

**AGENDA FOR A MEETING OF THE WAITAKERE COMMUNITY BOARD TO BE HELD AT
WAITAKERE CENTRAL, 6 HENDERSON VALLEY ROAD, HENDERSON, WAITAKERE,
ON TUESDAY, 6 MARCH 2007, COMMENCING AT 7.00 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 - AUCKLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL UPDATES	1
5	PUBLIC FORUM	2
6	CHAIRMAN'S REPORT	2
7	COMMITTEE SECRETARY'S REPORT	3
8	REPRESENTATION REVIEW - OUTCOME	8
9	2007 WAITAKERE CITY COUNCIL ELECTIONS: EARLY PROCESSING AND ORDERING OF CANDIDATES' NAMES ON VOTING DOCUMENTS	14
10	ELECTED MEMBERS REMUNERATION - REMUNERATION AUTHORITY DETERMINATION 2007/2008	16
11	NEW ZEALAND COMMUNITY BOARDS' CONFERENCE	21
12	BRUCE MCLAREN ROAD, HENDERSON - RELOCATION OF PEDESTRIAN CROSSING	23
13	CROWS ROAD, BIRDWOOD - NEW CENTRE LINE	25
14	WAITAKERE EVENTS UPDATE	27
15	KEEP WAITAKERE BEAUTIFUL TRUST 2007 TREES FOR BABIES	29
16	KAREKARE BEACH PUBLIC TOILET BLOCK DESIGN	31
17	STURGES ROAD RAIL OVERBRIDGE REPLACEMENT – CONSTRUCTION METHODOLOGY	34
18	PROPOSAL BY VECTOR LIMITED TO LOCATE ELECTRICITY TRANSFORMER ON GARDEN ROAD WALKWAY, MARINE PARADE, PIHA	37
19	BOARD MEMBERS' REPORTS	42

**AGENDA FOR A MEETING OF THE WAITAKERE COMMUNITY BOARD TO BE HELD AT
WAITAKERE CENTRAL, 6 HENDERSON VALLEY ROAD, HENDERSON, WAITAKERE,
ON TUESDAY, 6 MARCH 2007, COMMENCING AT 7.00 PM**

1 APOLOGIES



2 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes - Tuesday, 13 February 2007

RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Meeting of the Waitakere Community Board held on Tuesday, 13 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 - AUCKLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL UPDATES

Councillors Sandra Coney and Paul Walbran from the Auckland Regional Council will be in attendance to update the Board on Auckland Regional Council activities.



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

First I would like to thank Diane for Chairing the February meeting for me. I hope you all had a great Christmas and New Year break.

Boundary Review

I am overjoyed that the Commissioners acknowledged the need for the Waitakere Ward to retain 2 Councillors and though we will lose Western Heights and McLaren Park I believe it was inevitable as these areas are predominantly urbanised and can no longer be seen as rural or bush living. We will be welcoming a large portion of Titirangi into the Waitakere Ward at the next elections.

Annual Plan

This process has now begun and the initial deliberations are complete. Submissions can be made to Council from 26 March to 27 April and I would encourage you all to liaise with your Resident & Ratepayer and community groups to discuss their requirements and get their submissions in early.

I will be calling a meeting in the near future of Board members to draft the Waitakere Community Board submission. I would suggest if you have any updates or clarification of issues prior to this that you ask Jack Burton, Council's Executive Liaison Manager before he gets swamped.

Betty Hansen Celebrated

Betty turned 90 late last year and it was indeed a pleasure to acknowledge Betty at Council in February. Mayor Bob Harvey at my request invited Betty to join him, Councillors and Community Board Chairs for lunch, where she was acknowledged for the many years of service to the Waitakere Community Board and the Piha community. Betty is as sharp as ever and continues to serve on the Piha Residents and Ratepayers group.



Councillors Carl Harding & Penny Hulse, Community Board Chair Christine Shepherd, Mayor Bob Harvey and Betty Hansen.

Welcome Back Owena

I am sure you all join me in welcoming back our erstwhile Committee Secretary who took leave to have her lovely daughter 6 months ago.

Nigel has returned to South Africa and I would like to say what a pleasure it was to work with this young man. He had a great sense of humour and filled the gap admirably in Owena's absence. Councillor Hulse and I attended Nigel's farewell and enjoyed a wide variety of cultural culinary delights.



RECOMMENDATION

That the Chairman's Report be received.





Christine Shepherd, JP
CHAIRMAN



7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY'S REPORT


Issue	Comments	Reporting Council Officer
Claude Abel Pond Reserve, Piha Officer's Report	This project is still going through the consent process. Funding is currently provided in the 2007/2008 Annual Plan to carry out the physical works.	Tracey Hamilton  836 8000 Ext: 8969
Gorse Management for Piha Road, Piha 31 August 2004 Resolution No. 1619/2004	A contract to carry out the gorse control has been awarded. It is intended gorse removal will commence in early March 2007.	Helen Swinburne  836 8000 Ext: 8758

Issue	Comments	Reporting Council Officer
<p>Piha Domain Footbridge Officer's Report</p>	<p>The concept design will be developed into a detailed design and presented to the Bridge Evaluation Panel for their approval. A report will then be submitted to Waitakere Community Board and City Development. The intention is to carry out physical works in late 2007.</p>	<p>Debbie Chapman ☎ 836 8000 Ext: 8303</p>
<p>Waitakere River Realignment Officer's Report</p>	<p>The development of detailed designs and consent applications for the installation of bio-degradable sand bags and planting along the river bank adjacent to the Bethells Beach Surf Club is currently underway. The removal of sand will continue in order to prevent further erosion until the above-mentioned measures are in place.</p>	<p>Debbie Chapman ☎ 836 8000 Ext: 8303</p>
<p>Kitewaho Reserve Walkway Officer's Report</p>	<p>The resource consent lodged for vegetation clearance was granted in November 2006. The consent allows for only a simple bush track with a wood chip surface. Construction is anticipated to commence from early March 2007.</p>	<p>Andreas Lilley ☎ 836 8000 Ext: 8553</p>
<p>Swanson Station Park Development Officer's Report</p>	<p>Minor improvement works are continuing. The fence alongside the basketball court has been installed. A drinking fountain is to be installed in early March 2007. Other works also scheduled for completion in March 2007 are barriers at the skatepark entrance, skatepark boundary fencing adjoining Challenge Petrol Station, informal seating around the skatepark and additional planting.</p>	<p>Andreas Lilley ☎ 836 8000 Ext: 8553</p>
<p>Community Board Minor Parks Projects Officer's Report</p>	<p>The status of each project is as follows:</p> <p>Reserve on corner of Bruce McLaren Road and Posa Avenue - Planting along the fence line will take place in the planting season (April/May 2007)</p> <p>Swanson Station Park - The basketball court fence has been installed and the drinking fountain will be installed in early March 2007.</p> <p>Te Henga Reserve - A meeting was held with the community to confirm the project details. The project will entail the installation of furniture/stones around the existing bike track.</p>	<p>Laura Mitchell/ Katharine Slack ☎ 836 8000 Ext: 8779</p>

Issue	Comments	Reporting Council Officer
	<p>The furniture is to be made/provided by the community, consistent with what already exists by the car park. Physical works are scheduled to be carried out in April/May 2007.</p> <p>Les Waygood Park - The path link from the hall to the carpark will be installed in early March 2007.</p>	
<p>Les Waygood Reserve - Piha Preschool Playground Sunshade</p> <p>4 October 2005 Resolution No. 1847/2005</p>	<p>A building consent has been granted and works will be completed by early March 2007.</p>	<p>David Barker  836 8000 Ext: 8306</p>
<p>Piha Domain Playground Upgrade</p> <p>3 October 2006 Resolution No. 1902/2006</p> <p>Waitakere Community Board</p> <p>5 October 2006 Resolution No. 1973/2006</p> <p>City Development Committee</p>	<p>Resource and building consents are have been obtained. The project is currently going through a public tender process. The intention is to carry out the physical works in March/April 2007.</p>	<p>Tracey Hamilton  836 8000 Ext: 8969</p>
<p>Bethells Beach Wastewater System Replacement/Surf Club Connection</p> <p>Officer's Report</p>	<p>The City Development Committee approved the combined wastewater system at no cost to the Surf Club and also authorised funding for the connection of the Surf Club from funding for the Bethells Beach public toilet wastewater system. A resource consent has been lodged and it is anticipated physical works will be carried out in March/April 2007.</p>	<p>Tracey Hamilton  836 8000 Ext: 8969</p>
<p>Bethells Beach Water Safety Signage</p> <p>Officer's Report</p>	<p>A community working party has been established for this project. The design for the signs were presented for public comment at the Bethells Community Day held in January 2007. The feedback received was positive. It is anticipated the signs will be installed in March 2007.</p>	<p>Tracey Hamilton  836 8000 Ext: 8969</p>

Issue	Comments	Reporting Council Officer
<p>Community Hall Review Update</p> <p>Board Members Request</p>	<p>The review of the nineteen community halls in the Waitakere area which was undertaken in a collaborative approach between independent contractor Westies Waitakere and Council officers from Leisure Services, Property Assets and Health and Safety has been completed. An outcome of the review is the Waitakere City Community Halls Reference document which outlines the key identifiers of each community hall so that updated information and details are available on the halls for use throughout Council and Council Committees. The document is being presented to the Finance and Operational Performance Committee as an agenda report for the 12 March, 2007 meeting to request the Committee's approval for releasing the document so it can be made publicly available.</p> <p>Once the document is approved by the Finance and Operational Performance Committee, the next step (which is primarily driven by Council's Property Assets team) will be to conduct an internal analysis of each particular hall in order to identify key priority areas for Council's focus. This will result in a systematic approach towards addressing issues in community owned halls and an analysis report and action plan will be created for each of the nineteen Council owned Community Halls. All recommendations resulting from this next step analysis stage for any particular hall will be presented to the relevant Community Board for approval.</p> <p>The overall intended outcome for this Community Hall Review is to create a proactive, instead of reactive, asset management plan for Council on each of the City's community halls.</p>	<p>Kimberly Rees</p> <p> 836 8000</p> <p>Ext: 8559</p>
<p>Trial of Water-filled Barriers at Paremuka Reserve</p> <p>5 December 2006</p> <p>Resolution No. 2319/2006</p>	<p>The barriers were placed in Hillwell Drive before Christmas in response to the petition presented at the December 2006 meeting of the Waitakere Community Board complaining of anti-social behaviour in the parking bays on this street.</p>	<p>Sue Liddell</p> <p> 836 8000</p> <p>Ext: 8736</p>

Issue	Comments	Reporting Council Officer
	At the end of summer Council officers will contact nearby residents to see if they were effective at resolving their concerns. If they were effective the options for permanent solutions will be looked into. A report will come back to the Community Board at that time.	

REPORTS PENDING			
Subject	Date Requested	Report Due	Reporting Officer
Community Hall Review	12 September 2005 Resolution No. 1737/2005	Further updates will be provided to the Board on the basis of requirement.	Kimberly Rees  836 8000 Ext: 8559
Piha / Karekare and Huia / Cornwallis Local Water Plans	September 2004 Environmental Management Committee	Further updates will be provided to the Board on the basis of requirement.	Tony Miguel  836 8000 Ext: 8294
Trial of Water-filled Barriers at Paremuka Reserve	5 December 2006 Resolution No. 2319/2006	Further updates will be provided to the Board on the basis of requirement.	Sue Liddell  836 8000 Ext: 8736
Project Twin Streams Four Monthly Progress Report	2 August 2005 Resolution No. 1468/2005 Last updated 31 October 2006	3 April 2007	Tony Miguel  836 8000 Ext: 8294
Kiwi Trikers Move from Corban Green Reserve	Community Board Member's Request	3 April 2007	Kimberly Rees  836 8000 Ext: 8559
Huia and Whatipu Road Speed Limits and Safety Issues	Community Board Member's Request	3 April 2007	Sue Liddell  836 8000 Ext: 8736
Little Huia Boat Ramp Facility Current Condition and Potential to be Upgraded to be an All-Tide, All Weather Boat Ramp Facility	Community Board Member's Request	3 April 2007	Grant Jennings  836 8000 Ext: 8537

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee Secretary's Report for Tuesday, 6 March 2007 be received.

Report prepared by: Stephen McDaid, Committee Secretary.



8 REPRESENTATION REVIEW - OUTCOME

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to inform the Waitakere 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 3 years to at least 1 every 6 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 consultants 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 3 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 3 wards, with a Mayor and 14 Councillors. Community Boards would be established with boundaries aligned with those for each of the 3 wards and each Community Board would comprise of 6 Elected Members, elected at large within the ward concerned and 3 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 4 wards;
 - Henderson (5 Councillors);
 - Massey (3 Councillors);
 - New Lynn (5 Councillors);
 - Waitakere (1 Councillor).
- (c) That community boards be retained for each of the 4 wards.
- (d) That the Massey, Henderson and New Lynn Community Boards each consist of 5 Elected Members elected at large within the ward concerned and 2 appointed Members, and that the Waitakere Community Board consists of 6 Elected Members elected at large from the ward and 1 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 2 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.

A1-A13

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 A1 to A13.

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	+8.4%
New Lynn	58,210	4	14,552	+992.25	+7.37%
Waitakere	24,990	2	12,495	-1057.75	-7.8%
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 4 Councillors for each ward;
- The Waitakere Ward will be represented by 2 Councillors instead of 1.

A14 The boundaries for these 4 wards are indicated on the map attached to this agenda at page A14.

Massey Ward

A15 The Massey Ward, as indicated on the map attached to this agenda at page A15, will be the area generally encompassing Whenuapai, Hobsonville, West Harbour, Herald Island, Massey and Ranui (North of Universal Drive).

Henderson Ward

A16 The Henderson Ward, as indicated on the map attached to this agenda at page A16, 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

A17 The New Lynn Ward, as indicated on the map attached to this agenda at page A17, 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

A18 The Waitakere Ward, as indicated on the map attached to this agenda at page A18, 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 4 Community Boards will cover the same areas as the Council wards.

The membership of the Community Board for each community shall comprise of 5 Elected Members plus 2 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 (4 wards) is generally in-line with the earlier "4 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 "4 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 “4 ward model” and the communities of interest work lies with the boundaries between the 3 urban wards. The urban ward boundaries appear to reflect a desire to ensure equal representation (4 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 “3 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 Waitakere 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.



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 be received.*
- 2. That it be recommended to the Council that the returned voting documents for the 2007 Waitakere City 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 ELECTED MEMBERS REMUNERATION - REMUNERATION AUTHORITY DETERMINATION 2007/2008

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to advise the 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'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.

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.

A25-A28

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 A25 to A26. For comparative purposes a calculation spreadsheet showing the remuneration distribution on the same basis as the 2005 calculation is attached at pages A27 to A28.

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 have jurisdiction to make the determination and have 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 Chairing 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, resolutions 144 to 147/2007; or
 - b) Disagrees with the Council decision, 14 February 2007, resolutions 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.



11 NEW ZEALAND COMMUNITY BOARDS' CONFERENCE

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to obtain nominations of Members of the Waitakere 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 Waitakere 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 Board's 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 Board's 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 Waitakere 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, CA Shepherd, DJ Goodley, SF Davies, MC Davis and KJP Witten-Hannah 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 to the Agenda report at pages A29 to 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 Board's 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 Waitakere 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 Waitakere 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 CA Shepherd, DJ Goodley, SF Davies, MC Davis and KJP Witten-Hannah be nominated to attend the New Zealand Community Boards' Conference to be held at the Telstra Clear Events Centre, Manukau City from 7 to 9 June 2007.

3. That the Waitakere 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 BRUCE MCLAREN ROAD, HENDERSON - RELOCATION OF PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to seek the Waitakere Community Board's approval to relocate a pedestrian crossing on Bruce McLaren Road in the vicinity of Bruce McLaren Intermediate School and install broken yellow lines in the area of the relocated pedestrian crossing.

BACKGROUND

Bruce McLaren Intermediate School have contacted the Council and requested the existing location of the pedestrian crossing on Bruce McLaren Road be reviewed. The school patrols the crossing and has been experiencing some difficulties.

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.

Provision of appropriate pedestrian facilities is an essential part of providing access and safety for pedestrians.

ISSUES

Description

Bruce McLaren Road is a collector road and carries approximately 12,000 vehicles per day. It is a relatively straight road with a carriageway width of 11 metres, and runs between Railside Avenue and West Coast Road.

The existing pedestrian crossing is not in an ideal location. Although sight-lines are good in both directions, it is in close proximity to Heremai Road and several busy driveways. Children and the supervising adult manning the lollipop signs have to make judgements about gaps in Bruce McLaren Road traffic, as well as being aware of turning movements to and from these driveways. Ideally, the pedestrian crossing would be shifted to a location further from these distractions.

Accident Statistics

A search of the Land Transport New Zealand database shows that in the past five years there was one reported incident at the crossing, involving minor injury to a child.

Proposed Works

The recommended solution is to relocate the pedestrian crossing west of the vehicle entrance to Bruce McLaren Intermediate School. A pedestrian refuge island is proposed, which in particular will prevent eastbound drivers from using the flush median when overtaking left-turning vehicles into the school; this is a current issue for the driveway into the corner shops at the existing pedestrian crossing location.

A35

The location of the proposed changes is indicated at page A35.

Bruce McLaren Intermediate School supports the proposal. Affected residents were consulted in January 2007, and no responses were received.

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 works are estimated to cost \$25,000 and can be funded from the 2006/2007 Annual Plan Minor Safety budget.

CONCLUSION

The relocation of the pedestrian crossing to a more suitable location which is further from driveways and side roads will improve its operation and pedestrian safety.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Bruce McLaren Road, Henderson – Relocation of Pedestrian Crossing report be received.
2. That in relation to **BRUCE MCLAREN ROAD, HENDERSON:**
 - (a) That all existing parking restrictions or limitations currently applicable to **BRUCE MCLAREN ROAD** imposed by any prior resolution (including resolutions of any former authority), that are affected, or superseded, or replaced by part (b) of this resolution, cease to have any force and effect as from the date of this determination provided however that any current enforcement action by way of prosecution arising from, or infringement notice issued in relation to, any non-compliance with or breach of any such parking restriction or limitation be authorised to be concluded in the normal manner.
 - (b) 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 the existing **PEDESTRIAN CROSSING** located in **BRUCE MCLAREN ROAD**, 140 metres north of the intersection with **SILVER STONE PLACE** be disestablished.
 - (ii) That in **BRUCE MCLAREN ROAD** at a point 92 metres north of the intersection with **SILVER STONE PLACE** a new **PEDESTRIAN CROSSING** be put in place.
 - (iii) on the west kerb line of **BRUCE MCLAREN ROAD** starting from a point 52 metres north of the point where the kerb line meets the north kerb line of **SILVER STONE PLACE** and extending to a point a further 83 metres north along the kerb line a new **NO STOPPING AT ALL TIMES** control be put in place.
3. That a new **PEDESTRIAN REFUGE ISLAND** be installed at the **PEDESTRIAN CROSSING** located in **BRUCE MCLAREN ROAD**, 92 metres north of the intersection with **SILVER STONE PLACE**.
 4. 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 pedestrian crossing, parking limitations and restrictions.

Report prepared by: Duncan Campbell, Senior Transport Engineer.



13 **CROWS ROAD, BIRDWOOD - NEW CENTRE LINE**

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to seek the Waitakere Community Board's approval for a new centre line in Crows Road, Birdwood.

BACKGROUND

A resident of Crows Road has contacted the Council with concerns regarding vehicles that fail to keep to the left side of the road. The resident is concerned that vehicles are crossing over the centre of the carriageway and traveling at a high speed. The resident has asked Council to consider installing a centre line in Crows Road.

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.

Centre lines can be applied to calm traffic on roads by restricting vehicles to the left hand side of the road.

ISSUES

Crows Road is located in a rural area and is classified as a local road in the District Plan. It has an estimated traffic volume of 160 to 225 vehicles per day.

Crows Road has a narrow carriageway the width of which varies between 5.3 and 5.6 metres along its length. The Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004 states that centre lines may be installed in roads where the carriageway is 5.1 metres or more wide.

On narrow roads without centre lines there is a tendency for drivers to travel along the centre of the carriageway rather than staying to the left. This can present a potential collision hazard with traffic travelling in the opposite direction, particularly on curves in the road where forward sight distance is limited.

Installation of a centre line is an effective measure in these situations. The line reminds drivers of the requirement to keep left and shows drivers when they are entering into the area used by opposing traffic.

Installing a centre line can also reduce operating speeds in a road. On average, drivers travel faster on wider roads and slower on narrow roads. By narrowing the available traffic lane to one side of the carriageway, drivers can be encouraged to reduce their speed.

RESOURCES

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

CONCLUSION

The proposal to install a new centre line on Crows Road is recommended to improve road user safety.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Crows Road, Birdwood - New Centre Line report be received.
2. That in relation to **CROWS ROAD, BIRDWOOD**:
 - (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 along the entire length of **CROWS ROAD** a new centre line be put in place along the centre of the sealed carriageway.
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 centre line marking.

Report prepared by: Paul Schischka, Transport Engineer.



14 **WAITAKERE EVENTS UPDATE**

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to update Members of the Waitakere Community Board on events happening within the Waitakere 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 that 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 staff 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 are 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 Waitakere 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 being 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 workstream's around the Rugby World Cup in 2011.

Event	Date	Comments
Vodafone Surf Sessions	21 October 2006	An extremely popular event with a reported 10,000 people attending. Numbers were down on last year principally because of bad surf and weather conditions. The event received a high media profile (locally and internationally). Council's contribution to this event was \$25,000.
Flava Out West	25 November 2006	A free family 2 day event run by the Ezekiel 33 Trust which provides performance opportunities for school kapa haka groups. Attended by an estimated audience of 7,500 people. Held at Parris Park.
Waitakere Christmas Festival	2 December 2006	The annual 'westie' Christmas Festival held at Parris Park. Each year numbers increase and this year around 10,000 to 12,000 people attended. Council's contribution to this event is \$25,000.
Thermatech Head to Head	10 December 2006	The North Island Version of the famous South Island Coast to Coast, raced from the Tasman Sea at Huia to the Waitemata Harbour, this is a test of athletic ability. 75 participants in 2006 and around 150 spectators mark this event as a growing one for the city.
Swanson Christmas Parade	15 December 2006	The annual Swanson Christmas Parade. One of the smaller parades around the city it is none-the-less well supported by local residents.
SLSNZ Junior Surf Carnival	14 January 2007	The first of the surf carnivals for the summer season. Attendance continues to grow for this popular sport.

In addition to these events, there have been a number of markets, private sports events, ARC and Ark in the Park Walks through the Waitakere Ranges.

An events listing of upcoming events is now e-mailed to all Community Board Members each month. Significant events that are scheduled for the Waitakere area for the balance of summer are:

24 February	Piha Big Wave Surf Boat Classic at Piha;
25 February	Waitakere Sounds Concert at Huia Domain;
4 March	Slow and Steamy at Firlongs Nursery in Carter Road, Oratia;
4 March	Waitakere City Wild Wild West Cycle Tour (Waitakere Ranges);
10 March	Corona Super 16 Surf Series at Piha;
11 March	SLSNR Junior Life Saving Carnival at Bethells Beach;
17 March	Billabong Grom Surf Series, Piha Beach;
17 March	Whanau Day Out at Parrs Park;
17 March	Art on the Beach, North End of Piha Beach;
24 March	Wildcoast Auckland Surfing Championships, Piha Beach.

RESOURCES

Council currently have a general events fund in 2006/2007 of \$60,000 which is allocated across the city for small events which 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 & Special Projects Manager.



15 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 Waitakere Ward recommended as this year's site for the annual 'Trees for Babies' community planting and also requests 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 12th 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 Waitakere Ward is proposed to take place on Saturday, 19 May 2007 from 11.00 am to 1.00 pm and the recommended park is Hindmarsh Green. 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 Hindmarsh Street, Ohira Place, Imperial Place and Hinerau Street asking for comment. Two properties were personally visited as they border the proposed site. Both were happy with the proposal and are happy to help out on the day. There was no other response to the proposal from the neighbourhood.

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 Hindmarsh Green be accepted as the confirmed venue for the 2007 'Trees for Babies' event in the Waitakere Ward.
3. That an Elected Member from the Waitakere Community Board be nominated to speak at the 'Trees for Babies' event.

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



16 KAREKARE BEACH PUBLIC TOILET BLOCK DESIGN

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to seek the approval of the Waitakere Community Board on its preferred design of the new public toilet at Karekare Beach.

BACKGROUND

At the October 2006 meeting of the Waitakere Community Board a report was presented outlining the proposed options for the location of the new toilet block at Karekare Beach. The two options presented included utilising the existing toilet block site for an upgraded or new toilet block, or placing a new block in between the grass and metal carpark. At the October 2006 meeting of the Waitakere Community Board the Board resolved the following:

“That the Waitakere Community Board approves the building of a new toilet block in the car park as per option two in the Agenda report.”

1906/2006

A36

An aerial map showing the site of the approved location is attached at page A36. Resource consent for the wastewater discharge system and disposal has been approved by the Auckland Regional Council.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

This project contributes to Council's Urban and Rural Villages platform where the objective is to enhance the quality of public spaces in rural villages.

The 2005 Draft Parks and Open Space Strategy requires that toilets should be provided at destination type parks and open spaces where people have travelled some distance and do not have access to any other toilet facilities.

ISSUES

Consultation Process

A mail drop and mail out was undertaken in early November 2006 to inform and obtain feedback from the Karekare community and ratepayers on two proposed toilet designs. The mail out area covered in the consultation process included all property owners and residents on Karekare Road, Watchmans Road, Lone Kauri Road, and Waikarekare Lane. The mail out included a submission form seeking comments and feedback by the closing date of 28 November 2006.

A37-A84

From the consultation undertaken a total of forty eight (48) submissions were received. A common theme from the submissions was a desire for more sustainable materials to be used in the construction of the block, and for the design to reflect the special character of Karekare. A copy of all submissions received are attached at pages A37 to A84.

All feedback received was to be reported to the Waitakere Community Board at the meeting on 5 December 2006 to assist in its decision making and adoption of a preferred design. However there was a delay to presenting the report at this time to allow for further refinement of the proposed designs to reflect the feedback from the community.

Design

A85-A87

The two design options (Option One and Option Two) originally considered for the new toilet block and consulted with the community are attached at pages A85 to A87. Both design options feature tilt slab concrete walls and provide two all accessible unisex toilets, and two standard unisex toilets. There is also a small changing room included in each option. There are no differences in amenities and in the layout of the footprints. The distinguishing difference between Option One and Option Two is the design of the roof line. Of the forty eight (48) submissions received a total of forty one (41) submissions preferred the 'wave roof' design, with four (4) submissions preferring neither.

Option One and Option Two both incorporate the following sustainable features to reduce vandalism, graffiti and ongoing costs to Council:

- Tilt slab concrete walls;
- All fixtures and fittings are stainless steel;
- All doors are steel;
- Minimal use of timber to reduce fire risk;
- All services (plumbing and electrical) are hidden in the walls;
- Use of vandalite or similar vandalism resistant lighting;
- Coastal grade Colour Steel roofing to reduce the impact of the harsh coastal environment.

A88-A90

Option One and Option Two were provided to the community for feedback and input into the design. The feedback received identified several design considerations including materials to be used and a reduction in the facilities including the elimination of one toilet and any changing facilities to reduce the potential impact on car parking availability. This change in design is Option Three attached at pages A88 to A89 for consideration. One significant feature of this additional design is the use of macrocarpa timber slats for the wall construction. All other materials used would be consistent with the specifications above. Another feature of the revised design is the reduction in floor area of the toilet. The new floor layout for the design would include only one accessible unisex toilet, one male and female standard toilet, and no changing room. An aerial photo displaying the footprint area of the amended design is attached at page A90.

A summary of all features of all three designs is summarised in the table below:

	Advantages	Disadvantages
Option One Wing Roof	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roof design reflecting the harsh West Coast coastal environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central gutter and roof angles prone to collection of debris and vandalism. • Less space below roof line to facilitate ventilation and natural lighting.
Option Two Wave Roof	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roof design reflecting the rolling swells of the West Coast. • Maximum use of natural lighting and ventilation through the spaces provided below the roof line. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More exposed timber beams and joists in roof increasing the risk of fire damage.
Additional Option Three Macrocarpa walls with wave roof	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent style with other West Coast beach toilets • Smaller footprint area reducing impact on overflow carpark area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More exposed timber slats, beams and joists in overall structure increasing the risk of fire damage.

Although a detailed cost estimate will not be completed on the preferred design until the detailed design phase, initial cost estimates indicate each option can be achieved within the project budget available.

There are opportunities for local artists to enhance the appearance of any block with a mural or art piece on the blank walls. An art design will be developed jointly with local artists and Council and reported to Waitakere Community Board for approval when a concept has been developed.

The final decision of the Waitakere Community Board on the Karekare Beach public toilet concept design will be communicated back to Karekare residents and property owners.

Following the approval of the Waitakere Community Board, the preferred concept design will then progress into detailed design to obtain building consent.

It is intended to carry out physical works in the 2007/2008 summer construction period subject to Council resource and building consent approval. Physical works are expected to be completed by February 2008.

Treatment Plant

The proposed wastewater treatment plant associated with the toilet will be substantially located underneath the toilet building to minimise the encroachment onto the grass overflow parking area. The inspection lids will be positioned at the rear (northwest) of the block and will rise 250mm above the ground to restrict the entry of any surface water. Planting will be installed around the lids and along the rear of the block to mitigate the effects of the lids and limit graffiti to the rear wall of the block.

The treatment plant comprises of:

- 1 x 9 cubic metre buffer tank with vortex solids pump, alarm system and carbon filter;
- 1 x 5.6 cubic metre septic tank with "Orenco Biotube" outlet filter and carbon filter;
- 1 x 4.5 cubic metre recirculation tank with pump and alarm system;
- 1 x 3 square metre "Orenco Systems" recirculating textile filter;
- 1 x 4.5 cubic metre treated effluent tank with pump and alarm system;
- 1 x UV disinfection unit;
- 1 x remote monitoring system.

Decision Making

The original Option One and Option Two concept designs have been presented to the Karekare community for consultation. These options have been assessed against relevant criteria in accordance with Section 77 of the Local Government Act 2002. An additional design has been developed in response to the submissions on the two original designs.

RESOURCES

The sum of \$376,268 has been allocated in the 2006/2007 Annual Plan to undertake the Karekare Beach toilet block and wastewater treatment and disposal system upgrade. This budget excluding professional services fees and consent costs incurred up to 30 June 2007 will be carried over to the 2007/2008 financial year.

CONCLUSION

Two concept design options (Option One and Option Two) have been communicated to the Karekare community for their feedback. Following this feedback an additional concept has been developed that encompasses a reduced floor area and alternative wall materials. The Karekare Beach public toilet concept options have been designed to reduce vandalism and ongoing costs to Council.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Karekare Beach Public Toilet Block Design report be received.
2. That the Waitakere Community Board approve one of the three proposed designs as the preferred design for the new Karekare Beach public toilet block.

Report prepared by: Andreas Lilley, Parks Project Development Officer.



17 STURGES ROAD RAIL OVERBRIDGE REPLACEMENT – CONSTRUCTION METHODOLOGY

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to provide the Waitakere Community Board with information of the construction methodology for the re build 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 Waitakere 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 - “3 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 re construction 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

A91-A93

Consideration has been given to a number of options. The schematic options are shown at pages A91 to A93. These have been short listed to two possible options as follows:

Preferred Option: Upright 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: 4 weekends with no crossings at all plus 5 weeks when only single lane crossing is possible.

This option provides for a bridge built from two longitudinal upright 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 upright beams are craned in place at an early stage. These upright 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 2 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 5 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; • Pedestrian traffic has to be diverted to

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

COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

A94-A97

Public Affairs have drafted a communications plan that is attached at pages A94 to A97. 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 Waitakere 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.



18 PROPOSAL BY VECTOR LIMITED TO LOCATE ELECTRICITY TRANSFORMER ON GARDEN ROAD WALKWAY, MARINE PARADE, PIHA

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to inform the New Lynn Community Board about a decision made by Council officers under delegation from Council for Vector Limited (Vector) to locate an electricity transformer near the entry to Garden Road Walkway, Marine Parade, Piha (reserve and walkway) and to outline the terms of the licence.

BACKGROUND

In December 2006 Vector made a request to Council to locate an electricity transformer on the Reserve, near the entry from Marine Parade, and to under-ground electricity lines along the length of the reserve (proposal).

Vector advised Council that various residents of Piha had requested the under-grounding of over-head power lines within the vicinity of the reserve. Council understands that the affected residents are contributing to Vector's costs for this process.

The Service Manager: Parks & Open Spaces has provided approval to the proposal on 8 December 2006 subject to the terms of licence proposed to be granted to Vector. The approval was given in accordance with Council delegations as set out below.

This report therefore sets out the proposal for the information of the Board.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The objective of Council's strategic platform for urban and rural villages is for Waitakere to be a vibrant and enjoyable place to live, work and play. This is intended to be achieved by creating attractive urban places that encourage growth and economic development with minimal environment impacts.

The proposal by Vector to underground existing over-head lines is supported by the objectives of this platform. The under-grounding of the cables will increase the amenity value of Marine Parade by reducing the visual impacts of over-head lines. This will help to create an attractive urban space.

The draft Parks and Open Space Strategy 2005 states that parks are often seen as convenient locations for infrastructure that are not compatible with residential areas for example, among other things, power lines.

It is considered however that by removing the power poles and lines and replacing with a transformer that this will reduce the number of infrastructure and "clutter" on the walkway. The under-grounding of power lines will reduce the visibility of power lines and also the need for power poles.

The draft Parks and Open Space Strategy 2005 sets out a number of criteria to assess the location of infrastructure on reserves and states that such approval will be determined on a case by case basis. An assessment of the criteria is set out in Issues below.

ISSUES

Delegation to Approve

The approval for the proposal was given by the Service Manager: Parks & Open Spaces. The approval was provided under delegation 64 to Council officers, in respect of parks and reserves. This delegation allows the Service Manager: Parks & Open Spaces to approve procedures under the Reserves Act 1977, which are not otherwise delegated.

It is considered that there are no other specific delegations in respect of this proposal – and therefore delegation 64 applies to this proposal.

Draft Parks and Open Space Strategy 2005 – Assessment Criteria

The relevant criteria to assess the location of infrastructure on parks and reserves that are outlined in the Draft Parks and Open Space Strategy are:

- that all other options have been investigated;
- that there are no adverse effects on the use and enjoyment of the park;
- must not affect maintenance costs or ease of maintenance;
- no more than two infrastructure items allowed on local parks;
- that park entrances or views are not obscured;
- that any adverse effects are mitigated through for example planting or financial contribution.

The criteria were considered as follows:

(a) Other Options

All other options for locating the transformer have been considered by Vector and Council. Vector initially proposed to place the transformer on the road reserve (near the entry to Garden Road Walkway) in accordance with the Electricity Act 1992. This Act provides that local authorities may not charge electricity providers (such as Vector) to locate electrical works on road reserves.

However, the residents adjacent to the proposed location within the road reserve were unhappy with the proposal. Council understands that residents considered that the transformer would have a negative impact on the visual amenity of the road reserve given that it is adjacent to Piha beach.

On the basis that the affected residents objected to the proposal to locate the transformer on the road reserve, the proposal to locate the transformer on Garden Road Walkway was presented by Vector to Council.

(b) No Adverse Effects on Use and Enjoyment

It is considered that there will be no adverse effects on the use and enjoyment of the walkway. The dimensions of the transformer are no greater than 1.2 metres wide and 2 metres long. The walkway is approximately 4 metres wide. This leaves a clearance area of 2.8 metres. Vector has also stated that the transformer will need to be placed 400mm from the boundary.

It is considered based on the above that this is sufficient area for pedestrians to use the walkway.

(c) Must Not Affect Maintenance and Costs

There are no additional maintenance costs incurred through this proposal.

(d) No More than Two Infrastructure Items

There is one transformer on another part of the reserve and approximately three power poles within the reserve as shown on the plan attached at page A98. Council understands that Vector proposes to remove two power poles from the reserve (also shown on the same plan) and a number of power poles located on adjacent privately owned land.

This means that within the immediate vicinity of the proposed transformer that there will only be the proposed transformer.

It is considered that this complies with this requirement of the Draft Strategy on the basis that the other transformer is located at a significant distance from the proposed transformer and similarly with the remaining power poles.

(e) Does not Obscure Views or Entrance

A condition of locating the transformer on the walkway is that it does not obscure views into the walkway or the entrance to the walkway. It is therefore proposed that the transformer is located approximately three metres into the walkway and butts up to the side of the walkway so that it does not obscure views in to the walkway.

A98

(f) Mitigate Adverse Effects

A term of the licence will require Vector to plant around the transformer (with Council approved plants) – unless the costs for this are incorporated within the fees proposed to be charged to Vector.

The assessment criteria in the draft Parks and Open Space Strategy will be incorporated in to the licence.

Proposed Agreement between Council and Vector

The licence to Vector will allow Vector to locate a transformer on the agreed area of the reserve for a specified term. The main terms of the licence will be:

- that Vector will pay a licence fee to be determined using the valuation obtained by Council, or provide a specified benefit, to Council in consideration for Council granting the licence. The valuation obtained has been determined in line with fees that other local authorities charge for granting similar licences to utility providers;
- that Council approves the exact location of the transformer and dimensions of the transformer;
- that Vector will indemnify Council against any damage or loss resulting directly or indirectly from any act or omission on the part of Vector;
- that iwi consultation is obtained – it is noted that Ngati Whatua has stated that it has no interests in this proposal however Te Kawerau A Maki have not yet confirmed its interests;
- that on completion of under-grounding the cables that Vector will ensure the reserve is clean and tidy and all waste has been removed;
- that the transformer is painted a colour that enhances the natural environment of the location and is approved by Council;
- that Vector undertakes a planting programme to mitigate any adverse effects of the transformer, unless it is agreed that Council will recover these costs through the licence fees.

Council staff are in the processes of negotiating these terms with Vector and the above terms have not yet been finalised.

As well, Council has a current relationship agreement with Vector. Under this agreement Council and Vector have agreed to work together co-operatively to ensure good relations are maintained between the parties in relation to any works affecting the parties. To this end, the relationship agreement between Vector and Council may have some impact on the final terms negotiated between the parties in respect of the proposal.

Electricity Act 1992

The Electricity Act 1992 states in section 30 that local authorities, among others, may not charge electricity providers to construct works in respect of any roads. The meaning of road is defined to include road reserves.

This means that Council may not charge fees for electricity providers locating transformers or other electricity works on road reserves.

However, Council may enter in to agreements with electricity providers on terms agreed between Council and the electricity provider in respect of reserves and Council owned land.

Reserves Act 1977 – Process

Garden Road Walkway has been vested in Council in accordance with the Reserves Act 1977. Under section 48 of Reserves Act Council may grant to Vector a licence to locate a transformer on the reserve.

A public notice procedure is required to be carried out under section 48, unless:

- the reserve is not likely to be materially altered or permanently damaged; and
- the rights of the public in respect of the reserve are not likely to be permanently affected,

by the proposed location of the transformer.

It is considered that the walkway as a whole is not likely to be materially altered or permanently damaged by the transformer. There will be sufficient area adjacent to the transformer for pedestrians and small vehicles to pass. In addition, there will be a term of around ten [10] years imposed in the licence with regular reviews. For these reasons it was considered that the rights of the public are not likely to be permanently affected.

On this basis a public notice procedure is not required to be undertaken.

The Department of Conservation has advised that the approval of the Minister of Conservation is not required on the basis that the proposal is an “existing use”.

Decision Making Process

This decision was made in accordance with the requirements of sections 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81 and 82 of the Local Government Act 2002.

RESOURCES

The resource implications to Council in respect of the proposal include the costs of obtaining a valuation, and staff time for negotiating the terms of the licence and drafting the licence.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with delegation 64 the Service Manager: Parks & Open Spaces has approved a proposal to grant Vector a licence to locate a transformer on the reserve in accordance with section 48 of the Reserves Act 1977. As part of this approval the terms outlined in the report must be included in the licence granted by Council to Vector.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Proposal by Vector Limited To Locate Electricity Transformer on Garden Road Walkway, Marine Parade, Piha report be received.

Report prepared by: Huia Kingi, Legal Officer, Leisure Services



19 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.

WAITAKERE COMMUNITY BOARD APPOINTMENTS

OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS	APPOINTMENT
Auckland Region and Far North Community Board Association Executive Committee	Christine Shepherd Diane Goodley
Waitakere Citizen Advice Bureau	Diane Goodley
Keep Waitakere Beautiful	Christine Shepherd Sharon Davies (alternate)
Huia/Cornwallis Local Water Agenda Steering Group	Robin Taylor Diane Goodley
McLaren Park Community Project Steering Group	Diane Goodley
Piha/Karekare Local Water Agenda Steering Group	Kubi Witten-Hannah Robin Taylor
The Weedfree Waitakere Trust	Diane Goodley
West Coast Plan Liaison Group	Monique Davis
Council/Police Liaison Group	Kubi Witten-Hannah
COUNCIL COMMITTEES	
Community Sport Fund Allocation Subcommittee	Monique Davis Diane Goodley
Hearings Committee	Robin Taylor Kubi Witten-Hannah
Kay Road Balefill Site Management Committee	Sharon Davies
Street Events Subcommittee	Monique Davis

