trial 1.0 from October 2018 to March 2019
- During this trial
  - E-scooters popular with riders
  - Safety concerns raised by public, elected officials and media
  - Lime – ‘Wheel Locking Incident’
Trial 2.0
April to October 2019

Trial expanded to better inform decision making about future licensing.
Evaluated a wide range of elements to determine:

• The compliance levels of rental e-scooter operations against the requirements of the Trading and Events in Public Places bylaw,
• The role e-scooter rental schemes have played in the Auckland transport network during the trial period and
• How well their operation has aligned with the strategic objectives of the council.
Trial evaluation

Legal and probity oversight

Evaluation Report

- Background & Regulatory Framework
- Best Practice & Benchmarking
- Safety
- Nuisance
- Use of scooters
- Public and Stakeholder Surveys
- Licence fees
- Alignment with council plans
- Licence & COP

Evaluation report can be found [here](#)
‘Emerging best practice’ and benchmarking

- Commissioned Ride Report to assess Auckland’s e-scooter programme and provide recommendations

- Conclusions and recommendations:
  - “Auckland Council undertook one of the most rigorous and thorough evaluations of any city who has overseen a shared e-scooter programme.”
  - “Auckland Council set up a strong framework for licensing, launching, testing, evaluating, and iterating shared e-scooters through its trial.”
  - Create goals and targets
  - Create a sustainable funding model
E-scooter use: Trial 1 and 2

- Most trips take place in the CBD and fringe suburbs. Around 68% in the CBD and 30% in the fringe suburbs and inner isthmus.
- The median distance ridden for each trip was around 850m in winter and 930m over summer.
- The median time ridden for each trip was around 6.5 minutes in winter and 8.2 minutes over summer.
- Private e-scooter use: up to 45% of e-scooters observed were privately owned.
Public Response to E Scooters - KANTAR

1. A majority of Aucklanders want rental e-scooters to stay.
2. However, significant safety and public nuisance concerns.
3. As a result, strong support for regulation.
4. Users want to stay away from road traffic.
5. Rental e-scooters are making a marginal contribution to mode shift.
6. Penetration is stabilising.
Support and opposition to continued licencing of ride share e-scooters in Auckland

- 3 explicitly opposes
- 3 more explicit answer, provides conditions
- 3 Yes, with conditions
- 8 Yes, unconditionally

Question: When the trial finishes, should ride share e-scooter operations continue to be granted licenses? If not, why? If yes, what conditions should be in the Code of Practice linked to these licenses? (Source: 38 written stakeholder engagement respondents)

Targeted Stakeholder Engagement

- This survey complements the KANTAR survey
- Focused on highly impacted or engaged groups such as disability, aging, cycling, residents & business association etc.
- 17 of 38 groups responded
Auckland Council, Auckland Transport, LGNZ Micromobility Symposium

• Hosted the first national micromobility symposium

• Four sessions covered:
  • The future state of micromobility and what it means for our cities
  • NZ and International experience
  • Safety and Public Health
  • Emerging transport technologies and their integration into social life: Perceptions and considerations
Accident and incidents

Summary of key accidents/incidents during Trials 1 and 2;
- One fatality – ongoing coronial enquiry
- Accidents and incidents associated with ‘wheel-locking’ resulting in operator suspension
- Several reported accidents resulting in serious injuries
Key considerations and challenges

- Level of media and public interest
- Challenges of local vs multinational operators
- Negotiation and collaboration
- Limitations of existing bylaw
- Impact on people with disabilities
- Understanding limits of regulatory framework
  - Cannot regulate speed
  - Cannot regulate where e-scooters are ridden
  - Cannot regulate helmet use
Conclusion of trial

- Overall, the evaluation report suggests compliance with the requirements of the bylaw.
- The outcomes of the trial were in line with the strategic goals of the council and Auckland Transport.
- Steering Committee approved continued issuing of rental micromobility licences
- Steering Committee approved a number of updates to Code of Practice based on findings of evaluation.
Supporting micromobility in Auckland

- Continuous improvement across a range of areas
- Delivered robust and smooth licensing process
  - No adverse impact on Council or AT
- Micromobility ‘project’ work aligned with the four recommendations of draft micromobility paper
- Parklets/ AT metro hubs
- AT platform to receive and display e-scooter data
- Included provision in COP for integration of rental micromobility with AT Mobile App
- AT pilot in development with e-scooter operators- e-scooter training
Micromobility parklets

- 16 e-scooter branded parklets within the CBD
- Incentivised by operators through the license
- Locations based on trip-end data, deployment plans and PT
- Additional demand for micromobility parklets
Next steps

- Optimising customer experience
  - Rider
  - Licence holder (operator)
- Access for Everyone
  - Queen Street initiative
- Bylaw review
- Spatial review
  - Increasing the number of parklets
- Monitoring of bike and e-bike usage
- Micromobility working group
  - National data sharing platform
- Continued advocacy to central government
- Accessible streets
Attachment B
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END
Memorandum

To: Regulatory Committee
   Craig Hobbs, Director Regulatory Services
   Ian Smallburn, GM Resource Consents
   John Duguid, GM Plans and Places
   James Hassall, GM Licensing & Regulatory Compliance

Subject: Hearings held, hearing panels and hearing outcomes Jan 2020-Sept 2020

From: Julie McKee, Hearings Manager

Contact information: Julie.mckee@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose
1. To provide the committee with information about what hearings have been held between January 2020 and September 2020, who sat on the hearing and the outcome.

Summary
2. There have been 94 hearings held between January 2020 and September 2020 of which 56 have been approved, 22 declined and 16 have decisions pending.

Context
3. Each quarter, you will be provided with an updated list that outlines what hearings have been held over the previous 12 months. This list contains all hearings that are run by the Hearings Team, being:
   - resource consents
   - plan changes
   - notices of requirements
   - district licensing committee
   - bylaws
   - Reserve Act hearings; and
   - development contribution objection hearings.
   The list also includes who sat on the hearings panel and what the outcome of the hearing was.

Discussion
4. There have been 94 hearings held from January 2020 to the end of September 2020 and these are broken down as follows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of hearing</th>
<th>Approved / Approved in part</th>
<th>Declined</th>
<th>Decision pending</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bylaw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Licencing Committee</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Requirement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Plan Change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Plan Change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Consent</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Consent and Reserve Exchange</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next steps**

5. The next update will be provided in January 2021 and will include all hearings held up to 31 December 2020.

**Attachments**

Hearings held – Regulatory Committee.docx
### Hearings held, commissioners and outcome
#### January to September 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date commenced</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Site Address / Name of Premise</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Panel member</th>
<th>Panel member</th>
<th>Panel member</th>
<th>Panel member</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/02/2020</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>PC27 - Historic Heritage Schedule</td>
<td>David Mead</td>
<td>Gina Sweetman</td>
<td>Shona Myers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amend Schedule 14.1 and/or the planning maps for 73 historic heritage places</td>
<td>Approved with amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/02/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>88 Remuera Road, Remuera</td>
<td>Richard Blakey</td>
<td>Bridget Gilbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a new five storey apartment building</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/02/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>74 Seagrove Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>David Wren</td>
<td>Michael Parsonson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Take up to 2000m3/day to a total of 162,500m3/year of water from Franklin Watemata aquifer</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>Cocoon House (35 Spring St, Freemans Bay)</td>
<td>Michael Goudie</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Gwen Bull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New on-licence</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>28-30 Waiparua Road, Henderson</td>
<td>Karyn Sinclair</td>
<td>Trevor Mackie</td>
<td>Janine Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct and operate a community cultural centre</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/2020</td>
<td>RC and Reserve Exchange</td>
<td>10 &amp; 12 Sidmouth St, Montrose Toe, Mairangi Bay Beach Reserve</td>
<td>Robert Scott</td>
<td>Vaughan Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redevelop and upgrade the existing wastewater pump station</td>
<td>Granted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/02/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>6 Kalmia Street, Ellerslie</td>
<td>David Hill</td>
<td>Michael Parsonson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undertake alterations and additions to an existing church complex by replacing the existing hall</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/02/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>1053b Whangaparaoa Rd, Matakana</td>
<td>Cherie Lane</td>
<td>Lee Beattie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retrospective consent for construction of a two-level dwelling</td>
<td>Granted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Woodlands Park Road, Manuka Road, Waima</td>
<td>Philip Brown</td>
<td>Hugh Leersnyder</td>
<td>Michael Parsonson</td>
<td>Juliane Chetham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Huia Water Treatment Plant</td>
<td>Hearing adjourned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/02/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - Khanna</td>
<td>Katia Fraser</td>
<td>Patricia Reade</td>
<td>Stewart Heine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/02/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - Gerkin</td>
<td>Katia Fraser</td>
<td>Patricia Reade</td>
<td>Stewart Heine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/02/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - Gandhi</td>
<td>Katia Fraser</td>
<td>Patricia Reade</td>
<td>Stewart Heine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date commenced</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Site Address / Name of Premise</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Panel member 1</td>
<td>Panel member 2</td>
<td>Panel member 3</td>
<td>Panel member 4</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/02/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - Wacokeoke</td>
<td>Katia Fraser</td>
<td>Patricia Reade</td>
<td>Stewart Hein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/03/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>104-106 Rutherford Rd, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dave Sergeant</td>
<td>David Wren</td>
<td>Louise Wickham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expand an existing broiler chicken farm to a maximum of 231,000 birds</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/03/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>48 Orere Road, Orere</td>
<td>David Hill</td>
<td>Greg Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S127 to vary conditions 5 and 7 for a 20-lot subdivision</td>
<td>Hearing adjourned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/03/2020</td>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>PC32 - Avondale Jockey Club</td>
<td>Kim Hardy</td>
<td>Trevor Mackie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rezone part of Avondale Jockey Club from Special Purpose – Major Recreation Facility to THAB</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/03/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Empire Capital Marinas</td>
<td>David Hill</td>
<td>Robert Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objection to additional charges</td>
<td>Upheld in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/03/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>40 Mountain Road, Epsom</td>
<td>Barry Kaye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove a protected Pohutukawa tree</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/04/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>28 Inlet Road, Takapuna</td>
<td>David Wren</td>
<td>Karyn Kurzeja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish 17 two-storey units that will contain a mix of industrial, residential, office and storage activities</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/04/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>240 Sutton Road, Drury</td>
<td>Los Simmons</td>
<td>Gavin Lister</td>
<td>Cherie Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operate a rural Industry – Contractors Yard</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/04/2020</td>
<td>Bylaw</td>
<td>Food Safety Information Bylaw</td>
<td>Cr Newman</td>
<td>Cr Mulholland</td>
<td>Cr Young</td>
<td>IMSB Wilcox</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal to make a new Food Safety Information Bylaw</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>30a Beach Road, Castor Bay</td>
<td>Peter Reburn</td>
<td>Matt Riley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove a scheduled Norfolk Island Pine</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/05/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>74-80 Wellesley St West, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Richard Blakey</td>
<td>Kim Hardy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demolish existing buildings and construct a hotel in a 12-storey building</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/05/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>Papateo toe Panthers Rugby League Club (49 Station Rd, Papateo toe)</td>
<td>Bernard Kendall</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Motekiai Pahulu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Club licence</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/05/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>15 Rush Place, Mangere</td>
<td>Robert Scott</td>
<td>Michael Parsons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of seven two-bedroom dwellings</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/05/2020</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>PC34 - Howick Special Character</td>
<td>Greg Hill</td>
<td>Richard Knott</td>
<td>Cherie Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add a special character statement to Schedule 15 of the Auckland Unitary Plan for</td>
<td>Approved with amendments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date commenced</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Site Address / Name of Premise</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Panel member</th>
<th>Panel member</th>
<th>Panel member</th>
<th>Panel member</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/06/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>121-127 &amp; 129-135 Beaumont St and 184-200 Pakemah St West, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Barry Kaye</td>
<td>Karyn Sinclair</td>
<td>David Mead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the existing Howick Business special character area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/06/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>58 Blake Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Alan Watson</td>
<td>Allen Pattle</td>
<td>Vaughan Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redevelopment of a city block to provide six buildings containing dwellings, visitor accommodation units, retail activities and public plaza</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - Giles</td>
<td>Katie Fraser</td>
<td>Patricia Reade</td>
<td>Stewart Heine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct and operate a school plus a childcare centre</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - V Dixon</td>
<td>Michael Goudie</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Stewart Heine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - S Kumar</td>
<td>Michael Goudie</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Stewart Heine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - H Giles</td>
<td>Michael Goudie</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Stewart Heine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - I Dhadwai</td>
<td>Michael Goudie</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Stewart Heine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - K Keates</td>
<td>Michael Goudie</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Stewart Heine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - L Mitchell</td>
<td>Michael Goudie</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Stewart Heine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - M Robinson</td>
<td>Michael Goudie</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Stewart Heine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - N Xian</td>
<td>Michael Goudie</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Stewart Heine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - Y Hu</td>
<td>Michael Goudie</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Stewart Heine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/06/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>112a Bryant Road, Karaka</td>
<td>Ian Munro</td>
<td>Greg Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objection to Council not issuing a Certificate of Compliance</td>
<td>Upheld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/06/2020</td>
<td>NoR</td>
<td>City Rail Link</td>
<td>Alan Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To alter condition 63 of designation 2500-1</td>
<td>Confirmed in part</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>3 Pua St, Massey</td>
<td>Lee Beattie</td>
<td>Philip Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Childcare centre</td>
<td>Decline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date commenced</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Site Address / Name of Premise</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Panel member</td>
<td>Panel member</td>
<td>Panel member</td>
<td>Panel member</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>5 Atkin Ave, Mission Bay</td>
<td>David Wren</td>
<td>David Mead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a four storey building comprising of visitor accommodation and cafe</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>37 Westpoint Dr, Hobsonville</td>
<td>Janine Bell</td>
<td>Nigel Mark-Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a freight terminal</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/06/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>127 Green Lane East Greendale</td>
<td>David Hill</td>
<td>Bridget Gilbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish a mid-block, dual-sided landscape-orientated digital billboard structure</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>Chili Bar and Eatery (1-15 The Avenue, Lynfield)</td>
<td>Gavin Campbell</td>
<td>Patricia Reade</td>
<td>Ken Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On-licence renewal</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/06/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>175-243 Neilson St, Onewhanga</td>
<td>Dave Sergeant</td>
<td>Heike Lutz</td>
<td>Alan Pattle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demolish a category B historic heritage building and construct a &quot;temporary&quot; grandstand</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/06/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Coastal Marine Area adjacent to 1-19 Quay St, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Robert Scott</td>
<td>Sharon De Luca</td>
<td>Mark Farnsworth</td>
<td>Barry Kaye</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capital and maintenance dredging works within the Waitemata Navigation Channel</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/06/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>1669 Dairy Flat Highway, Dairy Flat</td>
<td>Greg Hill</td>
<td>Les Simmons</td>
<td>Lee Beattie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct and operate a café</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>Cable Bay Vineyard (12 Nick Johnstone Dr, Waiheke Island)</td>
<td>Katrina Fraser</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Motekiai Papahu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Off-licence renewal and variation to an on-licence</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>Longroom (114-128 Ponsonby Rd, Ponsonby)</td>
<td>Gavin Campbell</td>
<td>Patricia Reade</td>
<td>Motekiai Papahu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On-licence renewal</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - Dosen</td>
<td>Michael Goudie</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Patricia Reade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - Kota</td>
<td>Michael Goudie</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Patricia Reade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - Jeong</td>
<td>Michael Goudie</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Patricia Reade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - McCrae</td>
<td>Michael Goudie</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Patricia Reade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - Zhou</td>
<td>Michael Goudie</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Patricia Reade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date commenced</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Site Address / Name of Premise</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Panel member 1</td>
<td>Panel member 2</td>
<td>Panel member 3</td>
<td>Panel member 4</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/06/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>MC - Kongara</td>
<td>Michael Goudie</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Patricia Reade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managers Certificate</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/07/2020</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>PC31 - Historic Heritage Schedule</td>
<td>David Mead</td>
<td>Shona Myers</td>
<td>LB - Lisa Whyte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognise the historic heritage values of six historic heritage places by adding them to Schedule 14</td>
<td>Approved in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/07/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Small Road, Silverdale</td>
<td>Les Simmons</td>
<td>Lee Beattie</td>
<td>Justine Bray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish a retirement village including commercial spaces, retail units and a daycare</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/07/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>78 Orakei Rd, Orakei</td>
<td>Barry Kaye</td>
<td>Richard Blakey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove existing dwelling and construct 19 terraced dwelling units</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/07/2020</td>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>PC30 - Counties Racing Club</td>
<td>Janine Bell</td>
<td>Sheena Tepania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rezone 5.8 hectares of land at Pukekohe Park from Special Purpose – Major Recreation Facility to Business – General Business</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/07/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>315 Point Chevalier Rd, Point Chevalier</td>
<td>Philip Brown</td>
<td>Gavin Lister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a new church on the front half of the site</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/07/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>Thirsty Liquor Wickman Way (1/18 Wickman Way, Mangere East)</td>
<td>Katia Fraser</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Motekiai Pahulu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Off-licence renewal</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/07/2020</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>PC28 - Special Character Areas Overlay</td>
<td>Kitt Littlejohn</td>
<td>Ian Munro</td>
<td>Trevor Mackie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seeks to make it clear that certain planning provisions of the Special Character Areas Overlay would prevail over the corresponding provisions of the underlying residential zones</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/07/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>38 &amp; 40 Omaha Flats Rd, Omaha</td>
<td>Robert Scott</td>
<td>Kim Hardy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reconsent and increase hours of operation for existing restaurant, sculpture garden and wine tasting activities</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>Backyard Bar (149c Great South Rd, Manurewa)</td>
<td>Gavin Campbell</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Patricia Reade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New on-licence</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date commenced</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Site Address / Name of Premise</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Panel member</th>
<th>Panel member</th>
<th>Panel member</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30/07/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>44 St Georges Bay Rd, Parnell</td>
<td>David Mead</td>
<td>Matt Riley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a three storey apartment building</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/07/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>Surfade Liquor (2 Miami Ave, Surfade)</td>
<td>Katia Fraser</td>
<td>Glenda Fryer</td>
<td>Wilson Young</td>
<td></td>
<td>New off-licence</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/08/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>CMA Firth of Thames</td>
<td>Mark Farnsworth</td>
<td>Malene Absolutum</td>
<td>Juliane Chetham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish a 221 hectare marine farm for mussels</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/08/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>Liquids (542 Sandringham Rd, Sandringham)</td>
<td>Gavin Campbell</td>
<td>Marguerite Delbe</td>
<td>Wilson Young</td>
<td></td>
<td>New off-licence</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/08/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>Vavau Labi Nightclub (7/53 Cavendish Dr, Manukau)</td>
<td>Gavin Campbell</td>
<td>Patricia Roade</td>
<td>Motekiai Pahulu</td>
<td></td>
<td>On-licence renewal</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>286 Cascades Road, Howick</td>
<td>Les Simmons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objection to council declining the application to exceed coverage for a dwelling</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>465 Hibiscus Coast Highway, Orewa</td>
<td>David Hill</td>
<td>Gavin Lister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a nine-unit apartment complex</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/08/2020</td>
<td>NoR</td>
<td>SH16 Huapai to Waimauku</td>
<td>Janine Bell</td>
<td>Philip Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make alterations to designation 5766 State Highway 16 to enable the construction and operation of safety improvements to the road corridor between Huapai and Waimauku</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/09/2020</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>PC22 / PM12 - Sites of significance to mana whenua</td>
<td>Sheena Tepania</td>
<td>Alan Watson</td>
<td>William Kapea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seeking to recognise the cultural value to Mana Whenua of identified sites and places within the Auckland region</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/09/2020</td>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>PC38 - 522-524 Swanson Rd, Ranui</td>
<td>Peter Reaburn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rezone from business-light industry to mixed housing urban and terrace and apartment building</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date commenced</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Site Address / Name of Premise</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Panel member 1</td>
<td>Panel member 2</td>
<td>Panel member 3</td>
<td>Panel member 4</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/09/2020</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>PC29 - Notable Trees</td>
<td>Peter Reburn</td>
<td>Vaughan Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make amendments to Schedule 10 Notable Trees (re-order, technical errors and amendments to the mapped overlay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/09/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Te Whau Pathway</td>
<td>Robert Scott</td>
<td>Barry Kaye</td>
<td>Nigel Mark-Brown</td>
<td>David Mead</td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct, operate and maintain the Te Whau Pathway, a shared path that will link the Waitakere and Manukau Harbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/09/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>Bar Martin (43 Martin Avenue, Mount Albert)</td>
<td>Katia Fraser</td>
<td>Hannah Cheeseman</td>
<td>Deidre Hilditch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New on-licence and off-licence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/09/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>22 Herne Bay Road, Herne Bay</td>
<td>Greg Hill</td>
<td>Trevor Mackie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make additions and alterations to an existing dwelling located in the single house zone with a Historic Heritage and Special Character Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/09/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>118 Manuroa Rd, Takani</td>
<td>Ian Munro</td>
<td>Cherie Lane</td>
<td>Basil Morrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct 83 two-storey dwellings in both semi-detached and terraced typologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/09/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>38-42 Broadway, Newmarket</td>
<td>Richard Blakey</td>
<td>Matt Riley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To replace the existing portrait static signs with two digital billboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/09/2020</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>114 East Coast Rd, Glenvar</td>
<td>Richard Blakey</td>
<td>Philip Brown</td>
<td>Bridget Gilbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a new retirement village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/09/2020</td>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>John Hill Estate</td>
<td>Gavin Campbell</td>
<td>Richard Pamatatau</td>
<td>Wilson Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On-licence renewal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DLC = District Licence Committee
RC = Resource Consent
PC = Public Plan Change
PPC = Private Plan Change
NoR = Notice of Requirement
PHM = pre-hearing meeting
CURRENT UPDATE

Auckland Council’s Provisional Local Alcohol Policy 2015 is still in the appeal process.

The council has lodged an appeal to the Court of Appeal on the judicial reviews by Foodstuffs and Woolworths.

This appeal is in regard to the 2017 to High Court decisions on Alcohol Regulatory Licensing Authority (ARLA’s) decisions; to reject most appeals it needed to consider, and that council should reconsider four elements of the 2015 policy.

The objective of the council appeal to the Court of Appeal was to allow the Court to provide clearer guidance to the ARLA when reconsidering its 2017 decision, as well as the amended policy elements resubmitted to it by the council. Foodstuffs New Zealand Limited and Woolworths New Zealand Limited have also submitted cross-appeals.

Civil court proceedings are not progressing as normal due to COVID-19, which creates uncertainty about progress. An update will be provided should there be any further progress.

Elements of the Alcohol Policy which the Authority asked Council to reconsider and elements that were amended by Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What the Authority asked council to reconsider</th>
<th>Council Local Alcohol Policy amendments in response to the Authority’s request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-license maximum trading hours</td>
<td>Off-licence trading hours changed from 5am-9pm, Monday to Saturday 7am-9pm, Monday to Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewals of off-licences requiring a local impacts report</td>
<td>Renewals of off-licences requiring a local impacts report – deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of delivery for remote sellers and discretionary conditions for certain off-licences (limiting single sales)</td>
<td>Hours of delivery for remote sellers – Deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon closing of premises (near education facilities)</td>
<td>Discretionary conditions for limiting single sales and afternoon closing in specified circumstances - deleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart on the following page provides an overview of legal process for Auckland Council’s Provisional Local Alcohol Policy.

Tara Leota-Seluli (Graduate Policy Advisor)  Antonia Butler (Senior Policy Manager)
In September 2018, Foodstuffs filed an appeal to the High Court to review ARLA’s interim decision.

March 2018 Council makes an application to the High Court for stay of Authority proceedings and is successful.

2016, Foodstuffs and Woolworths submitted an application to the High Court for stay of proceedings before ARLA pending judicial review hearing.

December 2017, orders were sought from ARLA to limit the scope of appeals.

February 2019, the High Court judicial review proceedings were heard. The High Court reviewed ARLA’s decision-making process for the 2017 appeals regarding the Provisional Local Alcohol Policy 2016 (Alcohol Policy).

July 2019, the High Court decision reversed ARLA’s interim decision.

27 February 2019, the High Court decision on judicial reviews by Foodstuffs and Woolworths was released, finding largely against ARLA’s process and failure to provide reasons.

13 May 2020, the High Court decision on judicial reviews by Redwood was released, finding largely against ARLA’s process and failure to provide reasons.

On 9 June 2020, the Working Group agreed to not lodge an appeal to the Court of Appeal in regard to the Redwood High Court decision.

March 2019, Foodstuffs New Zealand Limited and Woolworths New Zealand Limited have also submitted cross-appeals.

On 25 March 2020, Council appealed the High Court decision on the judicial reviews to the Court of Appeal in Wellington.

On 5 June 2020, the Working Group agreed to lodge an appeal to the Court of Appeal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL DETAILS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complainant</td>
<td>Victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Date of Birth:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Phone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Phone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOG DETAILS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of dogs involved:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dog 1</th>
<th>Dog 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>Gender:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>Size:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ears:</td>
<td>Ears:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tail:</td>
<td>Tail:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breed:</td>
<td>Breed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour:</td>
<td>Colour:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collar:</td>
<td>Collar:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguishing Features:</td>
<td>Solid build</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOG IDENTIFICATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dog not positively identified</td>
<td>Positive identification of the dog(s) on (date) at (time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar with the dog(s)</td>
<td>Seen it / them confined on property at:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positively identified in Animal Management vehicle</td>
<td>Positively identified at Animal Shelter at:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positively identified from photos provided by Animal Management Officer #:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOG OWNER IDENTIFICATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not know who owns the dog</td>
<td>I know the owner of the dog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of dog owner (ethnicity, gender, build, approximate age, clothing, vehicle, etc.)

*Person in Possession: Tall, European, slim build, early 40s, called Adam.*
My name is [redacted] and my date of birth is the [redacted]. I reside at [redacted].

On Sunday the 26th of May 2019 at approximately 5.30pm I arrived home and took my dog Teddy, who is a 2 year old Labrador Retriever, for a walk in Tony Jegedin Esplanade as I do every night. We were at the top of the bank and I was throwing the ball for Teddy. We had been there for approximately 20 minutes when I saw a man walking a dog with his phone in his hand. He was clearly looking down at his phone as I could see the screen light up and opened his right hand to throw the ball. The dog came from the Tony Jegedin Drive entrance. The next thing I know I saw my dog come racing straight over to Teddy, his dog was barking and backing off it charged at Teddy. I yelled at the dog telling it to go away but it didn’t listen. The dog, which was a large sticky black/brown colour bounded into Teddy knocking him over the bank. I saw the dog grab onto Teddy’s back right leg now his foot and dragged him approximately 5 meters. Teddy yelped but managed to get out of the dogs grip and they started falling. I managed to reach them at this point and saved my tennis ball thrower at the dog telling it to go away. It did and went back to the dog owner. I yelled out to the dog owner to keep his dog off the bank, put Teddy back on his and walked home. I called the council at 6:03pm and reported the incident. I have had previous run ins with this same dog and owner and have been told to try and get his licence plate as I walked away to the Tony Jegedin Drive entrance to the Esplanade and there was only one car parked in the parking lot with the licence plate [redacted].

Signature: [redacted]
I believe the dog owners name is Adam. This is because about 3-4 months ago his dog first attacked Teddy and after it happened I saw him walk off and a lady who was also in the park picked up the dog as he got close. I approached her and asked if she knew him. She told me his name is Adam and her dog used to play with his before they started getting aggressive. She also told me that Adam’s dog had allegedly killed a dog on Riverdale Road although I do not know any details on this. Adam also has a second brown dog but it is normally on a lead and it has not been with him the last few times I have seen him. Teddy has been attacked by the black dog a total of 5 times since the 15th of November 2018 and once by the brown one. I often have my young son with me who are 6 and 3. These experiences have been very traumatic for him. In this incident Teddy did not sustain any injuries. In the initial attack on the 15th of November 2018 Teddy received a few superficial lacerations to his neck which drew blood. I have photos of this and tried to call Council but gave up after waiting on the phone line for half an hour. Although none of the attacks have resulted in serious injuries I am concerned about the dog owners lack of action or responsibility. He has only once spoken to me to tell me that the dogs are “playing.”
DECLARATION

This statement is true and I have made with the knowledge that it is to be used in court proceedings (Pursuant to section 82 of the Criminal Procedure Act 2011).

Print Name:

Signature: ___________________________  Date: 1/6/19

Name of parent / guardian:
(where complainant is less than 16 years old)

Signature of parent / guardian:
(where complainant is less than 16 years old)

Statement recorded at: [Redacted]

AMO Name: [Redacted]  AMO Number: 266

AMO Signature: ___________________________  Date & Time: 1/6/19 - 9:47am
INJURY INFORMATION SHEET - PERSON

Medical
Did you / the victim seek medical treatment following the incident?
☐ No  ☐ Yes  Date: _____________________  Time: _____________________
Where did you / the victim receive treatment?

Describe your / the victim’s injuries:

Describe the medical treatment you / the victim received:

Injuries
Did you / the victim receive injuries?
☐ No  ☐ Yes  Please indicate on the diagrams the part of the body that is injured
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1. Photograph taken by [redacted] on 20/01/19 at 8:30pm

2. Photographs show [redacted] Owner's Vehicle

3. Photograph taken at [redacted] Segredo Escapade

4. This photograph has not been altered in any way

Signature [redacted]
Attachment B

Item 16

1. Photograph taken by ____________________________ on 2.9.15 at 5:20pm
2. Photographs show ____________________________
3. Photograph taken at ____________________________
4. This photograph has not been altered in any way

Signature ____________________________
1. Photograph taken by [redacted] on 29/5/2019 at 8:30pm.

2. Photograph shows [redacted] vehicle.

3. Photograph taken at [redacted].

4. This photograph has not been altered in any way.

Signature [redacted]
ANIMAL MANAGEMENT – PROSECUTION FILE

COMPLAINANT

Tick all that apply:

☐ Statement & Declaration
☐ Photos
☐ Injury information sheet
☐ Consent to access medical / veterinary records
☐ Medical bills / reports
☐ Complainant's dog details
☐ Veterinary bills / reports
☐ Victim impact statement
☐ Correspondence
### Personal Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complainant</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Mr</td>
<td><strong>Date of Birth:</strong> [Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong> [Redacted]</td>
<td><strong>Address:</strong> [Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Phone:</strong> [Redacted]</td>
<td><strong>Mobile Phone:</strong> [Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong> [Redacted]</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dog Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of dogs involved:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 or more (attach separate sheet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Dog 1

- **Gender:** Unsure
- **Size:** Large
- **Ears:** Erect to semi erect
- **Tail:** Full length
- **Breed:** Unsure
- **Colour:** Black to dark brown
- **Collar:** Choker chain
- **Distinguishing Features:** Solid build

#### Dog 2

- **Gender:** [Redacted]
- **Size:** [Redacted]
- **Ears:** [Redacted]
- **Tail:** [Redacted]
- **Breed:** [Redacted]
- **Colour:** [Redacted]
- **Collar:** [Redacted]
- **Distinguishing Features:** [Redacted]

### Dog Identification

- Dog not positively identified
- Positive identification of the dog(s) on (date) at (time)
- Familiar with the dog(s)
- Seen it / them confined on property at:
- Positively identified in Animal Management vehicle
- Positively identified at Animal Shelter at:
- Positively identified from photos provided by Animal Management Officer #:

### Dog Owner Identification

- I do not know who owns the dog
- I know the owner of the dog

Description of dog owner (ethnicity, gender, build, approximate age, clothing, vehicle, etc.):

*Name in possession: Todd, European, slim build, male, early 40s, called Adam.*
ANIMAL MANAGEMENT — PROSECUTION FILE

COMPLAINANT

COMPLAINANT STATEMENT

My name is [redacted] and I reside at [redacted]. My date of birth is the [redacted].

On Wednesday the 29th of May 2019 at approximately 5pm I was at [redacted] with my 3-year-old black lab x kelpie named [redacted] and my [redacted] had been playing the ball with [redacted].

As we were playing I saw a strange large stocky black dog that had attacked [redacted] on the 28th of May 2019. I told my son to take my youngest home and called [redacted] over, putting him on a lead. My youngest son didn’t want to leave and grabbed my hand but took off running when he saw the dog. The dog charged straight at [redacted], grabbing him around the leg. I dragged [redacted] behind me by his lead and shook the ball away at the dog, yelling it to go away. It took off back towards its owner who I know is called [redacted] as he had just made it around the corner. I yelled out to [redacted] that I was sick of this and he had to get his dog under control. He said nothing to me, ignoring me and kept walking with his dog all the way to my house.

I took [redacted] home and checked to make sure he was okay. I didn’t find any injuries so called council to report this dog on the 29th of May. There was a [redacted] and he reported the incident on the 28th of May. There was a witness to the incident on the 28th. He is a police man in his early 20s who lives at [redacted].

[Redacted] his grandson is my children’s friend.

Signature: [redacted]
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ANIMAL MANAGEMENT - PROSECUTION FILE

COMPLAINANT

DECLARATION

This statement is true and I have made with the knowledge that it is to be used in court proceedings (Pursuant to section 82 of the Criminal Procedure Act 2011).

Print Name: [Redacted]
Signature: [Redacted] Date: [Redacted]

Name of parent / guardian:
(where complainant is less than 18 years old)

Signature of parent / guardian:
(where complainant is less than 18 years old)

Statement recorded at:

AMO Name: [Redacted]
AMO Number: [Redacted]
AMO Signature: [Redacted] Date & Time: [Redacted]
INJURY INFORMATION SHEET - PERSON

Medical
Did you / the victim seek medical treatment following the incident?
☐ No  ☐ Yes  Date:  Time:
Where did you / the victim receive treatment?

Describe your / the victim's injuries:

Describe the medical treatment you / the victim received:

Injuries
Did you / the victim receive injuries?
☐ No  ☐ Yes  Please indicate on the diagrams the part of the body that is injured

[Diagram of human body with left and right sides labeled: R L R]
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ANIMAL MANAGEMENT – PROSECUTION FILE
COMPLAINANT

INJURY INFORMATION SHEET - ANIMAL

Veterinary
Did you seek veterinary treatment for your animal(s) following the incident?
☐ No ☐ Yes Date: Time:
Where did your animal(s) receive treatment?

Nature of the animal’s injuries:

Describe the veterinary treatment your animal(s) received:

Veterinary costs: $ (attach veterinary bills / invoices)

Injuries
Did your animal(s) receive injuries?
☐ No ☐ Yes Please indicate on the diagrams the part of the body that is injured

Domestic Animals
☐ Dog ☐ Cat

☐ Other domestic animal:

Livestock
Animal type:
No. of animals injured:
No. of animals deceased:

Version 3 | Nov -15
1997 Toyota Mark 2 Quella-Four-2.5 Station Wagon

Current registered person details (5 registered persons)
Current registered person: ADAM EUGENE PALMER
Physical address: 25 Waterton Place
Avondale
Auckland 1026

Acquisition date: 18/06/2014
Sex or company: Male
Date of birth:
Registered person status: Complete
Prior odometer readings:
(at 06/06/2014) 200,748 Kilometres

Vehicle details
Vehicle type: Passenger Car/Van
Chassis number: MC/25-0001184
Colour: White/Gold
Previous country: Japan
Fuel type: Petrol
Last WOF inspection: 28/01/2019 (Pass)
Expiry date of last WOF: 28/07/2019

Engine no.: 2M2
CC rating: 2,490
Country of origin: Japan
Assembly type: Imported Built-Up
No. of seats: 5

Registration details
Date first registered in NZ: 30/10/2003
Date first registered overseas: 1997
Licence expiry date: 06/06/2019
Licence issue date/time: 09/03/2019 08:57
Continuous licence: Used
Usages: Subject to COF:
Type of registration: Private Passenger
Date of last registration: 30/10/2003
Latest odometer: 293,872
Subject to RUC:
Date of odometer readings: 28/01/2019
Subject to WOF:
Odometer source: Warrant of Fitness Inspection
Odometer unit: Kilometres

03 Jun 2020: Auckland Council

Job #8100424439
ANIMAL MANAGEMENT – PROSECUTION FILE

ANIMAL MANAGEMENT OFFICER STATEMENT

My name is Petra Unkovich, my date of birth is the 12th of June 1995. I am employed by Auckland Council as a full time Animal Management Officer.

1. On the 29th of May 2019 at approximately 6:10pm I was assigned a job for a dog attack on another dog at Tony Segedin Esplanade in Avondale. At approximately 6:30pm I called and spoke to the complainant – [REDACTED] had been walking his Labrador x Huntaway dog Teddy at the Esplanade when a large Stocky black dog rushed up to his dog, grabbing it by its back left leg and dragging it down the bank. [REDACTED] was able to get the dog off his dog and scare it away with his tennis ball thrower. The attacking dog then ran back to a man who [REDACTED] knew as Adam. [REDACTED] informed me that he knew the man was called Adam as Teddy had been attacked by his dog approximately 6 times since November 2016. [REDACTED] confirmed that his dog had only received minor injuries once from these attacks and he did not report that incident as he couldn’t get through to Council on the phone. [REDACTED] informed me that his dog had last been attacked by the same dog 3 days prior on the 28th of May 2019. [REDACTED] reported this incident to Council and had spoken to another Animal Management Officer in regards to this. He had also managed to take a photo of Adam’s vehicle in both of the recent incidents and told me that the vehicle registration was [REDACTED] this registration plate came back to a Mr Adam Eugene PALMER who in our system owns 2 dogs, Trident and Bonniville. I arranged to take a statement on the 30th of May 2019 at approximately 5:30pm.

2. At approximately 7:10pm I arrived at Tony Segedin Esplanade. I patrolled the area on foot and the surrounding roads in my vehicle and did not sight any dogs in the park or the vehicle that was described by the complainant.

3. On the 30th of May 2019 at 7am I looked into the history of the dog owner – Mr PALMER and found that we had history of a serious dog attack on another dog from his dog Trident in August 2014. The outcome of this attack was that Mr PALMER was a prosecution under the Dog Control Act 1996 to which he plead guilty. History of this attack is attached to this file.

4. On the 30th of May 2019 at approximately 4:30pm I called [REDACTED] and rearranged the time to get his statement for 9am on the 1st of June 2019.

5. On the 31st of May 2019 at approximately 9:30am I was asked to investigate the attack that occurred on the 28th of May 2019 as well as the attack that occurred on the 29th of May so that I only had to deal with one officer.

6. On the 1st of June 2019 at approximately 9:00am I arrived at the address and took 2 separate statements, one for the incident on the 26th of May 2019 and one for the incident on the 29th of May 2019. [REDACTED] informed me that there was a witness to the attacks and he would try to get the details of the witness for me. He also showed me photos of the attacking dog and the dog owner which I asked to be sent to me.

7. On the 3rd of June 2019 at approximately 12:30pm Milena CHODOR - AMO 216 visited the property of Mr Adam Eugene PALMER and spoke to him regarding the alleged attack. AMO 216’s statement is included in this file and gives information on this interaction. AMO 216 was able to confirm that the dog from the photo’s sent to me was Bonniville, however; AMO 216...
was unable to seize the dog and had to leave the property for health and safety reasons.

8. On the 6th of June 2019 at approximately 10am I called and spoke to [REDACTED] He has been unable to get the witness details as of yet.

9.

Signature:

ANIMAL MANAGEMENT OFFICER STATEMENT
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ANIMAL MANAGEMENT – PROSECUTION FILE
ANIMAL MANAGEMENT

DECLARATION

This statement is true to the best of my knowledge and belief. I have made the statement knowing that it may be used in court proceedings and that I could be prosecuted for perjury for making a statement known by me to be false and intended by me to mislead.

AMO Name: Petra Unkovich  AMO Number: 266
AMO Signature: ______________________ Date & Time: 07/06/19 - 2:26pm
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ANIMAL MANAGEMENT – PROSECUTION FILE

ANIMAL MANAGEMENT

Tick all that apply:

☑ AMO Statement and Declaration
☐ Case Notes
☐ GeoOp Printouts
☐ Other:
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ANIMAL MANAGEMENT OFFICER STATEMENT

My name is Petra Unkovich, my date of birth is the 12th of June 1995. I am employed by Auckland Council as an Animal Management Officer.

1. On the 31st of May 2019 at approximately 9:30am I was asked to investigate a dog attack on another dog. The attack occurred on the 26th of May 2019. The complaintant and the attacking dog were the same as an incident I was already investigating that occurred on the 29th of May 2019. I was asked to take over this file so that only had to deal with one Animal Management Officer for both incidents. I had previously spoken to on the 29th of May 2019 and arranged to take his statement on the 1st of June 2019 at 9am.

2. On the 1st of June 2019 at approximately 9:00am I arrived at address and took 2 separate statements, one for the incident on the 26th of May 2019 and one for the incident on the 29th of May 2019. There were no injuries to dog Teddy in either of these instances. Informed me that there was a witness to the attacks and he would try to get the details of the witness for me. had also managed to take a photo of the Dog Owner, who he knew as Adam, due to previous attacks and the dog owners vehicle. told me that the vehicle registration was , his registration plate came back to a Mr Adam Eugene PALMER who in our system owns 2 dogs, Trident and Bonneville.

3. On the 3rd of June 2019 at approximately 12:30pm Milena CHODOR - AMO 216 visited the property of Mr Adam Eugene PALMER and spoke to him regarding the alleged attack. AMO 216’s statement is included in this file and gives information on this interaction. AMO 216 was able to confirm that the dog from the photo sent to me was Bonneville, however; AMO 216 was unable to seize the dog and had to leave the property for health and safety reasons.

4. On the 6th of June 2019 at approximately 10am I called and spoke to He has been unable to get the witness details as of yet.

5. Please also refer to RFS# 8100426370 for the attack on the 29th of May 2019. (CAS# 174)

Signature: [signature]
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ANIMAL MANAGEMENT OFFICER STATEMENT

Signature:
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ANIMAL MANAGEMENT – PROSECUTION FILE

ANIMAL MANAGEMENT

DECLARATION

This statement is true to the best of my knowledge and belief. I have made the statement knowing that it may be used in court proceedings and that I could be prosecuted for perjury for making a statement known by me to be false and intended by me to mislead.

AMO Name: Petra Unkovich
AMO Number: 286

AMO Signature: [Signature]
Date & Time: 07/06/19 - 2:26pm
Dear Mr Palmer

Notice of Classification of a Menacing Dog – Section 33A, Dog Control Act 1996

Dog ID: 40060709386
Primary Breed: Mastiff
Microchip No: -
Secondary Breed: Cross
Name: Bonnievile
Primary Colour: Brown
Sex: Female
Secondary Colour: -
Age: 4Y 2M

Address where dog is usually kept: 26 Waterton Place, Avondale.

This is to notify you that the above mentioned dog has been classified as a menacing dog under section 33A of the Dog Control Act 1996. This is because Auckland Council considers that the dog may pose a threat to any person, stock, poultry, domestic animal, or protected wildlife because of observed or reported behaviour of the dog, namely: On the 26th of May 2019 Bonnievile did attack another dog at Tony Segedin Esplanade.

I hereby notify you that the dog described herein has been classified as a MENACING DOG with effect from the date of issue of this notice.

A summary of this classification and your right to object is provided on the reverse.

Please note:
- Your dog must now be microchipped with evidence produced by __/__/__.
- Your dog must now be muzzled when it is at large or in any public place or private way.
- Your dog must be kept under control at all times.

Documents requested above can be sent to:
Animal Management
Auckland Council
Private Bag 92300
Auckland 1142

Alternatively you can drop the documents into any customer service centre or scan and email to HAS@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Yours sincerely,

Troy Allison
Team Leader Animal Management

For the purposes of the Dog Control Act 1996, you are the owner of a dog if:
- You own the dog;
- You have the dog in your possession (otherwise than for a period not exceeding 72 hours for the purpose of preventing the dog causing injury, or damage, or distress, or for the sole purpose of restoring a lost dog to its owner); or
- You are the parent or guardian of a person under 16 who is the owner of the dog and who is a member of your household living with and dependent on you.
To Whom it may Concern

I, Adam Palmer, am writing in objection to my dog Bonnieville being classified as a "Mendicant" under Section 183D dog control Act 1996, stating that I have 14 days to apply.

I have requested information regarding the statement and photos of the alleged attack of another dog on the Council website under the LG01MA and privacy act of 1993. But the process takes 20 working days and means I will not have any animal control information to defend myself and the allegations made against Bonnieville as I have made the request on 17/6/19 and received confirmation on the 19/6/19 from LG01MA that it will take 20 working days, so the earliest I will receive my information could be the 16/7/19.

I feel that my rights have been breached when Animal Control officer Willy Chodor on the 2/6 came to my property and said she was sent to seize my dog Bonnieville and I was shocked and objected to this and asked what this was about. She then stated she was investigating a complaint made to Animal Control, I gave a statement due to the vague nature of the information she was telling me.
and asked can I see the Complaint or any of the photos regarding this incident and said that she couldn’t and I found her to be very unhelpful and withholding information that I should of been allowed to witness in regards to the malicious nature of the complaint.

This matter has been deeply distressing and frustrating as in 2014 I was the victim of malicious complaints and accusations that people used Animal Control to make allegations towards my dogs. There were even Infringement notices issued but due to the lack of proof and harassment I requested a court hearing and the tickets were withdrawn due to the complaint not wanting to expose their identity.

In summing up I hope that I can get a fair and equal hearing when I receive the information requested and seek legal advice to object the menacing classification and the way I have been treated through this investigation.

Regards

Adam Palmer
26 Waterton Place
Avondale 1026
Auckland