



**AGENDA FOR AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE MASSEY COMMUNITY BOARD  
TO BE HELD IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, 6 WAIPAREIRA AVENUE, LINCOLN,  
WAITAKERE CITY, ON WEDNESDAY, 2 JUNE 2004,  
COMMENCING AT 7.30 PM.**

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b><u>ITEM</u></b>		<b><u>PAGE NO.</u></b>
1	<b>APOLOGIES</b>	1
2	<b>CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES</b>	1
3	<b>PUBLIC FORUM</b>	1
4	<b>URGENT BUSINESS</b>	2
5	<b>CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT</b>	2
6	<b>COMMITTEE SECRETARY'S REPORT</b>	2
7	<b>2004 ELECTIONS - GUIDELINES FOR USE OF COUNCIL RESOURCES IN THE PRE-ELECTION PERIOD</b>	4
8	<b>KEEP WAITAKERE BEAUTIFUL TRUST - 2004 COMMUNITY STREET TREE PLANTING PROGRAMME</b>	8
9	<b>COMMUNITY GARDEN FOR MARINICH RESERVE</b>	10
10	<b>NEW RULE FOR SETTING SPEED LIMITS</b>	13
11	<b>NEW "NO STOPPING AT ALL TIMES" CONTROL - PARAMOUNT DRIVE</b>	17
12	<b>NEW "NO STOPPING AT ALL TIMES" CONTROL - WAIPAREIRA AVENUE, LINCOLN NORTH</b>	19
13	<b>TE PAI SKATE PARK EXTENSION</b>	21
14	<b>ALTERATION OF PREVIOUS RESOLUTIONS RELATED TO PARKING CONTROLS</b>	24
15	<b>BOARD MEMBERS' REPORTS</b>	25

**AGENDA FOR AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE MASSEY COMMUNITY BOARD  
TO BE HELD IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, 6 WAIPAREIRA AVENUE, LINCOLN,  
WAITAKERE CITY, ON WEDNESDAY, 2 JUNE 2004,  
COMMENCING AT 7.30 PM.**

---

**1 APOLOGIES**



**2 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

Ordinary - Wednesday, 5 May 2004

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Massey Community Board held on Wednesday, 5 May 2004, as circulated, be taken as read and now be confirmed.



**3 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 Chairperson at the beginning of the meeting; and
- (ii) The Chairperson 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.



#### 4 URGENT BUSINESS

Section 46A(7) and (7A) 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 item is a minor matter; and
- (ii) the Chairperson has explained at the beginning of the meeting (when open to the public) that the item will be raised for discussion, why the item is not on the agenda, and why it cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting; and
- (iii) the Board resolves to deal with the item.

No resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of the item except to refer the item to a subsequent meeting for further discussion.

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







#### 5 CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT


There will be no written Chairperson's Report for the month of June.



#### 6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY'S REPORT

Issue	Comments	Reporting Council Officer
Footpath Outside Massey Primary School 3 September 2003 Resolution 1844/2003	A design concept has been agreed and Transport Assets are currently preparing the design for reporting back to the July meeting of the Board.	Adam Moller  836 8000 Ext 8750
Safety Crossing Outside St Paul's Primary School, 498 Don Buck Road, Massey 7 May 2003 Resolution 877/2003	A pedestrian refuge island is proposed to provide for children crossing the road and to facilitate the proposed walking school bus from the Royal Road area. This work will be included in the minor safety programme.	Adam Moller  836 8000 Ext 8750

Issue	Comments	Reporting Council Officer
Westpark Marina - Various Issues 3 April 2002 Resolution 660/2002	Westpark Marina changed ownership in October 2003. The new owner is developing a concept plan detailing future marina development.  Council is continuing discussions with Westpark Marina Limited to try and secure solutions to the various issues at the Marina, most pressing of which is trailer-boat parking.	Ross McLeod  836 8000 Ext 8675
Draft Waitakere Crime Prevention Strategy 2004 - 2007	The City Development Committee at its meeting held on Thursday, 6 May 2004 resolved that the Community Board nominate a representative to attend the Council/Police Liaison Group.	Mike Mills  836 8000 Ext 8421

REPORTS PENDING			
Subject	Date Requested	Report Due	Reporting Officer
Hobsonville Primary School Footpath  Resolution 631/2004 no. 4	7 April 2004	2 June 2004	Adam Moller  836 8000 Ext 8750

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That the Committee Secretary's Report be received.
2. That the Board nominate a representative to attend the Council/Police Liaison Group meetings.

Report prepared by: Sharon Simiona, Committee Secretary.



7 **2004 ELECTIONS - GUIDELINES FOR USE OF COUNCIL RESOURCES IN THE PRE-ELECTION PERIOD**

**PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

The purpose of the report is to present to the Community Boards the Office of the Controller and Auditor-General's "Suggested Guidelines for Public Communications by Local Authorities" which contain aspects that are particularly relevant to the pre-election period. The guidelines have been adopted by the Council as 'good practice' and that the Council's Code of Conduct has been amended to be consistent with the Guidelines. The Guidelines will apply to all Elected Members including Community Board Members.

**BACKGROUND**

The Office of the Controller and Auditor-General has recently circulated "Suggested Guidelines for Public Communications by Local Authorities". Among other things, the Guidelines cover the use of Council resources in the pre-election period.

**STRATEGIC CONTEXT**

Council is committed to increasing community participation in democratic processes. Elections are a key democratic process. Elected Member behaviour, particularly during the lead up to Elections, is considered to be a factor in contributing to the validity and integrity of the election process.

**ISSUES**

**Guidelines from the Office of the Controller and Auditor-General**

A1-A26

The Guidelines contain 14 Principles. A full copy of the Guidelines is attached at pages A1 to A26.

Those Principles that are relevant to the pre-election period (Principles 12 - 14) are described below.

PRINCIPLE	EXAMPLES
<p><b>Principle 12</b> Communication of a Member's personal views or opinions using Council resources is unacceptable during a pre-election period.</p>	<p><b>Not permitted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communicating personal views using Council stationery, email, postage or fax/phone facilities or any other Council resource.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Principle 13</b> A Council's communications policy should also recognise the risk that communications by or about Members, whether in their capacities as spokespersons for Council or otherwise, during a pre-election period, could result in the Member achieving electoral advantage at ratepayers' expense. The Chief Executive Officer (or his delegate) should actively manage the risk in accordance with the relevant electoral law.</p>	<p><b>Permitted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Photographs of members where it is the practice to include them, such as the Annual Report or website.</li> </ul> <p><b>Not permitted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Anything that could be construed as giving a sitting member an unfair advantage through a raised profile, such as a photo-opportunity or chairing a public meeting.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Principle 14</b> The use of Council resources (including stationery and internet, e-mail and telephone communications facilities) for re-election purposes is unacceptable.</p>	<p><b>Not permitted:</b></p> <p>Using, for re-election purposes, Council stationery, email, postage, fax/phone facilities or any other Council resource.</p>

The Guidelines define the “pre-election period” to be three months before the close of polling day (10 July 2004 to 10 October 2004). The Guidelines also note that a Council may decide to apply restrictions over a longer period. An example of this was the decision in December 2003 to discontinue the monthly columns by elected members in the Waitakere City News.

### **Election Irregularity**

The Local Electoral Act 2001 sets out a number of principles in Section 4:

*“4 Principles*

- (1) *The principles that this Act is designed to implement are the following:*
- (a) *fair and effective representation for individuals and communities:*
  - (b) *all qualified persons have a reasonable and equal opportunity to -*
    - (i) *cast an informed vote:*
    - (ii) *nominate 1 or more candidates:*
    - (iii) *accept nomination as a candidate:*
  - (c) *public confidence in, and public understanding of, local electoral processes through -*
    - (i) *the provision of a regular election cycle:*
    - (ii) *the provision of elections that are managed independently from the elected body:*
    - (iii) *protection of the freedom of choice of voters and the secrecy of the vote:*
    - (iv) *the provision of transparent electoral systems and voting methods and the adoption of procedures that produce certainty in electoral outcomes:*
    - (v) *the provision of impartial mechanisms for resolving disputed elections and polls.”*

In a case last year the District Court established that a breach of the principles can lead to an election “irregularity” and result in the election result being over-turned. Particularly relevant is the principle that all qualified persons have a reasonable and equal opportunity to accept nomination as a candidate. There should not be a perception that any candidate has an unfair advantage through being able to use Council resources.

### **Re-election Purposes**

There may be instances where the use of Council resources would normally be entirely legitimate but doubts are raised because of the pre-election period. Two concepts that are used in the Guidelines and in the Local Electoral Act may be of assistance:

- whether there is a perceived electoral advantage through the use of Council resources;
- whether the activity is being carried out by the member in their capacity as a candidate or in their capacity as a member of the authority

It is also important to note the activities that need to be accounted for in terms of declaring electoral expenses. The Local Electoral Act 2001 defines “electoral activity” to be (s 104):

- “electoral activity, in relation to a candidate at an election, means an activity -*
- (a) that is carried out by the candidate or with the candidate’s authority; and*
  - (b) that relates to the candidate solely in the candidate’s capacity as a candidate and not to the candidate -*
    - (i) in his or her capacity as a member of the local authority or community board, or as the holder of any other office; or*
    - (ii) in any other capacity; and*
  - (c) that comprises -*
    - (i) advertising of any kind; or*
    - (ii) radio or television broadcasting; or*
    - (iii) publishing, issuing, distributing, or displaying addresses, notices, posters, pamphlets, handbills, billboards, and cards; or*
    - (iv) any electronic communication to the public, including (without limitation) the establishment or operation of a website or other method of communication to the public using the Internet; and*
  - (d) that relates exclusively to the campaign for the election of the candidate; and*
  - (e) that takes place within the applicable period before the close of polling day.”*

The “applicable period” is the three months prior to polling day.

### **Complaints**

In order to support the principles in the Act referred to above that elections need to be managed independently it is important that any complaints are dealt with independently, outside of the political realm.

Complaints about the integrity of the elections should be made to the Electoral Officer. The Electoral Officer would, in turn, bring any complaints about the use of Council resources to the attention of the Chief Executive.

### **RESOURCES**

There are no additional resources required to action the recommendations contained in this report.

### **CONCLUSION**

The “Suggested Guidelines for Public Communications by Local Authorities” produced by the Office of the Controller and Auditor-General is good practice and has been adopted by the Council. The particular aspects of the Guidelines that relate to elections have also been included in the Council’s Code of Conduct. The guidelines will also apply to Community Board Members.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That the 2004 Elections - Guidelines for Use of Council Resources in the Pre-Election Period report be received.
2. That the Massey Community Board note that the “Suggested Guidelines for Public Communications by Local Authorities” produced by the Office of the Controller and Auditor-General have been adopted as ‘good practice’ by the Council and apply to all Elected members.
3. That the following has been included in the Council’s Code of Conduct: and will apply as policy to all Community Board Members:

*“Pre-election period*

*During the three months prior to polling day for local body elections Council resources should not be used in any way that could be deemed to give any sitting member an electoral advantage or by any sitting member solely in their capacity as a candidate for the elections.*

*During this period the following practice will be observed:*

<b>PRINCIPLES</b>	<b>EXAMPLES</b>
Communication of a Member’s personal views or opinions using Council resources is unacceptable during a pre-election period.	<b>Not permitted:</b> - Communicating personal views using Council stationery, email, postage or fax/phone facilities or any other Council resource.
There is a risk that communications by or about Members, whether in their capacities as spokespersons for Council or otherwise, during a pre-election period, could result in the Member achieving electoral advantage at ratepayers’ expense. The Chief Executive Officer (or his delegate) should actively manage the risk in accordance with the relevant electoral law.	<b>Permitted:</b> - Photographs of members where it is the practice to include them, such as the Annual Report or website. <b>Not permitted:</b> - Anything that could be construed as giving a sitting member an unfair advantage through a raised profile, such as a photo-opportunity or chairing a public meeting.
The use of Council resources (including stationery and internet, e-mail and telephone communications facilities) for re-election purposes is unacceptable.	<b>Not permitted:</b> - The use, for re-election purposes, of Council stationery, email, postage, fax/phone facilities or any other Council resource.

*Complaints in regard to any matter relating to the conduct of the elections are to be made through the Electoral Officer. If any complaint involves the use of Council resources the Electoral Officer will bring the complaint to the attention of the City Manager.”*

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



## 8 KEEP WAITAKERE BEAUTIFUL TRUST - 2004 COMMUNITY STREET TREE PLANTING PROGRAMME

### **PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

The purpose of this report is to update the Massey Community Board on streets that have been nominated for planting as part of the Keep Waitakere Beautiful Trust's Community Street Tree Planting Programme for 2004.

### **BACKGROUND**

Keep Waitakere Beautiful Trust is a community based, environmental trust funded by Waitakere City Council. Keep Waitakere Beautiful has been working in partnership with Council since 1993, and for the past 11 years the Community Street Tree Planting Programme has been a successful core programme of Keep Waitakere Beautiful.

Keep Waitakere Beautiful delivers a wide variety of environmental projects as part of its annual calendar of events including Trees for Babies, Operation Spring Clean and Clean Stream Waitakere.

### **STRATEGIC CONTEXT**

The Community Street Tree Planting Programme is an important component in implementing Council's Green Network and Well-being Support goals by involving the community in creating and improving their neighbourhoods. The planning of this annual programme takes into account requests from residents received throughout the year, recommendations from the Council Arborist, and budget constraints.

### **ISSUES**

Keep Waitakere Beautiful is currently planning the 2004 Community Street Tree Planting Programme. The programme aims to:

- Complete at least 15 suburban street tree plantings each year.
- Involve the local community in planning, executing and maintaining street tree plantings.
- Provide a forum for community building.
- Provide a forum for promoting Waitakere City Council partnerships.

Historically, Keep Waitakere Beautiful has endeavoured to plant an equal number of trees in each of the four wards.

The 2004 Keep Waitakere Beautiful Community Street Tree Planting Programme will be carried out during the months of June/July 2004, when there is optimum rain to maximise survival rates of the trees. As in previous years, wherever possible a local resident Street Co-ordinator will be appointed for each planting. This person is supported by Keep Waitakere Beautiful to liaise with and encourage the support of residents to undertake the planting and ideally oversee the long term care of the trees.

### **NOMINATIONS FOR 2004**

Nominations received for Community Street Tree Planting in the Massey Ward for 2004 are:

- Breenagh Place, Massey West
- Holgate Avenue, Herald Island
- Muriel Place, Ranui
- Punga Road, Whenuapai

Keep Waitakere Beautiful has been liaising with residents on the streets nominated to gauge support and to determine the suitability of the streets (powerlines, underground services, etc.) and will be bringing final recommendations for streets to be planted in the Ward to the June Community Board meeting for ratification.

Dates for the Community Street Tree Plantings will be set with the community prior to the meeting and Board members will be advised of these dates at the meeting.

## **RESOURCES**

The funds for this project have been provided for in Council's grant to Keep Waitakere Beautiful for 2003/2004 and Keep Waitakere Beautiful is working with a landscape contractor who will provide trees, equipment, guidance and technical assistance at each planting event.

Each planting begins with a welcome from representatives of Keep Waitakere Beautiful and the Community Board; a planting demonstration follows and the planting day concludes with a community BBQ organised by residents and Keep Waitakere Beautiful.

## **CONCLUSION**

Keep Waitakere Beautiful will be delivering its annual Community Street Tree Planting Programme for the 11<sup>th</sup> consecutive year in June/July 2004. Nominations have been received for streets to be planted in the Ward and Keep Waitakere Beautiful is liaising with the community to gauge support for the plantings. A final list of recommended streets will be presented at the June Community Board meeting.

Dates for the Community Street Tree Plantings will be set with the community prior to the June Community Board meeting and Board members will be advised of these dates at the meeting. Community Board members are welcome and encouraged to attend the plantings in their Wards.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That the Keep Waitakere Beautiful Trust - 2004 Community Street Tree Planting Programme report be received.
2. That the recommended streets tabled at the meeting be accepted for this years Keep Waitakere Beautiful Street Tree Planting Programme.
3. That a Community Board Representative be appointed to attend the street tree planting as arranged.

Report prepared by: Jacki Byrd, Parks & Community Projects Co-ordinator.



## 9 COMMUNITY GARDEN FOR MARINICH RESERVE

### PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This report is to seek permission to proceed with the establishment of a community garden in Marinich Reserve under the management of the Ranui Action Project Inc.

### BACKGROUND

Community-based urban agriculture is practised world-wide. It takes a range of forms including:

- Farmers markets - for the direct sale of farm produce to urban buyers.
- Food cooperatives - member owned food buying groups often focussed on organic foods.
- Community supported agriculture - or subscription farming which creates direct links between consumers and farmers.
- City farms - larger community gardens that often allow the keeping of poultry and farm animals.
- Sustainable living centres - providing opportunity for the study, experiment and implementation of sustainable technologies many of which relate to food production such as organic gardening, energy efficiency, water conservation and other solutions to ecologically and socially sustainable urban living.
- Community gardens - cooperatively gardened open space usually including vegetables, flowers, fruit and harvestable materials.

In New Zealand there is increasing interest in community gardens. Some of the factors contributing to this include: intensification of urban areas and the loss of significant gardening space; loss of traditional contact with the country-side and rural activities; growing interest in sustainable practices and in providing opportunities to enhance community wellbeing.

In 2003 Council was approached by Melody Shinnock with a proposal to create a community garden. Melody successfully generated wider support and multiple discussions have been held involving interested members of the community. A steering group has been formed under the umbrella of the Ranui Action Project Inc. Some of the other organisations who have been offering active support include the Cancer Society, the Tongan Church, and Earthsong with Council participating in discussions and facilitating the process. The ideas contained in this report are the culmination of discussions held and work done by those interested parties.

### STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The community garden proposal relates both to the Green Network and Strong Communities strategic platforms. Council is encouraging contact with nature, community participation and the provision of cultural resources. Council is also encouraging people to be active and healthy, and offers to act in partnership with local communities to support wellbeing aspirations.

### ISSUES

#### The Site

A27 The proposed site for the community garden is Marinich Reserve, at the end of Marinich Drive, Ranui. It is an area of almost flat, mown grassland, undeveloped except for a children's playground at the end near the road, site diagram is attached at page A27. It is some 95 metres long and from 40m wide at the east end to 80m wide at the west (road) end.

There is a small stream with a 7m riparian margin running along the south side. Prior to 1999 the wider site was an orchard. The land now known as Marinich Reserve became a park at the time that the surrounding area was subdivided for housing.

Marinich Reserve (Lots 59 and 60 DP 130290) is owned by Waitakere City Council and vested as a recreation reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. The reserve is 0.6461 hectares in size of which it is proposed that the operations of the community garden would occupy some 0.5 ha with the remainder being occupied by the stream and riparian area (south side) and the existing play area.

### **The Proposal**

It is proposed to operate a community garden that while flexible according to changing interests over time is expected to include vegetables, fruit, flowers and harvestable materials (eg. flax). Some space for storage of gardening equipment and materials will also be necessary. The objectives of those planning the garden include:

- Promoting vegetable and fruit growing and consumption in Ranui;
- Promoting sustainable and organic gardening practices;
- Empowering the community (re the former objectives) through training opportunities that may develop income generating and self reliant skills and projects within the community;
- To accept and respect a variety of ethnic/cultural needs and practices.

Marinich Reserve is considered most suitable because:

- It is almost flat;
- It has few neighbours (two sides only) thereby reducing the possibility of issues between the garden operation and neighbours;
- The size is suitable to the expected size of the operation;
- Apart from the play equipment the reserve is used very little - possibly because of the presence of flat fields and playgrounds just on the other side of the road at Ranui Primary School;
- The site is reasonably accessible being just off Swanson Road and quite centrally located;
- With regards to alternative open space, in addition to Ranui Primary School Ranui Domain is 590m walking distance and on the same side of Swanson Road while on the other side of Swanson Road Coroglen is 320m and the larger Starling Park is 390m walking distance for the immediate neighbours of Marinich Reserve;
- Testing of the soil has been undertaken by Council to check this aspect of the sites suitability for the proposed use. The study involved checking for contaminants (metals and organochlorine compounds) that due to the sites previous use, may be expected to be present and may be of concern given the proposed use. Trace levels of both were found and these were compared with expected background soil levels and both local and international guidelines for relevant human exposure. The reports authors (Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Marinich Reserve by Environmental & Earth Sciences) concludes "From the investigations undertaken and results obtained, Environmental & Earth Sciences Limited conclude that Marinich Reserve, is unlikely to pose any adverse effects to human health or the environment under the proposed community garden development." The reports findings and conclusions have been discussed with the group and accepted by them as suitable given their expectations of the land.

The proposed community garden would be managed as a not-for-profit community enterprise under the umbrella of the Ranui Action Project Inc. Like many sports clubs operating from Council Parks, a variable fee structure for membership payable to Ranui Action Project Inc. will be used to cover the costs of developing the site and managing the project. This would include promotional and educational activities within the community in line with the above objectives of the project.

Issues of social and environmental sustainability including organics and permaculture are of strong interest to the steering group. Decisions about how best to manage such issues will be managed by the group, and will no doubt be the focus of much learning and debate.

In line with this concern for social sustainability, the steering group have already made considerable effort to inform and seek input from both the immediate neighbours and the wider community. This has included notices in the community newsletter and both letter box drops and face-to-face visits to all immediate neighbours, the latter seeking both approval and suggestions on how to improve the garden proposal from the perspective of being a neighbour. This has been very successful and every neighbour has given their endorsement of the proposal. Potential risk factors such as noise and untidiness have been discussed. The steering group have accepted willingly the accountability they will have to both the wider community and the Council as land owner. Also to be discussed is the issue of the sale of produce or products from the garden. These issues will be covered in the internal operational rules of the garden, the constitutional guidelines and the lease arrangements with Council as appropriate.

Marinich Reserve is a recreation reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. Section 73(1) of that Act provides that where Council has decided under Section 53(1)(a)(ii) that it is desirable to farm a recreation reserve as part of a development, improvement or management programme then a lease of part of the reserve may be granted with the prior consent of the Minister of Conservation. Section 73(4) also provides that before granting any lease Council must give public notice of the lease proposed to be granted and give full consideration to all objections and submissions received in relation to the proposal.

Once these steps have been taken, if there are no objections upheld by the Community Board and if the consent of the Minister of Conservation has been forthcoming then Council will negotiate a lease with the Ranui Action Project Incorporated. They are an incorporated society under the Incorporated Societies Act 1908.

The community garden group will be responsible for the development of facilities (raised beds and a shed for tool storage may be examples) and for the management and maintenance of the lease area, attached at pages Axx to Axx - site diagram. Guidance as to appropriate facilities development and maintenance will be included in the lease agreement.

Open public access will be maintained to the playground and along the riparian margin of the stream. Council will retain responsibility for maintenance of these areas.

### **Risks to Council**

Community enterprises such as the proposed community garden are dependant on ongoing commitment, often voluntary. Waning enthusiasm and/or loss of communication with the surrounding community can result in issues arising that Council would then need to manage. Means for managing such risks will be incorporated in the lease agreement.

### **RESOURCES**

No resources will be needed in addition to current resourcing of ground maintenance and community facilitation.

## CONCLUSION

This proposal to establish the first community garden in Waitakere City is well organised and situated in a community that is likely to be supportive. It is a constructive use of land that is currently underutilised and suited to this activity. Given the objectives of the organisers the activity, and the learning and community processes the presence of the garden will facilitate are expected to have valuable benefits for the community.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Community Garden for Marinich Reserve report be received.
2. That it be recommended to Council that under Section 53(1)(a)(ii) of the Reserves Act 1977 that it is desirable to farm part of Marinich Reserve (part Lot 59, Deposited Plan 130290) as part of a development, improvement or management programme.
3. That it be recommended to Council that in the absence of any objections or submissions, the Chief Executive be given authority to apply to the Minister of Conservation for consent to grant a lease to the Ranui Action Project Incorporated for a community garden and to negotiate and execute a lease with that society under Section 73(1) of the Reserves Act 1977.
4. That Massey Community Board approve the public notification of the intention to grant a lease to the Ranui Action Project Incorporated under Section 73(1) of the Reserves Act 1977 for a community garden on part of Marinich Reserve (part Lot 59, Deposited Plan 130290) subject to the satisfactory completion of recommendations 2 and 3.

Report prepared by: Chris Ferkins, Environmental Coordinator: Parks Planning.



## 10 NEW RULE FOR SETTING SPEED LIMITS

### PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the provisions of the new rule regarding the setting of speed limits.

### BACKGROUND

In early 2003 the Minister of Transport signed a new rule altering the way speed limits are set in New Zealand. The new rule came into force in April 2004. Under the new rule Councils and other road controlling authorities take over many of the Land Transport Safety Authority's responsibilities for setting speed limits.

There have been numerous reports in the media about the changes, many of which give a misleading impression of the changes. The elected members are often the first point of contact for members of the public with traffic concerns, and it is desirable that they are well informed of the process and rules for setting speed limits.

## 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.

Safe and appropriate speed limits play an essential role in ensuring motorist safety when using Council's road network.

## ISSUES

A28 Under the new rule Council is legally required to follow a certain procedure set out in the rule when setting or reviewing speed limits. This process comprises three steps, firstly conducting a speed limit rating survey, then conducting consultation, then finally passing a bylaw and registering the speed limit, as attached at page A28. The detail of each step is elaborated on below,

### Speed Limit Rating Survey

In this survey the road is divided into a series of 100 metre sections each of which is given a development rating and a roadway rating which are then combined together to get a total rating.

The development rating is based on the number of houses and businesses that have direct access onto the road combined with a value based on the development in any side road. A residence with its own driveway is worth one rating point while businesses and other facilities or several houses sharing a driveway are worth between one and four rating points based on the scale and type of the development. Only schools and kindergartens can be worth more than four rating points, their value being based on the number of pupils.

The roadway rating is based on the number of pedestrians, the availability of a footpath, the number of cyclists, the number of cars parked on street and their distance from the traffic lanes, the forward visibility for drivers, the presence of a flush median or median barrier, the presence of traffic control devices like "Stop" and "Give Way" controls and pedestrian crossings, road classification and the type of development adjacent to the road. Each of these factors is considered and a number of rating points assigned. These are totalled and compared to the total number of development rating points. If there are more roadway rating points than development points then the roadway rating is reduced to equal the development rating.

The combined total rating is then used to find a speed limit for the section of road: the attached chart shows the number of rating points required for a particular speed limit as well as other criteria. The speed limits for all the sections within a road are then compared with a view to achieving a consistent speed limit throughout the road. A small section of developed land within an undeveloped area will not warrant a reduced speed limit, neither will a small undeveloped section within an urban area warrant an increased speed limit. Rules for the minimum distance between speed limit changes and where to place the boundaries are included within the new rule. Thus the final limit chosen for a road will be the same for the entire road or large sections of the road. The speed limits in connecting roads also need to be taken into account.

It is important to note that since the roadway rating cannot exceed the development rating, regardless of other factors, the development adjacent to the roadway is the driving factor in determining speed limits. A well developed urban area will have 50km/h limit regardless of other factors, whilst an undeveloped rural area will have a 100km/h limit. This means that a 100km/h limit may apply on a road where, because of a number of curves in the road or other geometric features, it is unsafe or impossible to travel at the speed limit. Mountain Road is a good example of a road with a 100km/h limit which cannot be safely traversed at 100km/h. In situations like these roadway delineation and warning measures like curve warning signs, chevron signs, advisory speed signs, edge marker post and edge lines can be used to improve motorist safety.

### **Consultation**

The new rule requires that Council consult the following parties in writing before setting a new speed limit, as follows:

- The Land Transport Safety Authority.
- The Police.
- The Automobile Association.
- The Road Transport Forum.
- Any other road controlling or territorial authority affected by the change.
- *'Persons which may be affected by the proposed speed limit'* (In practice this will normally mean members of the public or business whose properties are adjacent to the road or use the road regularly).

Council is obliged to take into account any submissions received during consultation when setting speed limits, however this does not relieve Council of the requirement to set limits according to the rigid procedure laid down in the rule.

### **Bylaw and Registration of Speed Limits**

The final step in setting a speed limit is for Council to make a bylaw setting the new limit. Council is also required to keep an up to date register of all speed limits in the city and all correspondence and other documentation relating to speed limits for seven years. Council must inform the Land Transport Safety Authority of any change in the speed limit at least 14 days before the new limits come into effect.

The new rule requires that road controlling authorities pass a bylaw ensuring that all existing speed limits are retained before any new speed limits are set. The Land Transport Safety Authority are currently producing a model bylaw for councils which is expected to be released in the near future.

### **Role of the Land Transport Safety Authority**

The role of the Land Transport Safety Authority under the new rule is to oversee the application of the rule by road controlling authorities. A consistent national approach is essential and the Director of the Land Transport Safety Authority has the power to compel Council to review or change a speed limit or by notice in the New Zealand Gazette change a speed limit if Council refuses to do so.

### **Differences When Compared With the Old Method for Setting Speed Limits**

The method by which speed limits are set has not changed significantly. The speed limit ratings survey which is the determining factor in choosing a limit is the same method previously used by the Land Transport Safety Authority. The consultation requirements are new, but as the limit chosen is determined by the survey result this makes little practical difference. The main change is an administrative one, Council rather than the Land Transport Safety Authority is now responsible for the bulk of the administration of speed limits and this will enable faster processing of reviews and requests.

### **Timeframe for Setting New Speed Limits**

After the bylaw has been passed the process for changing a speed limit is still likely to be rather lengthy. The speed limit rating survey can be undertaken quite quickly, but consultation and the process required to pass a new bylaw whenever a speed limit is changed are both likely to take some time. The 14 days notice that must be given to the Land Transport Safety Authority before a new limit comes into effect will also add another two weeks to the time needed to change a speed limit.

The new rule requires Council to review all non-50 limits in urban areas and all non-100 limits in rural areas before 1 July 2005, for this reason there are likely to be a number of speed limit changes within the next year.

### **Pilot Study**

At the request of the Waitakere Community Board Transport Assets is conducting a pilot application of the new rule in Candia Road. Final outcomes of the pilot will be distributed to all Community Boards and the City Development Committee.

### **RESOURCES**

The requirement to review a number of speed limits before 1 July 2005 will require approximately three person months of time. This can be absorbed into existing budgets through the use of Transport Assets staff time and consultants paid for from the transport planning budget.

### **CONCLUSION**

The new rule for setting speed limits represents more of an administrative change than a major shift in the philosophy of setting speed limits in New Zealand. Council will take over much of the administrative workload to do with speed limits from the Land Transport Safety Authority but the actual limits that can be set will still be determined by the necessarily rigid rules used previously to set limits. For this reason it is unlikely that there will be many extensive changes to speed limits within the city.

The main benefit of the new rule to Council is that Council may now review limits when it feel that a change may be warranted rather than wait for the Land Transport Safety Authority to process a review the limit. The speed limit review process was also very drawn out when it was conducted by the Land Transport Safety Authority. Council now has the ability to ensure that speed limit reviews are conducted promptly where constituents consider that there is a discrepancy.

The main disadvantage to Council is that the majority of the cost of administering the speed limits must now be borne by Council.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the New Rule for Setting Speed Limits report be received.

Report prepared by: Paul Schischka, Transport Engineer.



## 11 NEW “NO STOPPING AT ALL TIMES” CONTROL - PARAMOUNT DRIVE

### **PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

The purpose of this report is to seek the Massey Community Board’s approval for two new proposed “No Stopping At All Times” controls in Paramount Drive, Lincoln.

### **BACKGROUND**

The manager of a business in Paramount Drive has requested that Council investigate improvements to allow heavy vehicles to better traverse this road. This business owner is concerned that the road is not sufficiently wide to allow heavy vehicles to pass each other or other vehicles when cars are parked on either side of the road. The middle section of the road where there are two curves in the road is of particular concern.

### **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.

“No Stopping At All Times” controls can be applied to ensure efficient, safe movement on roads by keeping traffic lanes and visibility lines clear.

### **ISSUES**

A29 After investigating the issue Transport Engineers have developed a proposal to install “No Stopping” controls along the inside kerbs of the two bends in Paramount Drive. The exact location and extent of the proposed new controls is indicated as attached at page A29. These changes will permit heavy vehicles to negotiate these sections of the roadway much more easily, and this will provide a benefit to the owners of these vehicles and other motorists who might otherwise be delayed whilst a heavy vehicle uses a large portion of the available carriageway to turn.

Paramount Drive is 10 metres wide kerb face to kerb face. Parked passenger cars narrow the carriageway by up to 2.1 metres each side and this leaves 5.8 metres of remaining carriageway. The maximum legal vehicle width in New Zealand is 2.5 metres. Thus there is sufficient width for two heavy vehicles to pass on the straight portions of Paramount Drive, albeit only slowly with absolutely minimal clearance each side.

On bends the swept path of heavy vehicles is wider and thus greater carriageway width is necessary at these locations to allow easy movement by all road users. The tightest of the two curves in Paramount Drive has an inside radius of 65 metres. For a typical semi-trailer the swept path width is increased by about 600mm on a curve of this radius. Removing parking on the inside of the bends will increase the available carriageway width in these locations by a total of 2.10 metres or 1.05 metres each side, allowing enough additional room for two heavy vehicles to pass on the bends.

The businesses whose premises are close to the proposed new controls were sent a consultation letter. Four favourable replies and seven unfavourable replies to the proposal were received. Six of those who oppose the proposal do so on the grounds that on street parking will be reduced. The other opponent of the proposal does so on the grounds that the proposed line does not extend far enough and has requested that parking be eliminated along the entirety of one side of the street.

The new controls would eliminate approximately 23 legal parking spaces in Paramount Drive. This would negatively impact on some businesses, especially once the western end of the street is better developed.

Some of the respondents stated that they believe that the roadway is unsafe due to its narrowness and the possibility of heavy vehicles blocking the carriageway. Any safety hazard that exists in this location due to the narrowness of the road is considered to be minor. Heavy vehicles are much larger and higher than passenger cars and the drivers of other vehicles are able to see them over the top of parked cars and other obstructions from a considerable distance away. Thus even if a heavy vehicle is blocking the entire road whilst traversing the bends approaching cars would have sufficient time to see the vehicle and slow down so that this does not present a hazard. The most likely accidents in this location are scrapes along the side of vehicles against parked vehicles or vehicles attempting to pass each other. Significant injury to vehicle occupants is unlikely to occur in this road due to its narrowness.

Many of the respondents requested that Council install parking bays within the existing road berm area. This option, although not undesirable, cannot be implemented within existing budgets. There are currently no plans for Council to purchase any plot of land within the adjacent subdivisions for the purposes of a public car park. There will be some additional on street parking available when the area is developed further, but this will be balanced by increased parking demands from new businesses coming into the area.

## **RESOURCES**

The proposed new parking control markings can be implemented under the 2003/2004 maintenance budgets.

## **CONCLUSION**

Although there is likely to be significant opposition from the businesses adjacent to the proposed new controls and the safety hazard in this road is minor, the primary concern is to provide for the safe movement of heavy vehicles and therefore it is recommended that the "No Stopping" controls be authorized.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That the New "No Stopping At All Times" Control - Paramount Drive report be received.
2. That in relation to **PARAMOUNT DRIVE, LINCOLN NORTH**:
  - (a) That all existing parking restrictions or limitations affected, or superseded, or replaced by this resolution applicable to **PARAMOUNT DRIVE** imposed by any prior resolution (including resolutions of any former authority) 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 authorized to be concluded in the normal manner.

- (b) That, in accordance with the powers conferred by virtue of the Local Government Act 1974, 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) On the north kerb line of Paramount Drive starting from the point 216 metres west of where Paramount Drive intersects with Central Park Drive and ending at a point 65 metres further west, a new **NO STOPPING AT ALL TIMES** control be put in place.
  - (ii) On the south kerb line of Paramount Drive starting from the point 140 metres west of where Paramount Drive intersects with Central Park Drive and ending at a point 68 metres further west, a new **NO STOPPING AT ALL TIMES** control be put in place.
3. That the appropriate marking, in accordance with the Traffic Regulations 1976, be hereby approved to be put in place to properly establish, delineate and record the said “no stopping at all times” restriction.

Report prepared by: Paul Schischka, Transport Engineer.



## 12 NEW “NO STOPPING AT ALL TIMES” CONTROL - WAIPAREIRA AVENUE, LINCOLN NORTH

### PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This report seeks the Massey Community Board’s approval for a new “No Stopping At All Times” control in Waipareira Avenue.

### BACKGROUND

At present there is no pram crossing opposite the pram crossing in Waipareira Avenue on the south corner of Waipareira Avenue and Moselle Avenue. A pram crossing outside Council’s offices would facilitate easier access to the building by the mobility impaired. Council is now planning to install a pram crossing in the footpath in this location, but some parking must be removed to ensure that parked vehicles do not block the crossing or the sight lines of those using it.

### 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.

‘No Stopping At All Times’ controls can be applied to ensure efficient, safe movement on roads by keeping traffic lanes and visibility lines clear.

## ISSUES

There is currently enough room to park two cars in the short stretch of unrestricted kerb line between the pathway to the main entrance and the vehicle crossing to the Civic Centre building. It is proposed that both of these parking spaces be removed. Removing the northern space is necessary so that parked cars do not block access to the pram crossing. Removing the southern parking space is desirable so that the sight lines between pedestrians waiting to cross and vehicles are not blocked. Although most adult pedestrians are able to see over a parked car, many mobility impaired people are seated on a wheelchair or mobility scooter and do not have the height required to see oncoming traffic.

A30 The location and extent of the proposed no stopping line is indicated attached at page A30.

## RESOURCES

The proposed new parking control markings can be implemented under the 2003/2004 maintenance budgets.

## CONCLUSION

The proposal to install a new "No Stopping At All Times" control on the east side of Waipareira Avenue is desirable to improve road user safety.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the New "No Stopping At All Times" Control - Waipareira Avenue, Te Atatu South report be received.
2. That in relation to **WAIPAREIRA AVENUE, LINCOLN NORTH:**
  - (a) That all existing parking restrictions or limitations affected, or superseded, or replaced by this resolution applicable to Waipareira Avenue imposed by any prior resolution including resolutions of any former authority 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 authorized to be concluded in the normal manner.
  - (b) That, in accordance with the powers conferred by virtue of the Local Government Act 1974, 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) on the east kerb line of Waipareira Avenue starting a point 23 metres north of where the kerb meets north edge of the south entrance to the civic centre car park to a point a further 10.5 metres north, a new **NO STOPPING AT ALL TIMES** control be put in place.
3. That the appropriate marking, in accordance with the Traffic Regulations 1976, be hereby approved to be put in place to properly establish, delineate and record the said no stopping at all times restriction.

Report prepared by: Paul Schischka, Transport Engineer.



## 13 **TE PAI SKATE PARK EXTENSION**

### **PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

The purpose of this report is to present the results of the public consultation process and obtain the Massey Community Board's approval of the concept plan for the extension of the Te Pai Skate Park

### **BACKGROUND**

A submission was received to the 2003/2004 draft Annual Plan on behalf of the skaters of Waitakere requesting improved skateboarding facilities at Te Pai Park. The submission included over 100 signatures from local skaters.

The 2003/2004 Annual Plan provided funding of \$30,000 for consultation and to obtain feedback from the local community, interest groups and from amateur and professional local skate-boarders in order to assess the need for improved skating facilities and for input in to the extension of the skate park. The funding was also provided to produce a concept plan resulting from the consultation.

The existing Te Pai Skate Park facility consists of a concrete structure with an area of approximately 1000 square metres. The proposed new facility would add a further 750-900 square metres.

### **STRATEGIC CONTEXT**

In 2002 a Waitakere City Skate Plan was produced which identified the need to provide quality skate facilities in Waitakere City to cater for the recreational and leisure needs of the cities youth. The plan identified that extensions to existing skate facilities in the city could help meet some of these needs.

The vision statement of the Council nine strategic platforms 2020 vision within the Long Term Council Community Plan in regards to Urban and Rural villages states that: *"Town centres are thriving, providing exiting options for people to live, work and play. Public facilities and places and the streets are alive and busy"*.

In addition, the Council Strong Communities strategic platform states that: *"People are active, happy and content. They feel safe and there is a strong sense of community. Our City is a great place for children. We enjoy our diversity of lifestyles and people"*.

The proposed extension of the Te Pai Skate Park fits in well with these particular Strategic platform visions by providing a challenging recreational opportunity for a wide range of children's age groups in a relatively safe environment whilst causing minimal negative environmental impact or nuisance to residences or nearby businesses.

The Te Pai facility is strategically located on a reserve which has high passive surveillance from passing vehicles, has residential properties located relatively far from the site, is clustered with other recreational activities and is easily accessible. Locations for new skateboarding facilities on other parks within the city are limited, mainly due to associated noise factors and close proximity to residential properties. The extension of this skate facility will increase the size to a regional facility and cater for a wider range and greater capacity of users.

## ISSUES

The initial phase of the consultation involved a letter drop delivered to residential addresses and businesses adjoining and surrounding the park up to a 1km radius. The letter included a location map with the expected extent of the development, a form for submissions and an invitation to attend a public meeting. A description of the proposal was also included on the Council website requesting submissions on the proposed skate park extension.

Sixteen (16) submissions were received. Four (4) opposed the development, or raised specific concerns or considerations on the development.

Some positive feedback included the following:

- “Really enjoying the current facility and would appreciate an upgrade.”
- “This upgrade will keep skaters away from the streets and car parks in this area.”
- “This proposed upgrade is supported, but council should also have a responsibility to maintain it.”
- “Great place for kids to stimulate their bodies and minds.”

Other feedback mainly from one submission against included:

- “This upgrade will take away valuable green open space. Skate park should be placed elsewhere in a light industrial area.”
- “This upgrade will only be tagged and wrecked again.”
- “Wasting taxpayers’ money.”
- “This is such a small upgrade. It is waste of money and time.”

A31 A copy of the summary of submissions is attached at page A31.

A public meeting was then held at the Te Pai Netball Court Clubrooms on 10 December 2003. Total attendance at the meeting was low with only three skateboarders attending. Feedback from this meeting has been incorporated as part of the attached design.

Following this initial meeting a public design workshop was held in February 2004 which involved local skate-boarders to provide input into the design and a forum for user group consultation. The workshop was advertised at a number of venues and media including:

- Flyers and submission forms handed out at the Waitakere City Council “Summer Slamz” outdoors events and skateboarding competitions.
- Flyers and submission forms at Cheapskates West skate boarding retail shop
- Information posted on the Council website.
- Signs located at local skate parks.

The workshop was held at the Te Pai Netball Court Clubrooms with 15 skateboarders and BMX bike riders attending. A sketch design was used as a discussion point during this process to assist in identifying key elements and desires for the final draft design. The design was refined following the receipt of the submissions and comments received during this process.

A32 The revised design was produced into a presentation model which was displayed at the local Cheapskates West shop with a register inviting feedback in regards to the design. Photos of the model and a submission form were also posted on the Council website. Feedback received related to design only with no negative feedback received, and was incorporated as part of the design attached at page A32.

From all stages of the consultation a contacts database was developed and constantly updated. Any one who left their name and contact details was added to the database and updated with information on the development. The consultation list included 110 skaters and other submission respondents.

## **PROPOSAL**

A well known New Zealand champion skater (Chey Ataria) was involved in developing the initial design, which was used as a starting point for the design development. The design was further developed and refined with input from design workshops and submission forms. Local BMX bike riders also attended the workshops.

The design includes a new area beside the existing facility with minor changes to the existing facility. The predominant desire was for the new area to be of a new "street-skating" style. This requirement was incorporated into the design with an emphasis on low platforms, banks and rails for "grinding" or sliding along the edges, rather than the older style of tall or deep bowls and ramps.

One traditional element of the older style of skating, called a half pipe, was a specific request from many of the earlier submissions and this element has been included. Some older skaters and BMX bike riders also preferred the elements of the older style parks so some features of this nature were also included. These items are integrated into the park but functionally separated from the main skateboard traffic areas to minimise the potential for bike riders to collide with skaters and resulting safety issues.

The design is integrated with the existing facility and grassed earth mounding. A wire mesh fence is proposed to separate the development from the neighbouring business owner as a result of the consultation process.

Tree planting is also included in the design, to provide shade and to soften the appearance with the park setting.

The attached concept design is a clear outcome from the consultation process that will meet the needs and desires of the user groups.

## **RESOURCES**

A cost estimate for the park has been prepared which shows that the development will cost approximately \$200,000. In the 2004/2005 draft Annual Plan \$180,000 has been included. Additional funding of \$30,000 is available from the removal of the skate park at Royal Reserve. The inclusion of these funds will enable the full project to proceed.

The current construction industry is experiencing high prices for construction works. The design has been developed to enable certain items to be removed without impacting heavily on the overall outcome of the skate park extension if tenders are received that are over the allocated funds.

Items to be removed for cost savings were prioritised in principle at the design workshops.

## **CONCLUSION**

Te Pai Skate Park is situated in an ideal location for a regional skate park to cater for the youth in Waitakere City. The park is easily accessible to Massey and Henderson youths and has minimum adverse impact on surrounding residences and businesses.

The consultation process undertaken indicates that there was relatively low level of opposition to the development while there was a high level of support.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That the information be received.
2. That the concept design for an extension to Te Pai Skate Park be approved.

Report prepared by: Alan Duxfield, Parks Assets Project Manager.



## **14 ALTERATION OF PREVIOUS RESOLUTIONS RELATED TO PARKING CONTROLS**

### **PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

This report seeks the approval of the Massey Community Board to alter a resolution made by the Board during the last twelve months, to comply with the requirements of the Local Government Act.

### **BACKGROUND**

The Local Government Act 2002 repealed and replaced many sections of the Local Government Act 1974. However some sections of the Local Government Act 1974 remain in force including part XXI (Roads) and Sections 591 and 591A. Council's powers to resolve parking restrictions are still contained within the Local Government Act 1974 and not covered by the new Act.

### **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.

Resolving parking restrictions facilitates safety, access and efficiency in the use of transport infrastructure.

### **ISSUES**

During the last twelve months a number of reports have been brought to the Massey Community Board on various parking issues. Some of these reports contained recommendations that incorrectly referenced the Local Government Act 2002 as the authority under which the resolutions were passed.

To prevent possible legal challenges regarding the validity of infringement notices issued at locations where the parking controls have been incorrectly resolved, it is necessary to correct these resolutions.

The Community Board may alter a previous resolution of the Board under Standing Order 27.18, which states that:

*"A local authority meeting may, on a recommendation contained in a report by the Chairperson or chief executive, or the report of any committee, revoke or alter all or part of resolutions previously passed at meetings. At least two clear working days notice of any meeting to consider such a proposal shall be given to members, accompanied by details of the proposal to be considered."*

A33 This report contains recommendations to correct one previous resolutions of the Massey Community Board, a copy of which is attached at page A33.

**RESOURCES**

No additional resources will be required.

**CONCLUSION**

The recommended alterations to the previous resolution is necessary to prevent possible legal challenges to enforcement of the resolution.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That the Alteration of Previous Resolutions Related to Parking Controls be received.
2. That the resolutions of the Massey Community Board listed below be altered by deleting the words "Local Government Act 2002" substituting the words "Local Government Act 1974" in each case:

Resolution	Date	Subject
1987/2003	1st of October 2003	Central Park Drive - No Stopping At All Times Control

Report prepared by: Adam Moller, Principal Transport Engineer: Development, Transport Assets.



**15 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.

**MASSEY COMMUNITY BOARD APPOINTMENTS**

OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS	APPOINTMENT
Far North and Auckland Region Community Boards' Association Executive Committee	Andrew Good
Keep Waitakere Beautiful Committee	Peter Chan
Massey Citizens Advice Bureau	Peter Chan
Massey Community House Committee	Karen Perri
Massey Leisure Centre Community Liaison Group	Jean Webster
Ranui Action Plan Project	Cr Nash
Ranui Community Centre Committee	Cr Nash
Henderson Creek Reserve Management Plan	Cr Hoskin
Safe Waitakere	Peter Chan

<b>OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS</b>	<b>APPOINTMENT</b>
Far North and Auckland Region Community Boards' Association Executive Committee	Andrew Good
Keep Waitakere Beautiful Committee	Peter Chan
Westpark Marina Working Group	Andrew Good
<b>COUNCIL COMMITTEES</b>	
Hearings Committee	Jean Webster Karen Perri
Community Sports Fund Allocation Subcommittee	Warren Flaunty
<b>WORKING GROUPS</b>	
Wai Care Programme	Peter Chan
Project Twin Streams	Bob Jessopp

