

**AGENDA FOR A MEETING OF THE MASSEY COMMUNITY BOARD TO BE HELD AT
WAITAKERE CENTRAL, 6 HENDERSON VALLEY ROAD, HENDERSON,
WAITAKERE, ON WEDNESDAY 7 MARCH 2007,
COMMENCING AT 7.30 PM**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>ITEM</u>		<u>PAGE NO.</u>
1	APOLOGIES	1
2	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	1
3	URGENT BUSINESS	1
4	PRESENTATION	1
5	PUBLIC FORUM	2
6	CHAIRMAN'S REPORT	2
7	COMMITTEE SECRETARY'S REPORT	3
8	ELECTED MEMBERS REMUNERATION - REMUNERATION AUTHORITY DETERMINATION 2007/2008	6
9	2007 WAITAKERE CITY COUNCIL ELECTIONS: EARLY PROCESSING AND ORDERING OF CANDIDATES' NAMES ON VOTING DOCUMENTS	12
10	REPRESENTATION REVIEW - OUTCOME	15
11	NEW ZEALAND COMMUNITY BOARDS' CONFERENCE	20
12	WAITAKERE EVENTS UPDATE	22
13	KEEP WAITAKERE BEAUTIFUL TRUST 2007 TREES FOR BABIES	26
14	STURGES ROAD RAIL OVERBRIDGE REPLACEMENT - CONSTRUCTION METHODOLOGY	27
15	INTERSECTION OF ARNEY ROAD AND ROBERTSON ROAD, RANUI - NEW GIVE WAY CONTROL	30
16	WEST HARBOUR - NEW INTERSECTION PRIORITY CONTROLS	32
17	WISELEY ROAD, WEST HARBOUR - SPEED HUMPS	35
18	BOARD MEMBERS' REPORTS	37

**AGENDA FOR A MEETING OF THE MASSEY COMMUNITY BOARD TO BE HELD AT
WAITAKERE CENTRAL, 6 HENDERSON VALLEY ROAD, HENDERSON,
WAITAKERE, ON WEDNESDAY 7 MARCH 2007,
COMMENCING AT 7.30 PM**

1 APOLOGIES



2 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes - 7 February 2007

RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Meeting of the Massey Community Board held on Wednesday, 7 February 2007, as circulated, be taken as read and now be confirmed.



3 URGENT BUSINESS

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides that where an item of business is not on the agenda, it may only be dealt with at the meeting if:

- (i) the Board by resolution so decides; and
- (ii) the Chairman has explained at the beginning of the meeting (when open to the public) that the item will be raised for discussion and decision, why the item is not on the agenda, and why it cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

The Board may make a decision on a matter determined to be urgent.

NOTE: Urgent business need not be dealt with now and may be delayed until later in the meeting.



4 PRESENTATION

Provision has been made on this Agenda for a representative from the New Zealand Police to update the Board on matters in the Massey Ward.



5 PUBLIC FORUM

For guidance of Community Board Members, the Council's Standing Orders have the following provisions in regard to Public Forum.

- (i) members of the public wishing to address the Board in Public Forum shall furnish their names to the Chairman at the beginning of the meeting; and
- (ii) the Chairman shall determine the order of speakers, and allow five minutes for speaking time;
- (iii) questions by members are to be confined to obtaining information or clarification on matters raised by the speaker.

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides that no resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of any specific item of business not on the agenda except to refer the items to a subsequent meeting for further discussion. Therefore, no decision may be made on matters raised in Public Forum. However, written reports on matters raised may be requested from the Chief Executive Officer.



6 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

MASSEY MATTERS

A workshop will to be held immediately before the April 2007 meeting of the Board. For input into this important project within our Ward, I urge the members to attend the quarterly community forum meetings. The last community forum was on 22 February 2007 and was well attended by our four Ward Councillors and Board members. Applications for grants from the Massey Matters Fund close next Friday, 9 March 2007 and will be considered during the workshop in April 2007.

PRESENTATION BY THE MAYOR

Mayor Bob Harvey is available to give a presentation to the April 2007 meeting of the Board. This will follow the Massey Matters workshop, to which the Mayor has also been invited to attend.

TE TAUMATA RUNUNGA

Mihi Te Huia, Deputy Chairman, Te Taumata Runanga will be giving a presentation prior to the March 2007 meeting of the Board. Her presentation will explain the role of Te Taumata Runanga within Council, its objectives, statutory involvement, and advisory role.

HERALD ISLAND WHARF AND BOAT RAMP AREAS

Constables Leigh Johns and Dean Furminger, in following up a complaint about drinking and unsociable behaviour in the wharf car park, have made a suggestion that the area have a liquor ban put on it, thus giving the police the authority to arrest those in breach of the ban. They believe this could remove the hoon aspect from the whole Island. I have also had a similar problem brought to my notice concerning the boat ramp.

INORGANIC COLLECTION

A particularly bad example of this service being abused occurred in Don Buck Road. I thank those Councillors and Board Members, who assisted the affected homeowners, for your proactive role. This Council service is very much appreciated by the public and it is very annoying to see it abused in this way. I suppose the lesson is to investigate how this situation might be better managed in the future.

ROAD MAINTENANCE

Members of the Board have raised their concern at the standard of maintenance on some of the roads in our ward. This follows on from the concerns of a resident in Don Buck Road who spoke at last month's public forum.

RUSH CREEK RESERVE PROPOSALS

A meeting with IMF New Zealand Ltd (IMF) and Council officers has resulted in recommending that the \$5,200 budgeted for the BBQ be carried forward into next year's expenditure, pending the design of a playground for the site that is being looked at. IMF has been advised to present this as a submission through the Long Term Council Community Plan and Annual Plan Special Committee process as, at present, there is no budget for this proposal in the Long Term Council Community Plan.

Graeme Barnard


CHAIRMAN



RECOMMENDATION

That the Chairman's report be received.









7 **COMMITTEE SECRETARY'S REPORT**

Issue	Comments	Reporting Council Officer
Westpark Marina - Various Issues 3 April 2002 Resolution No. 660/2002 10 November 2004 Resolution No. 1964/2004 28 September 2005 Resolution No. 1825/2005 Council	<p>Parking Arrangements</p> <p>At the time of writing this report, the shared use park n ride and boat trailer car park on Lot 7 was almost complete. As sub-lessee, Council must approve the final trailer parking configuration for this shared use car park. This approval will occur over the next month. Once this car park is complete, the trailer parking regime and parking restrictions on Clearwater Cove and on the land to the rear of the boat ramp will be put in place, as per the 2005 resolutions of the Council.</p> <p>Enquiry by Design Workshop and Future Planning</p> <p>Westpark Marina Limited's (WML) public enquiry by design process continues. The closing date for comments on their five development proposals is 1 March 2007. WML are also proposing to undertake a mail</p>	Rochelle Edwards  836 8000 Extn: 8575

Issue	Comments	Reporting Council Officer
	<p>drop in the West Harbour area, inviting residents to “have their say” on development proposals. These comments/submissions are being handled entirely by WML. However, Councillors and Council officers have received a number of queries about this process, largely because of public confusion over the Council’s role as landowner. Officers have continued to make it clear to members of the public that while Council own the fee simple to many of the titles at the marina, they do not own the rights to develop those lots, as outlined by the lease agreements. Additional controls are also provided through the District Plan. Members of the public are also being reminded that development of any further reclamation would require the applicant to work through a significant resource consent process through the Waitakere and regional Councils, and the Crown would need to approve a change to an underlying seabed license. Council also holds the rights to carry out further reclamation in terms of the Waitemata City Council (West Harbour) Empowering Act 1979. Strategic Projects has a role in facilitating significant economic development and intensification around public transport nodes, however, this is entirely separate to Council’s regulatory function in processing resource consent applications. These points have been communicated to the public in correspondence between Council and the Hobsonville Residents and Ratepayers’ Group.</p> <p>Dredging Update</p> <p>WML is continuing to undertake dredging of the Marina in accordance with their agreement with Council. The 2007 work programme has commenced and they are currently ahead of schedule. This progress is both significant and very welcome, and is making a substantial difference to the levels of siltation at the Marina. WML are to be congratulated on their efforts and progress.</p>	
<p>Christmas Beach, Herald Island, Playground Renewal</p> <p>Officer’s Report</p>	<p>Building consent for the renewal of the play facility at Christmas Beach, Herald Island has been obtained. It is intended for the physical works to be carried out in March 2007.</p>	<p>David Barker  836 8000 Extn: 8306</p>
<p>Christmas Beach, Herald Island, Seawall</p> <p>Officer’s Report</p>	<p>Repairs to replace fallen rocks and remortar the seawall at Christmas Beach, Herald Island were completed in February 2007.</p>	<p>Debbie Chapman  836 8000 Extn: 8303</p>

Issue	Comments	Reporting Council Officer
Christmas Beach, Herald Island BBQ Officer's Report	The damaged BBQ at Christmas Beach, Herald Island has been removed and fabrication of a new stainless steel model has begun. The BBQ is planned to be replaced by the end of March 2007.	Stuart Liddell  836 8000 Extn: 8375
Community Board Minor Parks Projects Officer's Report	The status of each project is as follows: <p>Triangle Park: A design for the community path has been finalised with the Massey Community House. It is intended to carry out physical works in March 2007.</p> <p>Moire Park: Designs for concrete terracing are currently being finalised. It is intended physical works will be carried out in March 2007.</p> <p>Picasso Reserve: Two picnic tables were installed in December 2006. Two specimen trees will be planted in the planting season, April/May 2007.</p> <p>Rush Creek Reserve: \$5,000 was allocated to install a BBQ at Rush Creek, however, subject to a proposal received from Investment Management Finance New Zealand Ltd (IMFNZ) to install a playground at Rush Creek, the BBQ project has been put on hold. IMFNZ would like to work with Council on a joint-funded playground project. Council currently has no funding committed to this project, consequently IMFNZ will be presenting an Annual Plan submission to the 2007/2008 draft Annual Plan. The Massey Community Board will also have an opportunity to allocate further funds to the playground project through the 2007/2008 Community Board Minor Parks Projects.</p> <p>Currently \$5,000 still remains unallocated to this project and the Board needs to advise on the allocation of this funding.</p>	Katherine Slack  836 8000 Extn: 8779

REPORTS PENDING			
Subject	Date Requested	Report Due	Reporting Officer
Rush Creek, Westgate	December 2004 Resolution No. 2205/2004 Last updated 3 May 2006	Further updates will be provided to the Board on the basis of requirement.	Tony Miguel  836 8000 Extn: 8294
Herald Island Causeway Culvert	October 2006 Resolution No. 1853/2006	4 April 2007	Tony Miguel  836 8000 Extn: 8294

REPORTS PENDING			
Subject	Date Requested	Report Due	Reporting Officer
Project Twin Streams Four-Monthly Progress Report	August 2005 Resolution No. 1468/2005 Last updated 1 November 2006	4 April 2007	Tony Miguel  836 8000 Extn: 8294
Holmes Drive South, West Harbour	February 2006 Resolution No. 66/2006	4 April 2007	Hussam Abdul-Rassol  836 8000 Extn: 8961
Traffic Management Wiseley Road/Clark Road/Hobsonville Road	February 2007 Resolution No: 63/2007	2 May 2007	Sue Liddell  836 8000 Extn: 8736
Traffic Management Don Buck Road	February 2007 Resolution No: 65/2007	2 May 2007	Sue Liddell  836 8000 Extn: 8736

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee Secretary's Report for 7 March 2007 be received.

Report prepared by: Sharon Simiona, Democracy Support and Sister City Officer.



8 ELECTED MEMBERS REMUNERATION - REMUNERATION AUTHORITY DETERMINATION 2007/2008

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to advise the Massey Community Board of the distribution of the new pool available for the remuneration of Waitakere City Council Elected Members released by the Remuneration Authority for the period 1 July 2007 to 30 June 2008 and to determine whether the Board agrees with the Council's recommendation or not.

BACKGROUND

This is an annual process and the next new determination will be made available for the year commencing 1 July 2008.

The Council, in previous workshops and meetings in 2005 and in 2006, has confirmed the basis for allocating the remuneration. This is required to be confirmed by a formal resolution and submitted to the Remuneration Authority for re-approval.

The Remuneration Authority is established and derives its delegations and functions from the Remuneration Authority Act 1977 and makes Determinations on local authority remuneration pursuant to clause 6 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Until the enactment of the Local Government (Elected Member Remuneration and Trading Enterprises) Amendment Act 2001 (the Act), Elected Members' salaries and meeting allowances were set by a determination of the Minister of Local Government. That determination set maximum salaries and meetings allowances for Local Authority Elected Members. For each determination, the remuneration was linked to the population of each Local Authority. Waitakere City's determination was in the "over 150,000 population" category. Each incoming Council needed to resolve Elected Members' salaries and meeting allowances up to the maximum permitted. Over the course of a triennium, the Minister would revise the remuneration and the Council would need to consider the issue in light of any new determination.

The responsibility for setting Elected Members' remuneration is now with the Remuneration Authority. The Authority is required to determine remuneration, allowances and expenses payable to all Elected Members, whilst having regard to:

- the need to minimise the potential for remuneration to distort the behaviour of Members;
- the need to achieve and maintain fair relativity with the levels of remuneration received elsewhere;
- the need to be fair to both the person whose remuneration is being determined and rate payers; and
- the need to recruit and retain competent persons.

The Remuneration Authority established remuneration for all Elected Members and all Local Authorities in 2002, following consultation on a discussion paper and the release of the first indicative pool. They have since released new pools on an annual basis and the Council has the opportunity to change the way it allocates remuneration each time a new pool is determined.

The Waitakere City Council has established the apportionment of that pool and this has been approved by the Remuneration Authority each year. The Community Boards also considered the Council's decision and made any representations to the Authority. After due consideration, the Remuneration Authority has approved the Council's apportionment of remuneration.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The Council is committed to increasing community participation and democratic processes. The way Elected Members are remunerated and the quantum of that remuneration will have considerable bearing on who can and who cannot stand for election. It has long been recognised that the role of an Elected Member can require a substantial investment of time and commitment and that this commitment can make it difficult to hold down either full or part-time employment. The interests of a diverse and young community such as Waitakere are unlikely to be best served should the only candidates putting themselves forward for election be those who have private income available to subsidise the Council duties.

ISSUES

Consultation

Consultation must take place with Community Boards, who have the opportunity to advise the Remuneration Authority whether they agree or disagree with the Council's determination. The Community Boards have also previously discussed the basis for allocating remuneration for Elected Members at Waitakere City and have generally agreed with the Council's decision.

The Remuneration Authority will make the final Determination.

Remuneration Pool and Salaries

The total remuneration pool is set by the Remuneration Authority and cannot be adjusted. The total remuneration pool established by the Remuneration Authority for this consideration is \$1,141,883. (Last year the pool was \$1,078,343 and in 2005 it was \$1,026,872.)

The Mayor's salary is set by the Remuneration Authority and cannot be adjusted. The Mayor's salary (including the value of any deduction for a motor vehicle) is included in the indicative pool, although separately specified. The total salary payable to the Mayor is set at \$138,210 (last year \$132,151 and in 2005 \$126,457), inclusive of a motor vehicle.

A deduction of 20% of the cost of the vehicle is made for full private use of the vehicle. This deduction is set by the Remuneration Authority.

A1-A6 A copy of the advice from the Remuneration Authority is attached at pages A1-A6.

Half of the total sum payable to Community Board Members is deducted from the total remuneration pool and the other half is paid outside of the pool. The half outside the pool can be thought of as a "top up". Any further adjustment to the Community Board Chairs and Members' salaries will necessitate an adjustment to the salaries payable to Councillors other than the Mayor.

In 2005 the Deputy Mayor and the Chairs of Standing Committees salaries were established as a percentage of the Mayor's approved salary. The Chairs of Committees were established as a percentage of a Standing Committee Chair.

All Community Boards were treated equally as a matter of principle and were assessed as a percentage of the Mayor's approved salary.

A7-A10 In 2006 the Council determined that all Elected Members should share the increase by an equal percentage (except the Mayor which is established as a fixed sum by the Remuneration Authority). A percentage increase was applied across the range of salaries established in 2005. The same process has been followed in 2007, with all Elected Members' salaries (except the Mayor's) being increased by the same percentage movement. The calculation spreadsheet is attached at pages A7-A8. For comparative purposes, a calculation spreadsheet showing the remuneration distribution on the same basis as the 2005 calculation is attached at pages A9-A10.

Payments to appointed Community and Iwi/Maori representatives on Committees are outside the indicative pool. These payments are matters that lie with the Council and are not within the Remuneration Authority's brief. Waitakere City Council has set a salary for the Chair of Te Taumata Runanga and meeting fees as appropriate for appointed Members to Te Taumata and any other Committees of the Council. The Council has also determined that the representative from Te Taumata Runanga on the City Development Committee be paid the same hourly rate as for Hearing Commissioners - currently \$60 per hour of meeting and workshop time. Any alteration to the determination made by the Council on this remuneration will not affect the indicative pool established by the Remuneration Authority for Waitakere. The percentage movement applied to the salary for the Chair of Te Taumata Runanga is the same as the movement in the salaries for Elected Members.

No changes are proposed to the way in which payments are claimed or made.

Any payments to Elected Members for Resource Consent Hearings are outside the pool.

Expenses, including mileage allowances, are outside the pool, although the actual amounts/rates that can be claimed are set by the Remuneration Authority.

This report also recommends amounts/rates for all allowances and reimbursement of expenses for submission to the Remuneration Authority. The only significant changes are reductions in cell phone and broadband, as the rates for plans most appropriate for Council use have been reduced. All Elected members should change their broadband plan to Xtra Broadband Basic if they wish to receive full compensation.

Should the Council wish to, it may request the Remuneration Authority to reduce the remuneration pool. This requires a unanimous vote of the Council.

Expenses

The Council should review the expenses currently approved by the Remuneration Authority with a view to recommending any changes. It is suggested that the retention of monthly allowances for Elected Members to cover the cost of technology and communications associated with Council business continue and that Elected Members be required to claim those allowances on their monthly claim forms. The Council has determined to review the provision of cell phones as an alternative to the payment of monthly allowances.

Elected Members may also incur expenses that arise as a direct result of carrying out the role of an elected representative. Some of those expenses not covered by allowances already paid, may be claimable as an expense reimbursement through Council. Other expenses may be claimable in an annual tax return.

Elected Members need to be aware of their responsibility for all taxation issues. Each will need to keep evidence of expenditure incurred for which the appropriately selected reimbursement allowances are claimed, in case Inland Revenue seeks justification of the claim.

The Remuneration Authority has jurisdiction to make the determination and has requested representations from the Council. Consequently Elected Members have no pecuniary interests in voting on salaries and personal allowances. Elected Members will be advised when the determination has been made. Each Elected Member will have a choice whether to claim payment of allowances, part claim, or not to make any claim at all. With respect to salaries, Elected Members are required to take the amount that is determined by the Remuneration Authority.

Meeting Allowance Rates

No meeting allowance rates will be payable except for appointed Members to Council Committees and Subcommittees and in respect of Members acting as Hearing Commissioners. The meeting allowance rate has been adjusted by the equivalent movement to remuneration levels.

On 14 February 2007, the Council resolved:

- “1. *That the Elected Members Remuneration - Remuneration Authority Determination 2007/2008 report be received.*
2. *That the Council recommends the following salaries for Elected Members to the Remuneration Authority:*
 - *Deputy Mayor - \$77,527,*
 - *Chairs of Standing Committees*
 - *(City Development, Planning and Regulatory and Finance and Operational Performance Committee) - \$74,003,*
 - *Chairs of Other Committees:*
 - *Chair of Hearings, Projects Special and Culture, Arts and Events Special Committees - \$62,902,*
 - *Chair Emergency Services Committee - 0,*
 - *Chair Performance Review Committee - 0,*
 - *Chair Tenders Subcommittee - 0,*
 - *Chair Long Term Council Community Plan and Annual Plan Special Committee - 0,*
 - *Other Councillors - \$50,928,*
 - *Community Board Chairs - \$23,963,*
 - *Community Board Members - \$12,334.*
3. *Resource Consent hearing fees will be paid in accordance with the determination of the Remuneration Authority (currently \$75 per hour of meeting time for the Chair and \$60 per hour of meeting time for the Members).*
4. *The following reimbursements and expenses be recommended to the Remuneration Authority:*

That Councillors and Community Board Members receive a monthly allowance to cover reimbursement of the following costs incurred as appropriate:

- *Reimbursement of one domestic line rental and one domestic line maintenance charge related to telephone, fax and email operation and the call minder facility - \$52 (currently \$46).*
- *Reimbursement of one cell phone on the basis of the best Call Plan available to Councillors including the Call Minder facility - \$40 (currently \$35) when a cell phone is made available to be used on Council business.*

- *Reimbursement of the best flat rate monthly fee available to the Councillors for a Broadband connection suitable for Council business operations - \$39.95 based on the Xtra Plan for 1GB download per month (currently \$69) (available to Community Board Chairs but not currently available to Community Board Members).*
- 5. *That Councillors and Community Board Members claim reasonable business related core costs on telephone or cell phone on a monthly basis provided they are supported by presentation of an account detailing to whom the calls have been made.*
- 6. *That Councillors be paid a flat monthly fee of \$20 to cover all consumables (not currently available to Community Board Members) for computers including lap tops, printers, facsimiles etc.*
- 7. *That Councillors will be supplied with either a personal computer at home or a lap top if necessary. Those Councillors who provide their own computer equipment be paid an additional monthly allowance of \$50 (not currently available to Community Board Members).*
- 8. *That no other telephones, fax machines or cell phones will be provided to Elected Members except that the Mayor and Deputy Mayor will be provided with a cell phone and the Council will pay for all expenses except private calls (except see 14 below).*
- 9. *That when on approved Council business all actual or related expenses will be met by the Council.*
- 10. *That the rate for reimbursing an Elected Members for travel, using their own motor vehicle on Council business is the maximum set by the Remuneration Authority - (currently \$0.70 per kilometre) and the Council also pays the approved rate to appointed Members. Any infringement fees e.g. parking and speeding infringements are by law the responsibility of the offender."*

144/2007

"That the Chair of Te Taumata Runanga not be paid a salary but instead be paid a pro-rata meeting allowance for attendance at and Chiring the meetings of Te Taumata Runanga of \$21,474 per year divided across the eleven scheduled monthly meetings of Te Taumata Runanga."

145/2007

1. *"That the non-elected Te Taumata Runanga representative appointed to the City Development Committee be paid a meeting fee aligned with those fees payable for Resource Consent hearings members (refer to clause 3 of this resolution) (currently \$60 per hour of meeting and workshop time).*
2. *That all appointed non-elected Members of Council Committees (except the Te Taumata Runanga representative to the City Development Committee) and subcommittees except the Hearings Committee be paid a meeting fee of \$221."*

146/2007

“That Council seeks from the Remuneration Authority the ability to issue Councillors with Council cell phones as an alternative to the current regime of an allowance payment.”

147/2007

CONCLUSION

The Community Board is required to consider the Council's proposal and advise whether it agrees with the proposal. If it disagrees, it may make representation to the Remuneration Authority.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Elected Members' Remuneration - Remuneration Authority Determination 2007/2008 report be received.
2. That the Community Board, in reference to the Remuneration Authority Determination 2007/2008:
 - (a) Agrees with the Council decision, 14 February 2007, resolution 144 to 147/2007; or
 - (b) Disagrees with the Council decision, 14 February 2007, resolution 144 to 147/2007 and will make a submission to the Remuneration Authority in this regard.

Report prepared by: Darryl Griffin, Group Manager: Democracy and Support Services.



9 2007 WAITAKERE CITY COUNCIL ELECTIONS: EARLY PROCESSING AND ORDERING OF CANDIDATES' NAMES ON VOTING DOCUMENTS

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to advise the Community Boards of the Council's decision approving the early processing of the returned voting documents used at the next Waitakere City triennial elections, to be held on Saturday, 13 October 2007, and the order in which candidates' names are to be shown on the voting documents used at that election.

BACKGROUND

(a) **Early Processing**

Section 79 of the Local Electoral Act permits a local authority to process (but not count) returned voting documents over the voting period.

(b) **Order of Candidates' Names on Voting Documents**

Formerly, candidates' names were required to be listed on the voting documents in alphabetical order, by surname.

Clause 31(1) of the Local Electoral Regulations 2001 now allows Council to decide whether the names are to be arranged on the voting documents in alphabetical order of surname, pseudo-random order or random order. In the absence of any Council resolution approving another arrangement, the candidates' names must be arranged in alphabetical order of surname.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

Active democracy is one of Council's nine strategic platforms. The Triennial Elections are one of the most fundamental contributions that Council makes to this platform.

ISSUES

(a) Early Processing

Early processing of voting documents was introduced for the 1998 Waitakere elections (but restricted to 84 hours before the close of voting) and was used very successfully throughout the country. Because of the success of early processing in 1998 and the benefits which early processing provides, the early processing period was subsequently increased to the whole three-week voting period now provided for under the current legislation. The immediate benefit of adopting early processing is that much, if not all, of the cumbersome and time-consuming task of extracting and checking the voting documents, is undertaken progressively over the three-week voting period (under strict security and under the supervision of a Justice of the Peace). This means a quicker and more accurate result can be achieved on polling day.

(b) Order of Candidates' Names on Voting Documents

The features of the three arrangements of alphabetical order of surname, pseudo-random order or random order are described below:

Arrangement 1 - Alphabetical Order of Surname

This is the order that has been required to be used at previous elections and is self-explanatory. This arrangement has worked well in the past.

Arrangement 2 - Pseudo-Random Order*

Under this arrangement, the candidates' names for each issue are placed in a hat (or similar receptacle), mixed together, and then drawn out of the receptacle, with the candidates' names being placed on all voting documents in that issue in the order in which they are drawn.

(*Note: Although the term "pseudo-random order" is used in the Local Electoral Regulations to describe this arrangement, this is a somewhat imperfect description, in that the term "pseudo-random" is understood by mathematicians and/or information technology specialists to have a quite different meaning.)

Arrangement 3 - Random Order

Under this arrangement, the names of the candidates for each issue are shown in a different order on each and every voting document, utilising software that permits the names of the candidates to be laser printed in a different order on each paper.

The Local Electoral Regulations 2001 provide that if a local authority has determined that pseudo-random order or random order is to be used, the Electoral Officer must state, in the public notice required to be given, the date, time and place at which the order of the candidates' names will be arranged. Any person is entitled to attend while the arrangement is in progress.

RESOURCES

The cost of printing the voting documents employing either Arrangement 1 or Arrangement 2 will be identical. Should Council adopt Arrangement 3 (random order), there will be some increase in cost because of the need to individually laser print each voting document. While it is not yet possible to give an estimate of the likely additional costs that will arise from this arrangement, they are not expected to be substantial.

CONCLUSION

(a) Early Processing

The Council is required to determine that it will permit early processing of returned voting documents over the voting period as allowed for under Section 79 of the Local Electoral Act.

(b) Order of Candidates' Names on Voting Documents

Formerly, candidates' names were required to be listed on the voting documents in alphabetical order, by surname. Council now has the option to continue with that arrangement or adopt a pseudo-random or random arrangement. The default position is that candidates' names must be arranged in alphabetical order of surname.

On 12 February 2007 the Finance and Operational Performance Committee resolved:

- “1. That the 2007 Waitakere City Council Elections: Early Processing and Ordering of Candidates' Names on Voting Documents report be received.
2. That it be recommended to the Council that the returned voting documents for the 2007 Waitakere City Council elections be processed during the voting period, such early processing to be undertaken in accordance with Section 79 of the Local Electoral Act 2001, the Local Electoral Regulations 2001 and the Society of Local Government Managers' Code of Good Practice for the Management of Local Authority Elections and Polls.
3. That it be recommended to the Council that the names of the candidates for the 2007 Waitakere City Council elections be arranged on voting documents in alphabetical order of surname.”

114/2007

The decision of the Council to be determined at the Council meeting scheduled for 28 February 2007 will be advised to the Board at the meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

That the 2007 Waitakere City Council Elections: Early Processing and Ordering of Candidates' Names on Voting Documents report be received.

Report prepared by: Darryl Griffin, Electoral Officer.



10 REPRESENTATION REVIEW - OUTCOME

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to inform the Massey Community Board of the Determination of the Local Government Commission on Council's Final Proposal on the 2006 Representation Review, as required by the Finance and Operational Performance Committee.

BACKGROUND

The Representation Review was undertaken to determine the method of election of the Council and of its Community Boards, in order to provide for fair and effective representation, pursuant to the Local Electoral Act 2001.

One of the reforms introduced by the Local Electoral Act 2001 was to reduce the frequency of reviews of the basis of elections by local authorities from every three years to at least one every six years. Only 23 out of 86 local authorities in New Zealand conducted Reviews in 2003, with all others therefore required to undertake these in 2006. Because the Council chose not to undertake a review in 2003, it was required to do so in the 2006 year.

The Local Government Commission advised that its workload to deal with any appeals and objections when considering final proposals from territorial authorities and regional councils would be substantial, and requested local authorities to submit their final proposals ahead of statutory deadlines if possible. The Council therefore determined that it would commence the process in 2005 and continue on to 2006 seamlessly, in order to make its decision on the Final Proposal well ahead of the statutory time lines, as soon as possible after completing a process of robust consultation with the community.

The Electoral Officer started this process for Council by preparing a Discussion Document for Elected Members, and commissioning a consultant to undertake a study identifying Communities of Interest. A number of workshops reviewed the consultant's report and updates thereto.

As part of the Review process, Council first considered the voting system and Māori representation. On 31 August 2005, the Waitakere City Council resolved to stay with the First-Past-The-Post (FPP) electoral system. Residents were advised in a public notice of this decision and of their right to demand a poll to change the decision. In October 2005, Council resolved not to introduce Maori wards for the 2007 Triennial Elections. No demand from electors for a poll on either issue was received by the deadline and therefore the Waitakere City Council will use the system in this year's elections.

Council's next task was to consider the number of Members and their method of election for both Council and the Community Boards, in the context of the requirement of the Local Electoral Act 2001 to provide for fair and effective representation.

The Local Electoral Act 2001 states that where a council is divided into wards, effective representation must be ensured by the wards having an identifiable "community of interest" in order to ensure "effective representation". There is no statutory definition of a "community of interest". However, the Government Commission's publication "Guidelines To Assist Local Authorities In Undertaking Representation Reviews" clarifies that these are based on common characteristics that help define a community, for example, transport services, stream catchments patterns, landscape features, the way land is used, etc.

Fair representation is ensured by the requirement that the ratio of Elected Members to population does not vary by more than 10% from the ratio of Elected Members (other than the Mayor and any Members elected at large) to population of the Council as a whole.

The Council undertook an informal public feedback/information process on three options for a ward structure prior to the formal review of representation arrangements for the City and its Community Boards.

On 15 March 2006, the Council adopted its Initial Proposal, making representation arrangements applicable for the 2007 Triennial Elections. This was publicly notified on 24 March 2006.

The Council's Initial Proposal was that the City be divided into three wards, with a Mayor and 14 Councillors. Community Boards would be established with boundaries aligned with those for each of the three wards and each Community Board would comprise of six Elected Members, elected at large within the ward concerned, and three Members appointed from the Councillors elected for the respective ward.

The Council received 510 submissions on time and 103 late submissions in response to its Initial Proposal.

After hearing and considering the submissions received, the Council accepted that the rural area had a "community of interest" by itself that was weighted alongside other communities of interest. Consequently, the Council amended its Initial Proposal when framing its Final Proposal.

The Final Proposal was publicly notified on 7 June 2006. As the Initial Proposal had been modified, anyone was entitled to object, not just those who had submitted to the Council on the Initial Proposal. Objections closed at 4.00 pm, 7 July 2006.

The Council's Final Proposal was as follows:

- (a) The Council comprise a Mayor and 14 Councillors;
- (b) The City be divided into four wards;
 - Henderson (five Councillors);
 - Massey (three Councillors);
 - New Lynn (five Councillors);
 - Waitakere (one Councillor).
- (c) That community boards be retained for each of the four wards;
- (d) That the Massey, Henderson and New Lynn Community Boards each consist of five Elected Members elected at large within the ward concerned and two appointed Members, and that the Waitakere Community Board consists of six Elected Members elected at large from the ward and one appointed Member.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

Active Democracy is one of the Council's nine strategic platforms identified in its Long Term Council Community Plan 2006-2016. This platform supports the involvement of citizens in the Council's decision-making process through education, removing barriers, developing partnerships, improving information flows and supporting the communities' own ways of interacting with the Council.

The Council measures its success in meeting active democracy targets by conducting regular household surveys. Although the public's perception of engagement in the Council's decision-making processes has improved since 2001/2002, (partly due to this Council's extensive community consultation processes), the voter turnout for Council elections remains low. Voter turnout was only 35.68% at the last Triennial Election and only 27.28% at the 2006 Waitakere Ward By-Election. The electoral Representation Review process addressed issues around communities of interest and aimed at structuring a system more conducive to active voter participation.

ISSUES

A total of 220 objections were received in response to Council's final decision. The main concerns of the objectors related to:

- The exclusion of Laingholm and other areas, including part of Titirangi, from the proposed Waitakere Ward (201 objections);
- The need for a minimum of two Councillors to adequately represent the Waitakere Ward, given the size and geography of the ward;
- The location of boundaries for the Massey, Henderson and New Lynn Wards; and
- The number of Community Boards and their membership.

A11-A23

The Local Government Commission held a hearing in the Waitakere City Council Chambers on 19 September 2006 at which the Council and objectors were given the opportunity to speak. On 19 December 2006, the Local Government Commission announced its decision on Waitakere City Council's membership, ward, and Community Board arrangements for the 2007 Triennial Elections, as attached at pages A11 to A23.

After considering objections against the Council's Final Proposal, the Local Government Commission decided that the Council will comprise a Mayor and 14 Councillors elected as follows:

Wards	Population	Councillors	Population per Councillor	Deviation from city average population per Councillor	Percentage deviation from city average population per Councillor
Massey	49,890	4	12,472	-1080.75	-7.97%
Henderson	58,770	4	14,692	+1139.25	+8.40%
New Lynn	58,210	4	14,552	+992.25	+7.37%
Waitakere	24,990	2	12,495	-1057.75	-7.80%
TOTALS	191,900	14	13,552.75	Range: 12,336 - 15,077	

There will be a Community Board for each ward.

The Commission's decision differs from the Council's Final Proposal in the following ways:

- An extended area around and including Ranui remains in the Massey Ward;
- An additional area of Glendene is to be transferred from the Henderson Ward to the New Lynn Ward;
- The Waitakere Ward will be extended to more closely follow the area identified in the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Bill (presently before Parliament), and will include Laingholm and part of Titirangi;
- Henderson, Massey and New Lynn Wards will be represented by four Councillors for each ward;
- The Waitakere Ward will be represented by two Councillors instead of one.

A24

The boundaries for these four wards are indicated on the map attached at page A24.

Massey Ward

- A25 The Massey Ward, as indicated on the map attached at page A25, will be the area generally encompassing Whenuapai, Hobsonville, West Harbour, Herald Island, Massey and Ranui (North of Universal Drive).

Henderson Ward

- A26 The Henderson Ward, as indicated on the map attached at page A26, will be the area generally comprising Western Heights, McLaren Park, Henderson, Lincoln (South of Universal Drive), Te Atatu South and Te Atatu Peninsula.

New Lynn Ward

- A27 The New Lynn Ward, as indicated on the map attached at page A27, will be the area generally comprising Green Bay, Titirangi (North of the Titirangi Road and Godley Road intersection), Kelston, Glen Eden, New Lynn and Glendene (up to and including most of Tirimoana Road).

Waitakere Ward

- A28 The Waitakere Ward, as indicated on the map attached at page A28, will be the area generally comprising Bethells/Te Henga, Waitakere Village, Swanson, Piha, Karekare, Oratia, Laingholm, Titirangi (South of the Titirangi Road and Godley Road intersection), Whatipu, and Huia.

The four Community Boards will cover the same areas as the Council wards.

The membership of the Community Board for each community shall comprise of five Elected Members plus two Members of the Council representing the ward concerned and appointed to the Community Board by Council.

Other Issues

1. Election Costs

One of the outcomes of the Commission's Determination has been to increase the number of voting paper combinations from 15 to 18 due to the inclusion of parts of more Licensing Trust wards in all Council wards, apart from Massey Ward, which is unchanged in this respect. One of the new combinations in Henderson Ward covers only 130 electors. One of the existing combinations in Massey Ward covers only 40 electors. Each combination attracts additional set up costs of \$321, making a total additional cost of \$963

2. Communities of Interest

Council's community of interest consultant has reviewed the outcome in the light of the previous exercise of identifying communities of interest. The final representation system (four wards) is generally in-line with the earlier "four ward model" developed through the communities of interest work, and as published as Option Two in the Council's informal consultation process in February 2006.

As proposed in the original "four ward model", the non-urban Waitakere Ward generally covers that area zoned under the District Plan as Bush Living, Waitakere Ranges and Foothills, (plus Swanson). It generally covers the area involved in the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Bill.

The inclusion of the Titirangi area into the Waitakere Ward will need to be communicated to residents of that area.

The issues arising in the new Waitakere Ward are likely to be somewhat different from the current situation, given that at least half of the residents in the new ward live in the Titirangi area, which was previously part of the New Lynn Ward.

The main differences between the final “four ward model” and the communities of interest work lies with the boundaries between the three urban wards. The urban ward boundaries appear to reflect a desire to ensure equal representation (four Members per ward), rather than any particular communities of interest.

Of particular note are the following issues:

- While the boundary between the Henderson and New Lynn Wards was always hard to determine due to the lack of any distinctive natural boundaries in this area, pulling the boundary further north than proposed in Council’s Final Proposal, as has occurred in the decision, was not advocated for in any responses to the informal options proposed by the Council, or in submissions on the formal proposal, as far as the consultant and the Electoral Officer are aware. With the boundary being so far north, it is likely that some residents in the northern Glendene area will be confused as to which ward they are in, given that Henderson town centre is closer than New Lynn, especially for residents in the Manhattan Heights, Kirby Street area.
- The Glendene town centre appears to be split between New Lynn and Henderson Wards, which may complicate some local management issues which often involve Community Board input (e.g. parking management, road signage, and any future town centre upgrade).
- The boundary between the Massey and Henderson Wards is somewhat different to that proposed in the informal and formal consultation processes. While Ranui as a whole is within the Massey Ward (as was proposed in the “three ward option”), the Sturges area is now split between Massey and Henderson. The Commission’s Determination appears to include the northern side of the Sturges area (the Babich area, off the southern side of Metcalfe Road), as well as the area around the Paremuka Pond (Hillwell Drive) in the Massey Ward, while the rest of the Sturges area is in the Henderson Ward. Residents in the Sturges area who are in the Massey Ward are more likely to associate themselves with the rest of the Sturges areas and Western Heights and Henderson, rather than Ranui and Massey.

3. Possibility of Judicial Review

Section 19S(3) of the Local Electoral Act 2001 states that subject to schedule 5 of the Local Government Act 2002, the determination of the Commission made under s19R(1)(b) is final.

Schedule 5 of the Local Government Act 2002 provides that proceedings before the Commission are not invalid for want of form and no appeal lies from any decision of the Commission, though nothing prohibits or restricts the High Court from exercising a supervisory jurisdiction over the Commission on questions of law.

The decision of the Commission is challengeable only for some procedural defect or illegality in their decision making. At present, the Electoral Officer is not aware of any such defect in the decision. Section 19R as read with Section 19Q of the Local Electoral Act 2001 requires the Commission to consider all the information supplied to it by Council in reaching its decision, but otherwise the Commission is not restrained as to the decision it may reach. The extent of the Commission’s discretion in making determinations is illustrated by the previous Commission’s decision to introduce a combination of election at large and election by ward for Tauranga City Council, despite a referendum having clearly indicated a preference for elections at large

It is estimated that any challenge would cost approximately \$25,000. Any party challenging the decision would have no certainty of success.

In essence, although there is no way of knowing whether anyone will make a challenge, there is no readily identifiable defect in the determination, so all Council can do is act on the determination as given. If the determination is challenged, that is the Local Government Commission's issue and Council would only be affected if the challenge is successful and the determination overturned. It is worth mentioning that the longer anyone delays before mounting a challenge, the less favourably the Court is likely to regard it. In fact, a successful challenge would have the effect of significantly impeding the election process; one can easily imagine the Court refusing to overturn the determination unless any defect in decision making by the Commission was of a very significant character.

Reporting to the Community Boards

At its meeting of 12 February 2007, the Finance and Operational Performance Committee by minute number 113/2007 received the report of the Electoral Officer, advising of the outcome of the Representation Review. The Finance and Operational Performance Committee also resolved, by the same minute number, that this report be forwarded to the New Lynn, Waitakere, Massey and Henderson Community Boards for their information. This report therefore includes all the information contained in the Electoral Officer's Report to the Finance and Operational Performance Committee on 12 February 2007.

RESOURCES

No additional resources will be required for the Representation Review. However, additional costs of \$963 will be incurred in running the 2007 Triennial Election, due to the increased number of voting paper combinations.

CONCLUSION

This report is brought to the Massey Community Board, for its information as resolved by the Finance and Operational Performance Committee, which has been delegated authority for electoral matters by Council.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Representation Review - Outcome report be received.

Report prepared by: Darryl Griffin, Electoral Officer and Charlie Inggs, Deputy Electoral Officer.



11 NEW ZEALAND COMMUNITY BOARDS' CONFERENCE

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to obtain nominations of Members of the Massey Community Board to attend the 2007 Community Board's Conference (the Conference), to be held at the Telstra Clear Events Centre in Manukau City from 7 to 9 June 2007, and to provide an opportunity for the Massey Community Board to submit an entry for the 2007 Community Board Awards.

BACKGROUND

The New Zealand Community Boards' Executive Committee is recognised by Local Government New Zealand as an advisory committee on Community Board matters.

All local authorities are members of Local Government New Zealand and it is Local Government New Zealand's role to represent the national interests of the sector. Community Boards are acknowledged by Local Government New Zealand as an integral part of the sector.

The first Conference was held in Christchurch in March 1997 and these have been held every two years since then. In addition, a Community Boards' Forum was held in Lower Hutt in July 2005.

To encourage Community Boards to excel, a variety of Community Board Awards are made at each biennial Conference.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

Ensuring Elected Members know and understand their role and the parameters in which they can most effectively govern the City, contributes to all the Community Outcomes identified by the Council in its Long Term Council Community Plan and supports in particular, the Active Democracy platform. The provision of training, including that available at the Community Boards' Conferences assists that contribution.

ISSUES

The Conference will be held at the TelstraClear Pacific Events Centre, Manukau City, from 7 to 9 June 2007, with the theme - "Leading to Safer Communities". Early Bird Registration has been set at \$500 plus GST. Initially, the cut off date for early bird registrations was set at 1 March 2007. This has now been extended up to 31 March 2007.

Expressions of interest were sought from Community Board Members who wish to attend in December 2006. The Massey Community Board was reminded of this through the Committee Secretary's report to its February 2007 meeting and asked to advise of any changes to the indications they gave in December 2006 as to their interest in attending. Accordingly, GE Barnard, RF Jessopp, and JG Riddell all indicated their interest in attending.

All Community Board Members have been notified of the criteria for entry into the 2007 Community Board awards, which will be awarded at the Conference.

A29-A34

A copy of the registration form and programme are attached at pages A29-A34. Full conference information is available on the Local Government New Zealand website and a registration brochure will be available in early March 2007.

RESOURCES

Despite the holding of the Community Boards' Forum in Lower Hutt, and Council making a commitment of \$5,000 towards the cost of the Conference as co-hosts, sufficient funding can be identified from the Elected Members component of the 2006/2007 Annual Plan to meet the registration fees of all Members wishing to attend. However, the funding available is insufficient to meet any overnight accommodation costs (which, in terms of normal Council practices would not normally be provided for an Auckland-based conference). Arrangements will be made to assist Members with shared fleet transport to travel to the Conference on a daily basis and any use of Members' private transport for this purpose will be reimbursed. Members are entitled to make their own personal arrangements for overnight accommodation, but these can not be refunded.

CONCLUSION

The Massey Community Board is requested to nominate its Members who will be attending the Conference, to be held at the Telstra Clear Events Centre, Manukau City from 7 to 9 June 2007. The Massey Community Board is also asked to indicate its intention as to whether it wishes to submit an entry for the 2007 Community Board Awards.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the New Zealand Community Boards' Conference report be received.
2. That GE Barnard, RF Jessopp, and JG Riddell be nominated to attend the New Zealand Community Board's Conference to be held at the Telstra Clear Events Centre, Manukau City from 7 to 9 June 2007.
3. That the Massey Community Board *either*.
 - (a) Indicates its intention to submit an entry in the 2007 Community Board Awards, and authorise the Chairman to approve the final format of the entry;
 - or*
 - (b) Indicates that it does not wish to submit an entry for the 2007 Community Board Awards.

Report prepared by: Charlie Inggs, Democracy and Governance Team Manager.



12 WAITAKERE EVENTS UPDATE

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to update Members of the Massey Community Board on events happening within the Massey Ward area and on events elsewhere in the city.

BACKGROUND

A regular report on events is presented to the Culture, Arts and Events Special Committee, the last such report being tabled in December 2006. It was also felt that, given the number and importance of events occurring within the city, a six-monthly report would be made to each of the Community Boards on events occurring within their jurisdiction and on events happening citywide.

Council continually receives Annual Plan submissions and sponsorship requests for a variety of events, parades and festivals and where possible, Council officers work with and seed fund as many events which comply with Council's strategic direction as is possible within the constraints of the events budget (\$60,000). Council officers work in liaison with the wider community in the planning and staging of such events, and also offer advice to event organisers around running successful events, including health and safety, event logistics and sourcing of event providers.

With the recent adoption of the Events Strategy, the focus of the events team is now on setting up an action plan to introduce the findings of the Events Strategy and to educate event managers on how Council is able to assist them with their events.

There are a number of Long Term Council Community Plan targets which events are measured against throughout the year. The current measurement criteria are:

Events (includes civic, community, art, cultural and regional events)	To design, manage and deliver events	Total number of events run and total number of attendees (audience)	25 events and 85,000 attendees or more in 2006/2007
		Residents satisfaction survey of citywide events and/or on site survey	80% of attendees surveyed rate the events acceptable, very good or excellent per annum

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The events portfolio is seen as supporting Council's First Call for Children commitments and also supporting the promotion of social, economic, environmental and cultural well being of communities, as defined through the Local Government Act and Council's own Long Term Council Community Plan.

ISSUES

The table below includes a brief update on significant Council and Council sponsored/partnered events held in the Massey Ward from October 2006 to February 2007.

In addition to working on or in support of events, Council officers have been involved in bidding and planning phases for two major international sporting events which have recently been awarded to the city, namely the World Netball Cup and the Equinox World Junior Badminton Championships, both of which will be hosted at The Trusts Stadium. In addition to this, Council officers are also assisting regional workstreams around the Rugby World Cup in 2011.

EVENT	DATE	COMMENTS
Diwali Festival of Lights	9 October 2006	Held at The Trusts Stadium, this was a hugely successful event, with around 3,000 participants and 20,000 visitors. A full report on this event will be brought to the Culture, Arts and Events Special Committee in March 2007. Council's contribution to this event was \$5,000 and staff time.
FIBA Oceania Basketball	15 - 21 October 2006	Held at The Trusts Stadium, an event run by Basketball New Zealand and heavily supported by our youth events' co-ordinator. A very successful event with eight countries and 160 athletes involved. Spectators were treated to two extremely tight and exciting finals between New Zealand and Australian men's and women's teams. Council's contribution to this event was \$30,000, which was tagged to venue hire. On the back of the success of this event, discussions are now underway between the Stadium, Basketball New Zealand and Council officers about other possible event opportunities.

EVENT	DATE	COMMENTS
West Harbour Christmas Parade	11 December 2006	After a two-year absence, the Rotary Club have reintroduced a Christmas parade in the Massey Ward. Small in numbers, this event is sure to grow as residents become more aware of it. Council contributed funding for marketing and traffic management.
Infratil Waitakere Community Awards	19 October 2006	Held at The Trusts Stadium, this was the second Awards' evening for the Infratil/Waitakere City Community Awards, which saw the Bring It On Trust take out top honours. Introduced to the ceremony this year was a Volunteer Recognition Award, which was awarded to all groups nominated. Attended by over 200 people from community organisations.
Waitakere Fireworks Display	4 November 2006	The annual fireworks display hosted by the Waitakere Lions Luncheon Club. A hugely successful family event which, due to fine weather this year, saw an audience of around 7500 people attend. Council's contribution to this event is \$25,000.
Trash to Fashion	10 and 11 November 2006	This annual fashion extravaganza, was once again held at The Trusts Stadium. This is an event which goes from strength to strength each year and has now reached Wearable Arts standards of production. Three thousand people saw the show over two nights and Council's contribution to this event was \$150,000.
Waitakere Sporting Excellence Awards	17 November 2006	Hosted by Sport Waitakere, these are the glamour Sporting Awards for Waitakere's sporting elite. Council make no contribution to these Awards other than offering promotional opportunities.
Pacific in the Park & Pacifica Games	15 and 16 December 2006	Two annual events which have combined and moved to the Stadium, having outgrown previous venues. Attended by around 3,000 people over a two-day period.
Westgate Summer Madness	19 - 23 December 2006	An initiative between Council and Westgate Mall management, where in the week leading up to Christmas a number of street performers were on hand to entertain Christmas shoppers. Lunch and early evening performances were appreciated by all and requests have been received for more of the same next year. Council's contribution to this was \$7,000.
Movies in Parks	16 - 19 December 2006	A new initiative where Council officers and external contractors ran a series of free family movies in parks. A huge success and an event we will run again next summer. Around 1500 people attended over four nights.

EVENT	DATE	COMMENTS
Kilikiti Competition	29 January 2007	Moire Park hosted the Western Kilikiti competition, which saw six teams battle it out in a round robin competition for the honour to represent the west at the finals in Manukau. Always a popular sport, the day was attended by around 700 people.

Council officers are working with the Massey Matters project to look at opportunities to introduce more events into the Massey Ward over the next 12 months. The Ezekiel 33 Trust, which has traditionally run events in the New Lynn Ward is, in 2007, expanding their events' portfolio and will be bringing a number of Watchmen Events to the Massey Ward.

An events' listing of upcoming events is now emailed to all Community Board Members each month. Significant events that are scheduled for the Massey area for the balance of summer are:

3 March	RNZAF Base Auckland Open Day at Whenuapai
4 March	Scruffs Dog Show at Hobsonville
4 March	Toddler Day Out at The Trusts Stadium
11 March	Holi Festival on Fields 2 + 3 at The Trusts Stadium
11 March	Inter-Island Cruise at Herald Island
17 March	Ranui Community Fair at Ranui Domain
24 March	Waitakere Sounds at Luckens Reserve
31 March	Te Reo Mokopuna at Moire Park.

RESOURCES

Council currently have a general events fund in 2006/2007 of \$60,000, which is allocated across the city for small events that fit the Council's strategic direction. In addition to these, separate budget lines are in place for the larger city events, such as the Diwali Festival or Moon Festival. In 2006/2007 a \$130,000 events bid budget is also in place and this has been used to secure international and world-class events for the city and its residents.

CONCLUSION

Overall, Council officers are pleased with the number and diversity of events and with the number of people participating at events. Council officers will continue to work with event organisers to ensure that the processing of their regulatory requirements around holding events (licensing requirements, road and traffic safety requirements, booking of parks etc) is as smooth and painless as possible for them and that Waitakere is seen as an event-friendly place.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Waitakere Events Update report be received.

Report prepared by: Barbara Cade, Events and Special Projects Manager.



13 **KEEP WAITAKERE BEAUTIFUL TRUST 2007 TREES FOR BABIES**

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Community Board for the park within the Massey Ward recommended as this year's site for the annual 'Trees for Babies' community planting and also to request the nomination of a representative from the Community Board to speak on the day.

BACKGROUND

Trees for Babies is an annual community event to celebrate babies born in Waitakere. Trees have been planted by the community in one reserve in each of the four wards as part of a Keep Waitakere Beautiful Trust, Plunket and Council joint project for the past 12 years. This is a popular community event, with approximately 100 trees planted in each reserve every year.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

Trees for Babies is now in its twelfth year, evidence of both the popularity of this event and the ongoing long-term partnership between the Keep Waitakere Beautiful Trust and Council. Trees for Babies is an active reflection of the Strong Communities platform, as well as the Green Network platform, within the Long Term Council Community Plan. Trees for Babies exists because both parties recognise the long-term value in establishing community ownership, and participation in community-based environmental initiatives. Trees for Babies also adds to the Green Network, providing habitat and "highways" for wildlife and enhanced recreational areas for people.

ISSUES

The Trees for Babies' event for the Massey Ward is proposed to take place on Saturday, 26 May from 11.00 am to 1.00 pm and the recommended park is Pooks Reserve. A map showing the proposed location within the park of the planting will be presented at the meeting.

The park has been recommended following consultation with the Keep Waitakere Beautiful Trust Board and Waitakere City Council Parks staff. The park recommended has been assessed for suitability and has adequate size and space to accommodate large areas of big tree planting.

Community consultation was carried out with letters sent to residents of Putney Place, Jillian Drive, Pooks Road and Ranui Avenue. There was no response to the proposal.

The event will be community-focused with family-orientated activities and guest speakers. A Community Board Member is requested to speak at the event.

RESOURCES

Funding for Trees for Babies has been approved through the 2006/2007 Annual Plan (\$20,500) and is one of the key programmes funded by Council through the Keep Waitakere Beautiful Trust.

CONCLUSION

The 'Trees for Babies' event has been held successfully since 1995 to celebrate the birth of babies in Waitakere. The park recommended for 'Trees for Babies' for 2007 has been selected based on its suitability for a Trees for Babies event following consultation with the Keep Waitakere Beautiful Trust Board and Waitakere City Council Parks staff.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Keep Waitakere Beautiful Trust 2007 Trees for Babies report be received.
2. That Pooks Reserve be accepted as the confirmed venue for the 2007 Trees for Babies event in the Waitakere Ward.
3. That an Elected Member from the Massey Community Board be nominated to speak at the Trees for Babies event.

Report prepared by: Estée Farrar, Parks and Community Projects Coordinator.



14 STURGES ROAD RAIL OVERBRIDGE REPLACEMENT – CONSTRUCTION METHODOLOGY

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to provide the Massey Community Board with information on the construction methodology for the rebuild of a new road-over-rail bridge at Sturges Road. This bridge falls in the geographic area of the Henderson Ward, but is also used by residents of the Massey Ward.

BACKGROUND

The existing road-over-rail bridge at Sturges Road, Henderson was built around 1940 by New Zealand Railways Corporation (ONTRACK) to permit vehicle traffic to pass over the single railway line to new housing developments. The present condition of this bridge is poor, with severe Alkali Silicate Reaction producing extensive cracking, with the long-term safety and life of this structure being limited. ONTRACK has posted a load limit on this bridge in an attempt to ensure vehicle and rail safety. ONTRACK intends to commence double tracking of stage four of the western line from Mount Lebanon Lane to Swanson Station later this year. The existing piers of the Sturges Road Bridge (Bridge 58) are aligned such that it is not possible to achieve double tracking without undertaking major structural changes. Accordingly a decision has been made by ONTRACK and Council to demolish the old bridge and to rebuild a new wider integrated transport bridge in its place. ONTRACK is prepared to grant Council funding of up to \$3 million for the design and construction of a replacement bridge.

At the City Development Committee meeting of 3 August 2006, the Committee resolved:

- “1. That the Sturges Road Rail Overbridge Replacement - Analysis of Options report be received.
2. That the recommended Option 3 - “Three Lanes and Cycle Lanes each direction”, being the preferred option for the replacement of the Sturges Road Rail Overbridge be approved.
3. That a report be submitted to the Finance and Operational Performance Committee on any funding issues, with the preferred option for the replacement of the Sturges Road Rail Overbridge.”

The design scope includes a replacement bridge as well as the design of new cycle lanes, an additional vehicle lane and a revised road intersection with Swanson Road. It is intended to commence with bridge removal and reconstruction later in this calendar year.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The Waitakere City Council's 'Integrated Transport and Communication' platform provides the strategic context for this report. The vision is for public transport and communications' systems that provide fast, effective services and for city travel facilitated by integrated, environmentally-responsible and innovative design, with a focus on meeting the essential needs of all, for access, communication and safety. Replacing the Sturges Road Bridge will provide an integrated link between Swanson and Sturges Development, maintaining the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, vehicles and trains.

ISSUES

Sturges Road carries daily traffic of about 17,000 vehicles that cross over the rail track at Bridge 58. Alternative rail crossing points for vehicles are restricted to a western crossing at Metcalfe Road and an eastern crossing at Henderson Valley Road. Both of these alternative crossings require detours of about five kilometres. Minor additional, but unguarded, pedestrian crossing of the rail line is possible at Sturges Station and at Neta Grove. It is predicted that when Bridge 58 is demolished, there is likely to be traffic congestion south of the rail line and concern from residents as access across the rail line is removed for a number of months until the new bridge is built.

ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

A35-A37

Consideration has been given to a number of options. The schematic options are shown attached at pages A35-A37. These have been short-listed to two possible options as follows:

Preferred Option: Upstand Concrete U Beams

Cost estimate: \$445,000 for the temporary traffic management, comprising a single lane Bailey Bridge, signage, temporary works, safety barriers and traffic control.

Bridge closure durations: four weekends with no crossings, at all plus five weeks when only single-lane crossing is possible.

This option provides for a bridge built from two longitudinal upstand U-beams that act as pedestrian walkways. These U-beams also carry a series of shallow transverse beams that form the bridge deck. The transverse beams that carry the road traffic are less deep than the box beams of the alternative option due to the span being substantially shorter. Lower transverse beams result in lower approach embankments, with consequently less earthworks and lower retaining walls at neighbouring properties.

A major advantage of the preferred option is that a lower bridge deck height permits that a single-lane Bailey Bridge be used to allow one-lane traffic flow. Although this is not as satisfactory as a two-way temporary crossing, it does at least provide some means of permitting vehicle movements over the rail corridor. With the preferred option, pedestrians and cyclists can be accommodated during the construction phase as the longitudinal upstand beams are craned in place at an early stage. These upstand beams protect pedestrians and cyclists from the adjacent construction works and allow them to cross in safety.

Road deviations and temporary traffic management solutions require two diversion routes for the majority of the traffic being routed either via Metcalfe Road or via Henderson Valley Road, a detour of about 5 kilometres. Traffic travel times increase by about 30 seconds. Residents close to Bridge 58 will be able to use a single lane temporary Bailey Bridge fitted with signalised single lane control or may elect to use the detour route. A through route over the site is maintained, albeit with delays likely.

The advantages and disadvantages of the preferred option are:

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shorter bridge down time compared to alternative option. • Enables a single lane Bailey Bridge to be used to reduce traffic congestion. • Lower bridge deck than the alternative option means easier driveway level adjustments. • Provides means of pedestrian and cycle access across the rail corridor during construction phase. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sophisticated bridge requiring specialist prestressing skills. • Upstand beams are heavy and need permits for overweight transport as well as large cranes to lift in place. • Higher temporary traffic management costs than the alternative option. • Traffic queuing is likely at the single lane Bailey Bridge.

Alternative Option: Concrete Box Beams

Cost estimate: \$270,000 for the temporary traffic management comprising signage, safety barriers, traffic control and road maintenance.

Bridge closure durations: 10 consecutive weeks full bridge closure, plus two weeks of single lane crossing.

This option provides for the replacement of the existing bridge with a bridge constructed from pre cast box section members. These beams are made from standard forms and are able to be manufactured in a precast yard, off site. Consequently the cost of the beams is lower than the special beams. The disadvantage that the box section beams have is that they are deep, and this results in more earthworks in the approach road on ramps and this has a follow-on effect of requiring retaining walls at neighbouring properties to retain the higher embankments.

Because the box beams have a great depth, it is not possible to obtain vertical geometric alignment of a temporary Bailey Bridge crossing over the rail track. Because of the narrow road corridor it is not possible to site a Bailey Bridge to the side of the existing bridge either.

Road deviations and temporary traffic management solutions require two diversion routes for all of the traffic being routed, either via Metcalfe Road or via Henderson Valley Road, a detour of about five kilometres. Traffic travel times increase by about 30 seconds. Residents close to Bridge 58 will not be able to use a single-lane crossing, as it is not possible to site a Bailey Bridge given higher bridge approaches of this option. A through route over the site is not maintained.

Pedestrian traffic will be required to detour to the existing crossing at Sturges Station until the new footpath and cycle lane are opened.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simplest beam construction • Beam forms readily available • Lighter craneage can be used • Lower temporary traffic management costs than the preferred option 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater earthworks volumes • Retaining wall height greater than the preferred option. • Unable to utilise a temporary Bailey Bridge • All traffic is required to be diverted to either Metcalfe or Henderson Valley Roads.

Advantages	Disadvantages
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pedestrian traffic has to be diverted to Sturges Station.• Traffic congestion and unhappy residents unable to easily cross over the rail tracks.

COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

A38-A41

Public Affairs have drafted a communications plan attached at pages A38-A41. This plan provides for a substantial amount of public notification and communication before and during the construction phase. In addition individual letters will be sent to residents directly affected by the works, explaining the temporary traffic management options and project durations.

RESOURCES

Funding for this project has been provided in the 2006–2016 Long Term Council Community Plan.

CONCLUSION

The replacement of bridge 58 is likely to introduce traffic congestion and concern of isolation among local residents, unable to easily cross the rail lines. The construction of a replacement bridge, according to the preferred bridge option, results in the least disruption to existing road use as well as provides for continuous walking and cycling access over the rail line during the construction phase. The preferred option will result in an additional cost of about \$175,000 for temporary traffic management.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Sturges Road Rail Overbridge Replacement Construction Methodology report be received.
2. That the Massey Community Board recommend to the City Development Committee its preferred option for the Sturges Road rail overbridge temporary bridge replacement construction methodology.

Report prepared by: Tony Miguel, Group Manager: Asset Management.



15 INTERSECTION OF ARNEY ROAD AND ROBERTSON ROAD, RANUI - NEW GIVE WAY CONTROL

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to seek the Massey Community Board's approval for a new Give Way control in Arney Road, Ranui, at the intersection with Robertson Road.

BACKGROUND

A member of the public has contacted the Council requesting an intersection priority control at the intersection of Arney Road and Robertson Road, Ranui. This person has observed several near-miss accidents at the intersection where drivers failed to give way and believes that a Give Way Control would help prevent accidents occurring at this intersection.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The Waitakere City Council's 'Integrated Transport and Communication' platform provides the strategic context for this report. The vision is for public transport and communications' systems that provide fast, effective services, and for city travel facilitated by integrated, environmentally-responsible, and innovative design, with a focus on meeting the essential needs of all, for access, communication, and safety.

Intersection priority controls can improve road user safety at intersections by better defining turning priorities and reminding drivers of the need to stop when they do not have priority.

ISSUES

Arney Road and Robertson Road are both short residential streets classified as local roads in the District Plan. Access to the Ranui Domain is located at the west end of Robertson Road.

A check of the Land Transport New Zealand's accident database shows no accidents reported by the Police at the intersection of Arney Road and Robertson Road in the last five years. The Land Transport New Zealand database does not contain a complete list of all accidents, especially minor or non-injury accidents, that have occurred and it is entirely possible one or more unreported accidents have occurred at one or both intersections.

As the cost of implementing a new Give Way control is small in comparison to the potential effects of an accident, it is recommended that a new Give Way control be approved at both intersections.

A42

The location of the proposed new intersection priority controls is indicated on page A42.

Decision Making

This proposal is presented with due consideration of relevant criteria, as promulgated in Section 77 of the Local Government Act 2002. The principal community outcome to be derived is an improvement in the level of traffic management, resulting in an increase in safety and convenience for residents of the City.

RESOURCES

The proposed new Give Way Control can be implemented under the 2006/2007 Annual Plan maintenance budgets.

CONCLUSION

The proposal to install a new intersection priority control at the intersection of Arney Road and Robertson Road, Ranui, is recommended to improve road user safety.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Intersection of Arney Road and Robertson Road, Ranui - New Give Way Control report be received.
2. That in relation to the **INTERSECTION OF ARNEY ROAD AND ROBERTSON ROAD, RANUI**:
 - (a) That, in accordance with the powers conferred by virtue of the Local Government Act 1974, the Land Transport Act 1998, the Transport Act 1962 and the Waitakere City Council Bylaw No.7, 1991 - Traffic, the following controls be now resolved to be specified and imposed, namely,
 - (b) That a new **GIVE WAY** control be put in place on **ARNEY ROAD** at the point where it intersects with **ROBERTSON ROAD**.
3. That the appropriate signage and/or road markings, in accordance with the provisions of Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004 - Rule 54002 be hereby approved to be put in place to properly establish, delineate and record the said intersection priority control.

Report prepared by: Paul Schischka, Transport Engineer.



16 WEST HARBOUR - NEW INTERSECTION PRIORITY CONTROLS

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report seeks the Massey Community Board's approval for new intersection priority controls at four intersections in West Harbour.

BACKGROUND

A member of the public has contacted the Council via an Elected Member with a request that a Give Way sign be installed at the intersection of Picasso Way and Marina View Drive, West Harbour. This person is concerned that a traffic island has been installed at this intersection without a Give Way sign, and believes that drivers are confused in regard to turning priorities at the intersection.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The Council's 'Integrated Transport and Communication' platform provides the strategic context for this report. The vision is for public transport and communications systems that provide fast, effective services, and for city travel facilitated by integrated, environmentally responsible, and innovative design, with a focus on meeting the essential needs of all, for access, communication, and safety.

Intersection priority controls can improve road user safety at intersections by better defining turning priorities and reminding drivers of the need to stop when they do not have priority.

ISSUES

Marina View Drive is classified a regional arterial road in the District Plan. Picasso Way is classified as a local road in the District Plan. Picasso Way provides access to a number of adjoining residential cul de sacs and some through traffic from Lagoon Way. The traffic volumes in Lagoon Way are estimated at 2,600 vehicles per day. This is higher than is typical for a local road.

While investigating this intersection, the Council's officers identified three other nearby intersections where a traffic island, but no intersection priority control, has been installed. It is not mandatory for the Council to install an intersection priority control at an intersection, but these controls can reduce the potential for accidents to occur in some locations by clarifying turning priorities for drivers.

To clarify turning priorities and reduce the potential for accidents to occur at the four intersections identified, it is recommended that new intersection priority controls be installed.

Land Transport New Zealand's Manual of Traffic Signs and Markings recommends that where an intersection priority control is installed at an intersection, a Stop Control is used where sight distances for drivers on the non-priority approach to conflicting traffic are less than 60 metres. In other locations a Give Way Control is recommended.

A check of driver sight distances at the four intersections has been undertaken and the following controls are recommended:

- A Give Way Control on Picasso Way at the intersection with Lagoon Way
- A Stop Control on Picasso Way at the intersection with Marina View Drive.
- A Give Way Control on West Harbour Drive at the intersection with Luckens Road.
- A Give Way Control on Matisse Drive at the intersection with Luckens Road.

A check of the Land Transport New Zealand's accident database shows no accidents reported by the Police at the intersection of Picasso Way and Marina View Drive, West Harbour Drive and Luckens Road, or Matisse Drive and Luckens Road in the last five years.

The Land Transport New Zealand database does not contain a complete list of all accidents, especially minor or non-injury accidents, that have occurred and it is entirely possible one or more unreported accidents have occurred at one or both intersections. As the cost of implementing a new intersection priority control is small in comparison to the potential effects of an accident, it is recommended that new intersection priority controls be approved at all four intersections.

One accident was reported at the intersection of Picasso Way and Lagoon Way. This was a single vehicle accident where a driver lost control of the vehicle while turning left out of Picasso Way and on to Lagoon Way.

A43-A46

The location of the proposed new intersection priority controls is indicated on pages A43-A46.

Decision Making

This proposal is presented with due consideration of relevant criteria, as promulgated in Section 77 of the Local Government Act 2002. The principal community outcome to be derived is an improvement in the level of traffic management resulting in an increase in safety and convenience for residents of the City.

RESOURCES

The proposed new intersection priority controls can be implemented under the 2006/2007 Annual Plan road maintenance budgets.

CONCLUSION

The proposal to install a new intersection priority controls at the intersection of Picasso Way and Lagoon Way, the intersection of Picasso Way and Marina View Drive, the intersection of West Harbour Drive and Luckens Road and the intersection of Matisse Drive and Luckens Road, West Harbour, is recommended to improve road user safety.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the West Harbour - New Intersection Priority Controls report be received.
2. That in relation to the **INTERSECTION OF PICASSO WAY AND LAGOON WAY, WEST HARBOUR:**
 - (a) That, in accordance with the powers conferred by virtue of the Local Government Act 1974, the Land Transport Act 1998, the Transport Act 1962 and the Waitakere City Council Bylaw No.7, 1991 - Traffic, the following controls be now resolved to be specified and imposed, namely,
 - (i) that a new **GIVE WAY** control be put in place on **PICASSO WAY** at the point where it intersects with **LAGOON WAY**.
3. That in relation to the **INTERSECTION OF PICASSO WAY AND MARINA VIEW DRIVE, WEST HARBOUR:**
 - (a) That, in accordance with the powers conferred by virtue of the Local Government Act 1974, the Land Transport Act 1998, the Transport Act 1962 and the Waitakere City Council Bylaw No.7, 1991 - Traffic, the following controls be now resolved to be specified and imposed, namely,
 - (i) that a new **STOP** control be put in place on **PICASSO WAY** at the point where it intersects with **LAGOON WAY**.
4. That in relation to the **INTERSECTION OF WEST HARBOUR DRIVE AND LUCKENS ROAD, WEST HARBOUR:**
 - (a) That, in accordance with the powers conferred by virtue of the Local Government Act 1974, the Land Transport Act 1998, the Transport Act 1962 and the Waitakere City Council Bylaw No.7, 1991 - Traffic, the following controls be now resolved to be specified and imposed, namely,
 - (i) that a new **GIVE WAY** control be put in place on **WEST HARBOUR DRIVE** at the point where it intersects with **LUCKENS ROAD**.
5. That in relation to the **INTERSECTION OF MATISSE DRIVE AND LUCKENS ROAD, WEST HARBOUR:**
 - (a) That, in accordance with the powers conferred by virtue of the Local Government Act 1974, the Land Transport Act 1998, the Transport Act 1962 and the Waitakere City Council Bylaw No.7, 1991 - Traffic, the following controls be now resolved to be specified and imposed, namely,
 - (i) that a new **GIVE WAY** control be put in place on **MATISSE DRIVE** at the point where it intersects with **LUCKENS ROAD**.

6. That the appropriate signage and/or road markings, in accordance with the provisions of Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004 - Rule 54002 be hereby approved to be put in place to properly establish, delineate and record the said intersection priority controls.

Report prepared by: Paul Schischka, Transport Engineer.



17 WISELEY ROAD, WEST HARBOUR - SPEED HUMPS

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to the Massey Community Board on the monitoring carried out following the installation of speed humps in the northern part of Wiseley Road, West Harbour, and to seek a decision from the Board on whether to proceed with further speed humps in the southern part of Wiseley Road.

BACKGROUND

Speed humps have been installed in the northern part of Wiseley Road from Clark Road, Hobsonville to Suncrest Drive, West Harbour. As part of the approval to install these humps, the Massey Community Board requested that their effectiveness be monitored over a trial period following their installation.

Andrew Good and Graeme Barnard were delegated authority by the Massey Community Board to work with Council officers to review the results of the speed surveys and to approve the next stage in the consultation process.

A47

The speed counts indicate that vehicles in the northern part of Wiseley Road have on average reduced their speed by approximately 10kph following the installation of the speed humps. This has resulted in a substantially improved rate of compliance with the posted speed limit in the northern part of Wiseley Road. Graphs showing the speed distribution before and after the humps were installed are included in page A47.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The Council's 'Integrated Transport and Communication platform provides the strategic context for this report. The vision is for public transport and communications systems that provide fast, effective services, and for city travel facilitated by integrated, environmentally responsible, and innovative design, with a focus on meeting the essential needs of all, for access, communication, and safety.

The implementation of slow streets treatments focuses on addressing speed related safety problems and providing a more pedestrian friendly environment. However implementing slow streets has some negative consequences including impeding response times for emergency vehicles and reducing ride comfort for vehicle occupants including public transport.

ISSUES

A letter and a brief questionnaire were sent to 1,101 residents in Wiseley Road and the surrounding streets. There was a response rate of 42% (464 returns). Of these responses 45% of residents were in favour of installing speed humps in the southern part of Wiseley Road and 42% were opposed to the installation of speed humps in the southern part of Wiseley Road. The remaining 13% gave no answer to that particular question in the questionnaire.

The table below further breaks down the questionnaire responses into the areas from which they were received.

AREA	FOR	AGAINST
Residents of Wiseley Road (north of Suncrest Drive)	24	19
Residents of Wiseley Road (south of Suncrest Drive)	28	9
Residents of side streets west off Wiseley Road	72	73
Residents of side streets east off Wiseley Road	72	72
Residents of Hobsonville Road	9	18

The comments included in the responses to the questionnaire indicate that among the residents, strong views are held both in favour of and in opposition to the speed humps.

Common observations by those opposing the speed humps were:

- The humps slow some vehicles down too much
- The traffic noise is either as bad, or worse than before the humps were introduced
- The humps do not slow some vehicles down enough.

Common observations by those in favour of the speed humps were:

- The humps slow vehicles down adequately
- The traffic feels less threatening for pedestrians using Wiseley Road.

With regard to the question of installing further speed humps in the southern part of Wiseley Road, a commonly-raised concern was the impact of humps on the movement of boat trailers to and from the West Harbour Marina.

Options

Three options are presented for the Board's consideration, as follows:

Option 1 - No further humps on Wiseley Road.

Option 2 - Install humps on Wiseley Road between Suncrest Drive and Clearwater Cove (allows unimpeded access to the West Harbour Marina from the southern end of Wiseley Road), at an estimated cost of \$26,000.

Option 3 - Install humps on Wiseley Road between Suncrest Drive and Marina View Drive (this would require at least one speed hump to be travelled over by boat trailers moving to and from the Marina), at an estimated cost of \$30,000.

A47

The options are shown in the plans attached at page A47.

Should the Board elect to support either Option 2 or Option 3, then the detailed design will be referred back to the Board for approval.

RESOURCES

Option 2 or 3 would require additional funding that is not currently budgeted in the 2006-2016 Long Term Council Community Plan. Should the Board decide to endorse either Option 2 or 3, it will be necessary for the Board to recommend to the Long Term Council Community Plan and Annual Plan Special Committee that consideration for funding be put to the Long Term Council Community Plan 2009-2019.

CONCLUSION

The installation of speed humps in the northern part of Wiseley Road has substantially improved speed limit compliance.

However the views of residents are split on the relative benefits and disbenefits of the project. The majority of immediate residents of the southern part of Wiseley Road have indicated they are in favour of extending the project to the southern part of Wiseley Road, however the wider community in the surrounding streets is split almost evenly on the question of whether to extend the project.

However, funding has not been provided in the 2006-2016 Long Term Council Community Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Wiseley Road, West Harbour - Speed Humps report be received.
2. That the Massey Community Board determine whether it wishes to support either Option 2 or Option 3 as outlined in the Agenda on Wiseley Road between Suncrest Drive and Clearwater Cove.
3. That subject to recommendation 2, the Massey Community Board recommend to the Long Term Council Community Plan and Annual Plan Special Committee that additional funding be provided in the Long Term Council Community Plan 2009-2019.

Report prepared by: Adam Moller, Senior Transport Engineer: Planning and Design, Transport Assets.



18 BOARD MEMBERS' REPORTS

Provision has been made on this agenda for Board Members should they so wish to submit a report on their activities during the month in regard to matters within the scope and delegations of the Board. However, to comply with the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, no decision may be made on matters raised in Board Members' reports.

John Riddell

Keep Waitakere Beautiful

Rush Creek Reserve apparently is not able to host a Tree for Babies event, as currently the reserve is not laid out or planned, with no playgrounds and similar area to place Trees for Babies close to. Therefore Pooks Reserve will be the venue for this year's Trees for Babies. However Keep Waitakere Beautiful is able to arrange a community tree planting event at the Rush Creek Reserve.

Waitakere City Road Safety Steering Group

Our most recent meeting was held on the 16 February 2007, and the Police were in attendance and provided some very valuable information. Hopefully by the time of the Community Board meeting, I will have an email address for the police to which members can directly submit police-related traffic matters.

I raised the fact that Road Watch Reports, currently distributed by Neighbourhood Support (which is now in receivership), could be taken over by Community Boards and modified to provide Boards with a way of addressing the communities concerns with respect to road safety matters

As a way of perhaps addressing speed problems in the community, the Auckland City Council Speed Trailer is available for placement in areas, perhaps where speed humps have been suggested by the community as an alternative or as an interim measure.

I have circulated for members' interest, information about the speed trailers, and Speed Feedback signs that are able to be placed on lamp posts. Waitakere City Parking Services also have certificates and warning letters that they are issuing to people who park illegally around schools, or for parking safely.

MASSEY COMMUNITY BOARD APPOINTMENTS

OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS	APPOINTMENT
Auckland Region and Far North Community Board Association Executive Committee	Andrew Good
Keep Waitakere Beautiful Committee	John Riddell Bob Jessopp
Ranui Community Centre Committee	Cr Linda Cooper
Westpark Marina Working Group	
Council/Police Liaison Group	Cr Peter Chan Gayleen Maurice Bob Jessopp
Massey Community House Committee	Cr Linda Cooper
Waitemata Harbour Foreshore Reserves Management Plan Joint Subcommittee	Bob Jessopp Graeme Barnard
COUNCIL COMMITTEES	
Hearings Committee	Graeme Barnard Allen Davies
Community Sports Fund Allocation Subcommittee	John Riddell Gayleen Maurice
Street Events Subcommittee - Massey Ward	Bob Jessopp
Long Term Council Community Plan and Annual Plan Special Committee	Graeme Barnard John Riddell
Massey Ward Local Reserves Management Plan	Graeme Barnard Bob Jessopp Gayleen Maurice
Steering Group on Lincoln / Rathgar Joint Safer Routes and School Travel Plan	Gayleen Maurice Bob Jessopp

