



Panuku Development Auckland

An Auckland Council Organisation

Board Report

Date

Wednesday, 31 May 2017

Time

Commencing at 9.00 am

Venue

Panuku Development Auckland
Level 2, Pier 21 Building,
11 Westhaven Drive, Freemans Bay

Board Agenda

Where: Level 2, Pier 21 Building, 11 Westhaven Drive, Freemans Bay, Auckland

When: Wednesday, 31 May 2017 | 9.00 am – 3:00 pm

Board Members: Richard Aitken – Chair
 Dr Susan Macken – Deputy Chair
 Anne Blackburn – Director
 Evan Davies – Director
 Richard Leggat – Director
 Paul Majurey – Director
 Mike Pohio – Director
 Martin Udale – Director

In attendance: Roger MacDonald – Chief Executive
 David Rankin – Chief Operating Officer
 Carl Gosbee – Director Corporate Services
 Angelika Cutler – Director Corporate Affairs
 Rod Marler – Director Place and Design
 Ian Wheeler – Director Portfolio Management
 Allan Young – Director Development
 David Gurney – Company Secretary
 Aaron Simperingham – Company Secretary (Acting)

		Timing
1.	Directors Only time	8.30am
2.	Opening of Public Meeting 2.1 Apologies 2.2 Directors' Interests 2.3 Directors' Board Meeting Attendance Register 2.4 Minutes of the 26 April 2017 Board meeting 2.5 Public Deputations	9:00 am
3.	Chief Executives Report	9:30 am
4.	Decision Papers 4.1 Disposals Programme Report 4.2 Disposals Recommendations	10:00 am
5.	Procedural Motion to Exclude the Public Put the motion that, pursuant to the provisions of Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information & Meetings Act 1987, the public be excluded from the following proceedings of this meeting, so that commercially sensitive issues can be discussed in confidential session.	
	Morning Tea	

6.	<p>Chief Executive's Report (Confidential)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaderkit Project Summary • Financial Dashboard • Health and Safety Report • Risk Update • Acquisitions Summary • Disposals Summary • Shareholder Feedback on the SOI 	10:40 am
7.	<p>Decision Papers (Confidential)</p> <p>7.1 Remuneration Policy - <i>Withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.</i></p> <p>7.2 Dividend Payment and Share Issue to Auckland Council - <i>Withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.</i></p> <p>7.3 Wynyard Quarter High Level Project Plan and Framework Plan - <i>Withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.</i></p> <p>7.4 Site 18 - <i>withheld from the public under S7(2(h)) of the LGOIMA.</i></p> <p>7.5 Acquisition of Land for Open Space Purposes - <i>Withheld from the public under S7(2(i)) of the LGOIMA.</i></p> <p>7.6 Disposal of Land - <i>Withheld from the public under S7(2(i)) of the LGOIMA.</i></p> <p>7.7 Acquisition of Land – <i>Withheld from the public under S7(2(i)) of the LGOIMA.</i></p> <p>7.8 Disposals Programme Report - <i>Withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.</i></p> <p>7.9 Westhaven Pile Mooring Reclamation - <i>Withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.</i></p> <p>7.10 Transform Onehunga - <i>Withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.</i></p> <p>7.11 Manukau Programme Business Case - <i>Withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.</i></p>	11:05 am
8.	<p>Information Papers (Confidential)</p> <p>8.1 Update on Queens Wharf and Central Wharves Framework - <i>Withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.</i></p> <p>8.2 Update on Wynyard Central Development - <i>Withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.</i></p> <p>8.3 Discussion of the Evaluation of the Barrowcliffe Pilot Report - <i>Withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.</i></p>	1:00 pm
	Lunch	1:30 pm
9.	<p>Barrowcliffe Development Pilot Project</p> <p><i>Withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.</i></p>	2:00 pm
10.	General Business	3:00 pm

Note: Some information has been withheld from the public under the relevant sections of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA). Where information is withheld, the relevant section of the LGOIMA is cited. A copy of Section 7 of the LGOIMA, which provides reasons to withhold official information, is attached to the Board papers for reference.

Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

7 Other reasons for withholding official information

(1) Where this section applies, good reason for withholding official information exists, for the purpose of [section 5](#), unless, in the circumstances of the particular case, the withholding of that information is outweighed by other considerations which render it desirable, in the public interest, to make that information available.

(2) Subject to [sections 6, 8, and 17](#), this section applies if, and only if, the withholding of the information is necessary to—

(a) protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons; or

(b) protect information where the making available of the information—

(i) would disclose a trade secret; or

(ii) would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information; or

(ba) in the case only of an application for a resource consent, or water conservation order, or a requirement for a designation or heritage order, under the [Resource Management Act 1991](#), to avoid serious offence to tikanga Maori, or to avoid the disclosure of the location of waahi tapu; or

(c) protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information—

(i) would be likely to prejudice the supply of similar information, or information from the same source, and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied; or

(ii) would be likely otherwise to damage the public interest; or

(d) avoid prejudice to measures protecting the health or safety of members of the public; or

(e) avoid prejudice to measures that prevent or mitigate material loss to members of the public; or

(f) maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through—

(i) the free and frank expression of opinions by or between or to members or officers or employees of any local authority, or any persons to whom [section 2\(5\)](#) applies, in the course of their duty; or

(ii) the protection of such members, officers, employees, and persons from improper pressure or harassment; or

(g) maintain legal professional privilege; or

(h) enable any local authority holding the information to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities; or

(i) enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations); or

(j) prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage.

Directors' Interests at 23 May 2017

Member	Interest	Company/Entity	Conflicts pre-identified?
Richard H. Aitken	Chairman	Development Auckland Limited	
	Director	BGCF Trustee Ltd	
	Shareholder	Beca Group Ltd	
	Director	BGL Custodian Ltd	
	Director	BGLIR Trustee Ltd	
	Director	BGL Management Share Trustee Ltd	
	Director	BGL Nominees Ltd	
	Director	BGS Trustee Ltd	
	Director	Derceto Trustee Ltd	
	Director	Hopetoun Pitt Ltd	
	Director	Gands Plan Pty Ltd (Australia)	
	Director	John Scotts Investments Ltd	
	Director	TrustPower Ltd	
	Chair	Te Punaha Matatini Advisory Board	
	Trustee	BAS Custodian Trust	
	Trustee	Beca Indemnity Fund Custodian Trust	
	Trustee	BGLIR Custodian Trust	
	Trustee	BGL Custodian Trust	
	Trustee	BGS Custodian Trust	
	Trustee and discretionary beneficiary	The Glade Trust	
Trustee	The Sunnybrae Trust		
Trustee	The Waimarama Trust		
M. Anne Blackburn	Director	Development Auckland Limited	
	Member	Commercial Operation Advisory Board to the Treasury	
	Director	New Zealand Venture Investment Fund Limited	
	Director	NZVIF Investments Limited	
	Director	Warren & Mahoney Limited	Supplier
	Director	Warren & Mahoney Architects Limited	Supplier
	Director	Committee for Auckland Limited	
	Director	Fidelity Life Assurance Company Limited	
	Director	Fisher Funds Management Limited	

Member	Interest	Company/Entity	Conflicts pre-identified?
	Director	TSB Bank Limited	
	Director	TSB Group Capital Limited	
	Director	TSB Group Investments Limited	
	Director	Ten Gracie Square Limited	
	Director	Wairaka Land Company Limited (Unitec land development subsidiary)	Possible
Evan W. Davies	Director	Development Auckland Limited	
	Director	Welch Securities Ltd	
	Director	Paris Magdalinos Architects Ltd	
	Director	Kokako Fames Ltd	
	Director	Todd Property Group Limited and Subsidiaries	
	Director	Todd Property Ormiston Town Centre Ltd	J/V with Panuku
	Trustee	Melanesian Mission Trust	
	Trustee	Anglican Trust for Women and Children	
	Chair	Capital Investment Committee, Nation Health Board	
	Chair	Christchurch Hospital Redevelopment Partnership Board	
	Director	FMS Ltd (Aust)	
Richard I. Leggat	Director	Development Auckland Limited	
	Director	New Zealand Post Ltd	
	Deputy Chair	Tourism NZ	
	Director	Education NZ	
	Director	Cycling NZ	
	Member	Union Cycliste Internationale Ethics Commission	
	Chairman	NZ Cycle Trail Incorporated	
	Director	Snowsports NZ	
	Panel Member	NZ Markets Disciplinary Tribunal	
	Director	Trophy Metropolitan Limited	
	Director	Mortleg Ltd	
	Director	Winter Games New Zealand	
	Advisor	Busways Pty Limited	
Dr Susan C. Macken	Director	Development Auckland Limited	
	Director	Treasury Advisory Board	
	Director	Blossom Bear Limited	
	Director	Fertility Associates Trustee Ltd and Associates	
	Director	STG Ltd	
	Deputy Chair	Tāmaki Redevelopment Company Limited	Possible
	Director	Spa Electrics Ltd (Aust)	
	Director	FA Ventures One Limited	
	Director	Kiwibank	

Member	Interest	Company/Entity	Conflicts pre-identified?
Paul F. Majurey	Chair	Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority	
	Chair	Tāmaki Makaurau Community Housing Limited	
	Chair	Mana Whenua & Crown Working Group (Proposed Hauraki Gulf / Tikapa Moana Recreational Fishing Park)	
	Chair	Marutūāhu Rōpū General Partner Limited	
	Chair	Marutūāhu Collective (5 iwi collective)	
	Chair	Hauraki Collective (12 iwi collective)	
	Co-Chair	Sea Change Marine Spatial Plan Project	
	Co-Chair	Tāmaki Healthy Families Alliance	
	Director	Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa	
	Director	Development Auckland Limited	
	Director	Pare Hauraki Asset Holdings Limited	
	Director	Taimoana Marine Farms Limited	
	Director	Tikapa Moana Enterprises Limited	
	Director	Pouarua Farm General Partner Limited	
	Director	Ngāti Maru Pouarua Farm Limited	
	Director	Half Moon Bay Venture Limited	
	Director	Atkins Holm Majurey Limited	
	Trustee	Crown Forestry Rental Trust	
	Trustee	Ngāti Maru Rūnanga Trust	
	Trustee	Hauraki Fishing Group	
	Mana Whenua Representative	Hauraki Gulf Forum	
	Tainui Waka Representative	Iwi Working Group (Review of Te Ohu Kaimoana)	
	Chair	Whenuapai Housing General Partner Limited	
Michael E. Pohio	Director	Development Auckland Limited	
	Director	National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research Limited	
	Director	NIWA Vessel Management Limited	
	Director	KiwiRail Limited	
	Chairman	BNZ Partners Waikato	
	Director	Te Atiawa Iwi Holdings	
	Director	Te Atiawa (Taranaki) Holdings Limited	
	Director	TBFree	
	Director	OsPRI New Zealand Ltd	
		• National Animal Identification and Tracing Ltd	
C. Martin Udale	Director	Development Auckland Limited	
	Director	Urban Canvas Limited	

Member	Interest	Company/Entity	Conflicts pre-identified?
	Director	Essentia Consulting Group Limited	
	Director	Fleming Urban Limited	Possible Onehunga development
	Director	Innovation Waikato Limited	
	Director	Paparata Limited	
	Director	Tall Wood Limited	
	Director	Tall Wood Distribution Limited	
	Director	Forest Group Limited	
	Director	Tamaki Redevelopment Company Limited	Possible
	Director	Tamaki Regeneration Limited	
	Council member	Unitec Institute of Technology	
	Director	Waikato Innovation Park Limited	
	Chair	Wairaka Land Company Limited (Unitec land development subsidiary)	Possible
	Trustee	Cardinal Trustees Limited	
	Director	TW Twenty Twenty Limited	
	Director	Hobsonville GP Ltd	
	Director	New Ground Living (Hobsonville Point) Limited	



DIRECTORS' MEETING ATTENDANCE REGISTER – 2016 / 2017

	2016						2017						
	27 Jul	31 Aug	21 Sep	26 Oct	30 Nov	14 Dec	22 Feb	29 Mar	26 Apr	31 May	28 June	TOTAL	
Sir John Wells	A	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	NA	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	
R.H. Aitken	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Dr S.C. Macken	✓	✓	✓	✓	A	✓	✓	✓	✓				
M.A. Blackburn	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
E.W. Davies	✓	✓	✓	✓	A	✓	A	✓	✓				
R.I. Leggat	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
P.F. Majurey	✓	✓	✓	A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
M.E. Pohio	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
C.M. Udale	✓	✓	A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF DIRECTORS OF DEVELOPMENT AUCKLAND LIMITED (PANUKU DEVELOPMENT AUCKLAND), HELD IN **CONFIDENTIAL** SESSION AT LEVEL 2, PIER 21 BUILDING, 11 WESTHAVEN DRIVE, AUCKLAND ON WEDNESDAY 26 APRIL 2017 COMMENCING AT 9.00 AM.

ATTENDING		<p>Board: Richard Aitken (Chair), Anne Blackburn, Evan Davies, Richard Leggat, Paul Majurey, Mike Pohio, Dr Susan Macken, and Martin Udale.</p> <p>Executive: Roger MacDonald (Chief Executive), David Rankin (Chief Operating Officer), Angelika Cutler (Director Corporate Affairs), Carl Gosbee (Director Corporate Services), Rod Marler (Director Place and Design), Ian Wheeler (Director Portfolio Management), Allan Young (Director Development), David Gurney (Company Secretary).</p>
APOLOGIES	1-04/17	There were no apologies for the meeting.
BOARD MEETING WITH MANA WHENUA RANGITIRA	2-04/17	<p>The Board welcomed mana whenua rangitira to the meeting.</p> <p>Attendees at the rangitira ki rangitira hui were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Williams - Te Patukirikiri • Martin Te Moni – Ngaati Whanaunga (on behalf of Mike Baker) • Wati Ngamane – Ngāti Maru • Peter Wilson – Te Runanga o Ngāti Whatua (on behalf of Tame Te Rangi) • Hauāuru Rawiri – Ngāti Paoa • James Brown – Ngāi Tai ki Tamaki • Karen Wilson – Te Akitai Waiohua • Yvonne Wiki – Ngāti Rehua <p>Apologies were received from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Haydn Edmonds – Ngāti Wai Trust Board • Tame Te Rangi – Te Runanga o Ngāti Whatua • Mike Baker – Ngaati Whanaunga <p><i>Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2)(b)(ii) of the LGOIMA.</i></p>
OPENING OF PUBLIC MEETING	3-04/17	The Board meeting formally started, and was open to public attendance. George Wood, Deputy Chair of the Devonport Takapuna Local Board, was in attendance.
DIRECTORS' INTERESTS	4-04/17	<p>The Directors' Interests Register was noted.</p> <p>Paul Majurey declared his interest relating to Britomart. Evan Davies declared his interest relating to Ormiston.</p>
BOARD ATTENDANCE REGISTER	5-04/17	The Board received the Board Attendance Register.
DECISION PAPER 7.1 – UNLOCK TAKAPUNA: CAR PARKING STRATEGY	6-04/17	Clive Fuhr, Project Development Director Central, Kate Cumberpatch, Development Manager, and Deborah Lee Sang, Programme Leader Master Planning, presented on this item. The presentation outlined the approach to use the Gasometer site to develop enough carparks to satisfy the

<p>AND FRAMEWORK PLAN</p>	<p>7-04/17</p> <p>6-04/17</p>	<p>requirements modelled by Auckland Transport for car park demand growth, to then enable mixed use development of the ANZAC Street site.</p> <p>It was noted that the AT modelling had been peer reviewed.</p> <p>The recommendations were separated into two categories; those that could be resolved in public, and those that needed to be resolved in confidential.</p> <p>It was RESOLVED THAT the Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Approves the direction and intent of the Unlock Takapuna Framework Plan as a basis of providing context to ongoing site development activity. 2) Delegates authority to the Director Design & Place to approve the final Framework Plan following completion of the detailed drafting. 3) Approves the strategy to meet Auckland Transport’s replacement car park requirements for the Anzac Street and Gasometer car parks by constructing a standalone car park building on part of the Gasometer site for 400 to 500 cars. 4) Approves, subject to the outcome of consultation under the Local Government Act 2002, the use of the sale proceeds from the balance of the Gasometer site to contribute to the cost of constructing a standalone car park that then enables the development of the remaining council land within the Unlock project. <p><i>Moved Richard Aitken, seconded Richard Leggat; CARRIED.</i></p> <p>It was RESOLVED THAT, pursuant to the provisions of Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information & Meetings Act 1987, the public be excluded from the Meeting for the following proceedings; the subject matter, the reasons and specific grounds for exclusions being set out below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="635 1099 1463 1272"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="635 1099 1142 1160">General subject of matters to be considered</th> <th data-bbox="1142 1099 1463 1160">Grounds under Section 48(1) for considering in private</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="635 1160 1142 1196">Governance; Committee report</td> <td data-bbox="1142 1160 1463 1196">Commercially sensitive issues</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="635 1196 1142 1232">Finance and Risk</td> <td data-bbox="1142 1196 1463 1232">Commercially sensitive issues</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="635 1232 1142 1272">Management and operations</td> <td data-bbox="1142 1232 1463 1272">Commercially sensitive issues</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Moved Richard Aitken, seconded Paul Majurey; CARRIED.</i></p> <p><i>Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(i)) of the LGOIMA.</i></p>	General subject of matters to be considered	Grounds under Section 48(1) for considering in private	Governance; Committee report	Commercially sensitive issues	Finance and Risk	Commercially sensitive issues	Management and operations	Commercially sensitive issues
General subject of matters to be considered	Grounds under Section 48(1) for considering in private									
Governance; Committee report	Commercially sensitive issues									
Finance and Risk	Commercially sensitive issues									
Management and operations	Commercially sensitive issues									
<p>MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING OF 30 MARCH 2017</p>	<p>8-04/17</p>	<p>The Board reviewed and approved the Minutes of the Board Meeting of 30 March 2017, with one change noting a risk relating to the establishment of Urban Development Authorities, that too many would increase competition for resources and people.</p> <p><i>Moved Anne Blackburn, seconded Mike Pohio; CARRIED.</i></p>								
<p>DECISION PAPER 4.1 – DISPOSALS RECOMMENDATIONS</p>	<p>9-04/17</p>	<p>The Board received this report.</p> <p>It was RESOLVED THAT the Board recommends to the Auckland Council Governing Body that the following properties are surplus to Council requirements and should be divested:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Areas C and D, 3 Memorial Drive, New Lynn b) 32 Harbour View Road, Te Atatu Peninsula c) 343 Swanson Road, Ranui iv. d) 80 Vincent Street, Howick e) 145A West Tamaki Road, Glen Innes f) 24 Waipuna Road, Mt Wellington 								

		<p>g) Units 1-4, 26 Waipuna Road, Mt Wellington h) 27B Waipuna Road, Mt Wellington i) 1/77 Waipuna Road, Mt Wellington j) 93 Waipuna Road, Mt Wellington k) 3/136B Mt Wellington Highway, Mt Wellington l) 134A Mt Wellington Highway, Mt Wellington</p> <p><i>Moved Evan Davies, seconded Dr Susan Macken; CARRIED.</i></p>
DECISION PAPER 4.2 – CORPORATE SPONSORSHIP POLICY	10-04/17	<p>The Board received this report.</p> <p>It was RESOLVED THAT the Board approves the Corporate Sponsorship Policy.</p> <p><i>Moved Evan Davies, seconded Dr Susan Macken; CARRIED.</i></p>
MINISTRY OF BUSINESS INNOVATION AND EMPLOYMENT (MBIE) PRESENTATION ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITIES	11-04/17	<p>Andre Anderson, Principal Advisor at MBIE, presented on the Government's proposal to establish Urban Development Authorities.</p>
DECISION PAPER 7.2 – 20 BARROWCLIFFE PLACE, MANUKAU	12-04/17	<p><i>Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.</i></p>
CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT	13-04/17 14-04/17	<p>The Chief Executive spoke to his report, which was taken as read. The following items were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationship with Auckland Transport – <i>Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.</i> • Ormiston Town Centre – <i>Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(b(ii))) of the LGOIMA.</i>
DECISION PAPER 7.3 – PRIORITY LOCATION MASTER PROGRAMME	15-04/17	<p><i>Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.</i></p>
DECISION PAPER 7.4 – PUBLIC WORKS ACT ACQUISITION	16-04/17	<p><i>Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(i)) of the LGOIMA.</i></p>
INFORMATION PAPERS 9.1 – URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITIES DISCUSSION DOCUMENTS, 9.2 – GRANTS AND DONATIONS QUARTERLY REPORT, AND 9.3 –	17-04/17	<p>Due to time constraints, these papers were all taken as read and received by the Board.</p>

GROUP WIDE FINANCE POLICIES AND PROTOCOLS		
		The meeting closed at 3:00pm.

READ AND CONFIRMED

_____ **Chairman**

_____ **Date**

Chief Executive's Report to the Board

Document Author	Roger MacDonald - Chief Executive
Contributors	David Rankin – Chief Operating Officer Rod Marler – Director Place and Design Allan Young – Director Development Ian Wheeler – Director Portfolio Management Carl Gosbee – Director Corporate Services Angelika Cutler – Director Corporate Affairs
Date	31 May 2017

1. Overview

This report provides the Board with a summarised overview of the opportunities and the issues facing the organisation.

This report is a public report, however confidential information is redacted. Where redacted information exists, a reference to the section of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA) will be cited in the publicly available version of the report.

2. Key issues

This section outlines issues that are not otherwise covered by a Decision or Information Paper elsewhere in the agenda and are either:

- Requiring a Board resolution
- Strategically significant issues
- Emerging and developing issues
- Project updates.

2.1 Issues requiring a Board Resolution

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(i)) of the LGOIMA.

2.1.2 Appointment to Company Secretary

Following David Gurney's move to be the Manager Corporate Performance at Auckland Council, Aaron Simperingham has been seconded into the position of Executive Officer/Company Secretary.

Aaron has been working in strategic and statutory advisory roles at Panuku and is a qualified solicitor. We are fortunate to have found such a capable person to act in the Company Secretary role as we recruit for the permanent role.

David and Aaron have been working through a two month transition period to ensure there is a smooth transition of responsibility for Board matters to Aaron.

As part of the Company Secretary role, Aaron will be the Board Secretary. It is therefore **recommended** that the Board formally appoint Aaron Simperingham to be Board Secretary, effective from 1 June 2017.

2.2 Strategically significant issues

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.

2.2.2 Projected housing and gross floor area supply

We have agreed with the Board that we will update them at a programme level on the reported net new dwellings and commercial and non-commercial gross floor area (GFA) being delivered within Panuku work programmes on a quarterly basis.

In a report to the Board in February, Panuku outlined the process and criteria it uses for reporting residential outcomes and the gross floor area contribution to commercial mixed use development. The report set out housing supply forecast over a ten year period across a continuum e.g. completed, underway or forecast future dwellings being delivered within Panuku work programmes. It also outlined Panuku's contribution to public open space GFA provision, particularly in the Transform and Unlock locations.

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.

We also advised the Board that we will continue to build the data set with an emphasis on recording the provision of mixed use and commercial outcomes in our Transform and Unlock areas as they progress. Our Communications and Marketing team is preparing a region-wide visual representation of all three measures so that there is a clear picture of the types of outcomes being delivered to the wider community by Panuku. We anticipate this body of work will be complete by the end of May.

2.2.3 Council Group submission on MBIE's UDA Discussion Document

On 2 May 2017 the Planning Committee approved the Council Group's submission on MBIE's urban development authorities discussion document. The submission incorporated feedback received from Panuku and the other CCOs. Overall, the Council Group submission supported in principle the establishment of UDAs, but raised concerns over a number of specific matters in the discussion document, particularly the extent of powers proposed to be given to UDAs.

The submission was lodged with MBIE prior to the 19 May 2017 deadline. MBIE staff are currently reviewing the feedback received with a report expected to go to Cabinet in July 2017. Subject to Cabinet's decision, MBIE has signaled that the earliest a Bill could be introduced to parliament is May 2018, and six months after that before a Bill would be reported back from Select Committee (i.e. November 2018).

The Executive will continue to engage with MBIE and Council Group staff on this proposal, and will update the Board on progress.

2.2.4 City Centre and Waterfront scenario testing and prioritisation

The new City Centre and Waterfront Governance structure established early this year seeks to ensure cross-council integration and coordinated delivery of key projects. It includes an Executive Steering Group and Programme Control Group and puts in place a structure to escalate and resolve critical issues to ensure momentum. The aim is to reach agreement on the prioritisation and staging of development projects across the area and present a joined-up narrative to decision makers.

Panuku is taking a leading role in both groups and participated in a scenario testing workshop on 10 May to consider different development packages and implications for the immediate (10 years) and longer term (11-30 years). The purpose was to review and agree the vision for the city centre and waterfront, to better understand dependencies and priorities.

2.2.5 Panuku End to End Priority Development Location Programme and Process

As noted last month we are continuing to address a series of issues that will enable us to be more effective in the roll out of our development programme across the multiple development locations. This is from an “end to end” process perspective.

There has been slight delay caused by the unfortunate resignation of the manager of the Programme Management Office. However we are progressing with pieces of work, and workshopping, to ensure further clarification of the role of the PMO and its range of services and responsibilities addressing a range of practical issues which the broader Panuku leadership group raised around how our end to end process currently works.

We expect to have substantially agreed on the way forward by the end of June.

2.2.6 Evaluation of the Barrowcliffe Pilot Report - summary

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.

2.2.7 Housing New Zealand Partnering Agreement

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(b(ii)) of the LGOIMA.

2.3 Emerging and developing issues

2.3.1 St Mary’s Bay Water Quality

The initiatives to improve St Mary’s Bay water quality continue, and include:

- Healthy Waters have commenced geotechnical surveys through the proposed route for the storage pipe for the St Mary’s Bay water quality project.
- Stakeholder consultation continues with education pamphlets going to St Marys bay residents.
- Installation of Tetra traps continue through the Masefield beach areas.
- Healthy Waters have commenced bathymetry and geophysical scanning of Masefield beach area for the investigations towards a replacement outfall for that area.
- Additional specialists in coastal ecology, coastal processes, archaeology and arboriculture are working on assessments of the impact of the project during construction and operations.

2.3.2 Whitford Quarry and Landfill

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(b(ii)) of the LGOIMA.

2.3.3 Queens Wharf – RFA transition – The Cloud and Shed 10

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(b(ii)) of the LGOIMA.

2.4 Project updates

2.4.1 Hobson Wharf Remediation Project

Remediation works under Hobson Wharf recommenced in April 17 post the summer shutdown, with contractor BBR Contech working on the northern end of the wharf. The northern end requires the greatest volume of repairs due to its exposure to the open harbour.

Works will continue during 2017 and will be suspended again from 1 December so that local businesses can have a break from the noise associated with such works. The volume of works to be completed has been revisited with additional elements under the wharf to be

remediated. Panuku is awaiting confirmation of the additional remediation budget within the annual plan. The additional works have been proposed at this time due to the economies of having the contractor mobilised under the wharf at this time. The project is targeted to be completed in mid-2018.

2.4.2 Project Lumens

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(b(ii)) of the LGOIMA.

2.4.3 Airfields – Hobsonville Point

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(h)) of the LGOIMA.

2.4.4 Gaunt Street, Wynyard Quarter Site

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(h)) of the LGOIMA.

2.4.5 Willis Bond West One LV1

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(h)) of the LGOIMA.

2.4.6 Vos Boat Yard, Wynyard Quarter

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(h)) of the LGOIMA.

2.4.7 Marine Village

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(h)) of the LGOIMA.

2.4.8 Ormiston Town Centre

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(b(ii)) of the LGOIMA.

2.4.9 Barrowcliffe Place, Manukau

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(h)) of the LGOIMA.

2.4.10 Improving the Gateway project – Eastern Viaduct

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.

2.4.11 Civic Administration Building

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(b(ii)) of the LGOIMA.

2.4.12 Britomart

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(i)) of the LGOIMA.

3 Panuku Leaderkit Project Summary

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.

4 Financial Summary

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.

5 Organisational Summary

5.1 Chief Executive's Networks

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.

5.2 Staff success

Two members of staff were recognised by The Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors.

Panuku's Waterfront Development Manager, Anna Wallace, received the Institute's *Construction Professional of the Year* award.

The Marinas team was awarded the *Facilities Management Team of the Year* award, received by the General Manager Marinas, Tom Warren, on behalf of the team.

5.3 Panuku office accommodation – sustainability

Panuku has through the design and delivery of the office accommodation project has been mindful of our Corporate Responsibility Framework and in particular sustainability aspects of this project. We have also been looking at the best way to make a public commitment to sustainability in our new office.

We have already committed to an 'excellent' NABERSNZ rating for energy (4 stars). Over the past few weeks we have been exploring further steps we can take, including feasibility of gaining a Green Star rating for the tenancy and we have decided to set this as a goal for the fit-out. This means we will be working alongside the fit-out contractors, landlord and consultants to make sure we are following best practice on sustainability.

We are aiming for a 4 Green Star rating for the fit-out. This will complement the landlord's Green Star rating for the base building. With only 12 tenant fit-out ratings in New Zealand, this shows real leadership and sends a strong signal to industry and our development partners that we're walking the talk.

5.4 Health and Safety

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.

5.5 Risk Management Framework

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.

5.6 Asset Management

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(f(i))) of the LGOIMA.

5.7 Portfolio Management Update

5.7.1 Acquisitions and Disposals Summary

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2(h)) of the LGOIMA.

5.8 Overseas Travel

5.8.1 Auckland New Zealand Investment Forum in Shanghai

Panuku led the Inaugural Auckland New Zealand Investment Forum in Shanghai, China, with Roger MacDonald and John Hong attending alongside Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore and the Chair of Fu Wah. The Forum was co-hosted by the China Economic Cooperation Centre, an important strategic partner for Panuku.

More than 100 highly net worth individuals and companies attended the Forum from all corners of China with some immediate interest to either partner with Panuku or invest in Auckland and New Zealand in many different sectors with a focus in housing and infrastructure.

The event was covered by a number of TV media channels, including the International Channel Shanghai, NetEase, Mulberry Media.

Information has been withheld from the public under S7(2)(b)(ii) of the LGOIMA.

5.9 Media summary

On 3 May the Western Leader led with a front page story about our Unlock Henderson project being approved by Council's Planning Committee . The project has gained strong support from Henderson-Massey Local Board Chairman Shane Henderson.

Queens Wharf was widely praised in the media as the successful host of the World Masters Games, which wrapped on the last day in April.

The April-May edition of New Zealand Construction News featured the Lysaght Building as the first in Wynyard Quarter to gain an excellent energy efficiency rating.

OurAuckland.co.nz published a number of Panuku stories this month, including about building starting at the Hobsonville Point Airfields precinct, Mayor Phil Goff's visit to Old Papatoetoe and the family fun day Open Streets that was held in Manukau last Saturday. Panuku Facebook and Twitter posts about two public sessions held in Onehunga were well received and were shared by Councillor Denise Lee through her social media channels among others.

Two new videos about Wynyard Quarter that were released this month have proved extremely popular. The first video showcases development in the Quarter in the last five years and has received 11,000 views via our Your Waterfront Facebook page. The second video is about the complexity of working under the ground of the Quarter, and has been viewed 5,600 times.

The NZ Herald covered two wins by Panuku at the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) awards: Anna Wallace, Development Manager Waterfront, who was awarded Construction Professional of the Year and our Marinas team who won Facilities Management Team of the Year.

On 25 May Paperboy published a four page feature on Panuku that includes an interview with Roger and an overview of five of our projects – Wynyard Quarter, Manukau, Old Papatoetoe, Northcote and Onehunga.

Blogs this month came from Panuku graduate Tessa Meyer on what makes a liveable city and Place Making manager Frith Walker on balancing commercial interests and community needs in urban renewal.

Attachments

Attachment A – Shareholder Feedback on Panuku's SOI

Attachment B – Leaderkit Project Summaries

Attachment C – Financial Dashboard

Attachment D – Health and Safety Report

Attachment E – Risk Update

Attachment F – Acquisitions Summary

Attachment G – Disposals Summary

Decision Paper: Disposals Programme Report

Document Author(s)	Letitia McColl, Team Leader Portfolio Review Marian Webb, Manager Portfolio Strategy
Reviewer(s)	David Rankin, Director Strategy and Engagement
Date	11 May 2017

1. Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to update the Board on the current activities at a programme level related to the portfolio review, the clearance process and the disposals programme. This paper also seeks the Board's approval to recommend to the Council the SOI 'recommended for sale' and disposal targets for the 17/18 financial year. Once approved, this will be incorporated in the FY17/18 SOI.

2. Executive summary

Our SOI sets out the requirement to identify and present properties for disposal to Council at a value of \$75 million for the 2016/17 financial year. The SOI also sets out a target of \$50 million net value of unconditional sales for the same period. To date, Panuku has recommended the disposal of \$73.9 million of property to the Finance and Performance Committee and unconditionally sold \$92.8 million worth of property for the same period.

The Portfolio Strategy team continues to develop a programme of properties to be considered for development or disposal on an annual basis, based on proactive property research it undertakes. Upon identification of the properties, the team engages council's service departments and other CCOs to get properties suitable for consideration as either a development or disposal site transferred to Panuku. To facilitate this process, the team has completed work on the creation of a complete dataset of Council owned property assets (circa 9000 properties).

Work continues on the day- to- day components of the optimisation project. This includes engagement with various Local Boards on the optimisation concept and on the progression and investigation of a number of optimisation pilots.

3. Background

Why direction is required	Panuku Development Auckland Board approval is required before a recommendation can be made to Auckland Council.	
Previous Board engagement and decisions		
Date	Document	Decision / Outcome
Councillor engagement	This will be undertaken following Panuku Development Auckland Board approval being obtained.	

4. Discussion

Portfolio Review

To date Panuku has recommended the disposal of \$73.9 million of property to the Finance and Performance Committee against the current \$75 million SOI target. This includes properties in the Transform Onehunga and Unlock Henderson priority locations.

Of the 84 properties recommended for sale to the Finance and Performance Committee to date this financial year, three properties with a combined rating value of \$815,000 were not approved for sale. These properties are 2 Forrest Hill Road, Forrest Hill and 27 and 37 Tobin Street, Pukekohe. For each of these properties, the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board and the Franklin Local Board respectively advocated to the Finance and Performance Committee that the properties be retained for open space purposes. The Parks and Recreation Policy team did not support the retention of these properties for open space purposes. The Finance and Performance Committee voted against the proposed divestment of these sites.

Two further properties presented to the Finance and Performance Committee this financial year, being 14 Baxter Street, Warkworth and 19 Anzac Street, Browns Bay were deferred. Both properties are formed as car parks and located in town centres outside of the Panuku development locations. The Rodney Local Board and the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board presented to the Committee that they had not been adequately consulted with by Auckland Transport about why these properties were not required for car parking purposes. In both instances, the local boards requested that Auckland Transport undertake parking surveys in the relevant town centre to ascertain if the properties should be retained for car parking purposes. The Finance and Performance Committee deferred decision making about each property for three months to allow Auckland Transport time to undertake parking surveys, and further requested that representatives from Auckland Transport attend a future Finance and Performance Committee meeting and brief the Committee about its car parking strategy.

Optimisation

Work continues on the development of a cross-council project to coordinate and execute optimisation. The Portfolio Strategy team investigates opportunities such as replacing current service assets in a more innovative form via the private sector, co- location, intensification or the closure and release of a site for sale to deliver strategic value e.g. housing.

Property Disposal Overview

Panuku (and previously ACPL) has presented a total of \$358.6 million worth of property to Council since establishment in November 2010. \$352.3 million has been approved for sale, \$5.5 million has been deferred pending further investigation and \$825,000 was not approved for sale.

In addition, \$130 million worth of property was approved for sale by the various legacy councils and currently sits in the Panuku portfolio for disposal. This comprises \$77.9 million worth of property progressed by the Development team for possible development opportunities and \$52.1 million worth of property progressed by the Disposals team.

Panuku is making considerable progress on a number of proposed across the region. These include the Transform Manukau sites, the mega lots in Hobsonville and the development sites in Flatbush with the proceeds of sale expected to be staged over several years. Prior to disposal, activity such as total value analysis is being undertaken to ensure non-financial outcomes are considered as part of a development objectives on a number of large development sites. Added value activities such as planning, subdivision consents, surveys and other enabling works are being undertaken prior to the marketing of these sites. Future market conditions will influence the timing of development or disposal and impact on the actual value realised at the time of sale.

Recommended for Sale -17/18 Financial Year Statement of Intent

As agreed through our Statement of Intent with Council, Panuku is required to identify and present to the Finance and Performance Committee properties that may be suitable for potential sale. Capital receipts

from the sale of surplus properties will contribute to all Auckland Plan outcomes by providing the council with an efficient use of capital and prioritisation of funds to achieve its activities and projects. Panuku agrees this target with Council annually in June prior to the commencement of the financial year once it has been approved by the Panuku Board.

The new SOI target has been assessed taking into account the probability of risks associated with clearing specific assets for sale. As the year progresses we will reassess the risks and add/deduct assets from the identified pipeline accordingly to ensure the target is achieved.

Disposals – 2016/17 Financial Year Statement of Intent Commitment

The net figure of properties with unconditional sale agreements for the current financial year to date is \$92.8 million. This is against the \$50 million target.

Disposals – 2017/18 Financial Year Statement of Intent Commitment

In the Letter of Expectation received from the Mayor earlier this year, Panuku was set a target of \$60 million net value of unconditional sales for the 2017/18 financial year. This target has now been reviewed and a final recommendation formed.

Statement of Intent Targets proposed for the financial Years 2018-2025

Panuku agrees its annual targets with Council annually in June prior to the commencement of the financial year once it has been approved by the Panuku Board. Therefore, the agreement of the annual proportion of the target that Panuku will achieve against the deficit LTP outlined in Table 2 below is yet to be made with the Council.

Table 2: LTP target

\$million	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	69	67	53	62	65	67	69	69	69	69
Forecast	69	67	53	56	45	47	49	49	49	49

LGOIMA Status

Information contained in sections of this report that should be treated as confidential, as releasing it would prejudice the commercial position of Panuku or Auckland Council. In terms to Section 7 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, Auckland Council Property Limited is entitled to withhold information where making available the information:

- i) would affect the commercial interest of a third party (s7(2)(b)(ii)); and
- ii) would be likely to prejudice or disadvantage the commercial position of council (s7(2)(h)).

5. Options Analysis

Not applicable.

6. Implementation

If approved by the Panuku development Auckland Board, the proposed targets will be recommended to the Council in June 2016.

Document Sign-off

Role	Name	Sign-off Date	Signature
Director Strategy and Engagement	David Rankin		
Chief Executive	Roger McDonald		

Decision Paper: Disposals Recommendations

Document Author(s)	Anthony Lewis – Senior Advisor Portfolio Review
Date	8 May 2017

1. Proposal

This paper seeks approval from the Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku) Board for one council owned property to be recommended to the Auckland Council governing body for disposal.

2. Executive summary

4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna is a vacant parcel of land used as an informal green space. It was released by Auckland Transport as it was no longer required for its future service needs and held no strategic purpose to retain. Consultation with council and its CCOs, iwi authorities and the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board about this property has been undertaken. No planned and funded alternative service uses were identified for this site through the rationalisation process. The Devonport-Takapuna Local Board does not support the proposed disposal of this site on the basis that it is required for open space purposes.

3. Recommendations

It is **recommended** that the Board

1. Approves

- a. The recommendation to the Auckland Council Finance and Performance Committee that 4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna is surplus to council requirements and should be divested:

4. Prior Board and Council engagement and decisions

Previous Board / Council engagement and decisions		
Date and meeting	Document	Decision / Outcome
NA	NA	NA

5. Discussion

General

Panuku and the Auckland Council Stakeholder and Community Facilities Land Advisory team jointly work on a comprehensive review of council's property portfolio. One of the outcomes of the review process is to identify properties in the council portfolio that are potentially surplus to requirements and that may be suitable to sell. The subject properties were identified as potentially surplus through this review process.

Once a property has been identified as potentially surplus, Panuku engages with Council and its CCO's to establish whether the property must be retained for a strategic purpose or is required for a future funded project or public work. Once a property has been internally cleared of any service requirements, Panuku then consults with local boards, mana whenua and relevant ward councillors. All sale recommendations must be approved by the Panuku board before a final recommendation is made to Auckland Council's Finance and Performance Committee.

Background

4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna is a vacant parcel of land comprising 496m². It is the residue of the land that was acquired pursuant to the Public Works Act 1981 by the former Takapuna City Council from Her Majesty the Queen (the Crown) in 1969 for the purpose of a service lane (now Club Lane, Takapuna).

In 2015, Auckland Transport transferred 4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna to Auckland Council following the Auckland Transport Board declaring that this property had no current or future transport function.

The Auckland Unitary Plan zoning of 4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna is Business - Metropolitan Centre Zone. It has a 2014 capital value of \$1,025,000. The property is subject to airspace restriction designations for protection of approach and departure paths (Whenuapai Air Base). An electricity easement exists in favour of Vector Limited.

4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna was acquired and held for a public work, being for the purpose of a service lane. If it is no longer required to be held for a public work, it must be offered back to the former owners or their immediate successors in accordance with section 40 of the Public Works Act 1981.

Internal consultation

The internal consultation for this site commenced in August 2015. No expressions of interest were received during the internal consultation process and no issues were raised.

Local board views and implications

The Devonport-Takapuna Local Board opposed the proposed disposal of 4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna at its 21 March 2017 business meeting on the basis that it is required for open space purposes. Panuku sought feedback on this from the Council's Parks and Recreation Policy team, which advised that while there is a gap in quality open space in the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board area, this site does not provide the outcomes sought for a quality open space network.

The Devonport-Takapuna Local Board also requested that tabled correspondence from members of the public be included in the report to the Panuku Board as part of the decision making regarding the subject site. The tabled correspondence is included in the Appendix to this report.

Iwi feedback

13 mana whenua iwi authorities were contacted regarding the potential divestment of 4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna. The following feedback was received:

a) Te Runanga o Ngāti Whatua

No site specific feedback received for this site, noting that as per earlier conversations with Te Runanga representatives, it is understood that any cultural significance considerations will be raised at hapū level and that all Ngāti Whatua hapū have been contacted about properties in their rohe.

b) Ngāti Whatua o Kaipara

No feedback received for this site.

c) Ngāti Whatua Ōrakei

No feedback received for this site.

d) Te Kawerau a Maki

No feedback received for this site.

e) Ngai Tai ki Tamaki

Ngai Tai ki Tāmaki confirmed the site holds cultural significance. Takapuna is named after a spring near Maunga-ika (North Head) and a place where many Ngai Tai ancestors were also named the same, none more so than Takapuna Hetaraka, a Ngai Tai.

f) Ngāti Tamaoho

No feedback received for this site.

g) Te ākitai - Waiohua

Te ākitai – Waiohua has expressed a potential commercial interest in this property.

h) Ngāti Te Ata - Waiohua

No site specific feedback received for this site; however Ngāti Te Ata has expressed general cultural interest across Tāmaki Makaurau, has potential commercial interest in any council owned land that comes available for sale in their rohe and notes specific association with the south western area of Auckland, focusing around Manukau and the western coastline.

i) Ngati Paoa

No feedback received for this site.

j) Ngati Whanaunga

No feedback received for this site.

k) Ngati Maru

No feedback received for this site.

l) Ngati Tamatera

No feedback received for this site.

m) Patukirikiri

No feedback received for this site.

6. Financial implications

There are financial implications for Council if it chooses to retain this site, as there was a book value transfer of \$1,025,000 from Auckland Council to Auckland Transport upon transfer of the site. Advice from Council's Financial Strategy and Planning team is that if this site were to be retained for open space purposes, as requested by the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board, the book value could be

deducted from the open space budget. This would result in a neutral impact on the Council's financial position. Alternatively, Council would incur an unanticipated additional \$1,025,000 debt due to the foregone asset sales opportunity should this site be retained, which would have consequential budget implications.

7. Implementation

The results of the rationalisation process are that this property is not required for current or future service requirements. As such, we recommend that 4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna be divested. Should a resolution be obtained from the Finance and Performance Committee approving the divestment of this site, we will undertake a disposals process for this site that provides an optimal return to council and ideally delivers a housing outcome.

There has been interest registered by several parties in acquiring this site should it be cleared for disposal. This can be explored further should the Finance and Performance Committee approved the proposed disposal.

Document Sign-off

Role	Name	Sign-off Date	Signature
Chief Executive	Roger MacDonald		
Chief Operating Officer	David Rankin		

Appendix A – 4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna

Images





Grant

I, along with my wife Rosemary, are the owners and residents of [REDACTED] I wish to address the recommendation by Panuku to sell the pocket park on a Section 40 offer back to the previous owner.

Please accept this email as a formal submission to the Local Board meeting tomorrow 21 March 2017.

I do not support the sale or loss of Blomfield Reserve at 4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna.

Blomfield Reserve on the corner of Club Lane is a passive reserve which provides a good separation between our residential street and the commercial centre of Takapuna. The park forms part of the amenity of our community of our street and its loss would adversely affect our home.

I have read the Panuku recommendation included in the Agenda for 21 March as Item 14. The document references consultation with the Local Board and it is clear that disposal of the land was not supported by the feedback under section 11.

I believe the statements under section 12 do not reflect the wishes or beliefs of the owners and ratepayers of Blomfield Spa. Panuku state under section 12;

12. "Panuku has liaised with the Parks and Recreation Policy team during the rationalisation process. The Parks and Recreation Policy team advised that 4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna has limited function as a neighbourhood park for people living in the area. There is no neighbourhood park service gap in this area and there are other civic spaces nearby, both privately and publically owned that have a similar function. The size of the section makes it limited for uses other than passive recreation. There are no open space connection attributes or treasure values evident."

The Parks and Recreation policy team's statement of the reserve "providing limited function as a neighbourhood park for people living in the area is not correct". The passive reserve serves the role of a pocket park and separation from the commercial interface. For this reason alone the proposal is rejected.

Parks and Recreation also state that there is no neighbourhood park service gap in this area as there are other civic spaces nearby. I disagree with this statement as well as the subjective measure for the distance and abundance of civic spaces is relative to the character of the locality. Takapuna's reserves are part of the character of the location and the loss of any reserve space changes the nature and character of the community. If the Parks and Reserves policy team has quantified a measure of sufficient parks for a location I believe it calls for more clarity. Some civic spaces in Takapuna attract visitors from elsewhere in Auckland to enjoy the beach amenity while this reserve provides a very different benefit for those that live in the area.

I agree that the size and location of the reserve makes it suitable for passive recreation, as a pocket park and I have personally witnessed many local employees using this park as a lunch time retreat.

Finally, the resource management under the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part has increased the density of commercial and residential activities considerably in Takapuna. A greater need for open space reserves arises as intensification occurs. Accordingly, the disposal of this space is not supported by the ratepayers of Blomfield Spa.

Regards

Gavin Houghton

[REDACTED]

Hi Grant

I'm forwarding on an email which my neighbour has sent you already and I would also like to say that My husband Gavin and I are in agreement with our neighbours letter to you in relation to file no. CP2016/24929 Disposals recommendation report.

I have just read this and I would like to advise we as owners of [REDACTED] do not support the sale or loss of this green belt area.

As owners and residents of [REDACTED] I wish to address the recommendation by Panuku to sell the pocket park on a Section 40 offer back to the previous owner.

Please accept this email as a formal submission to the Local Board meeting today 21 March 2017.

We do not support the sale or loss of Blomfield Reserve at 4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna.

Blomfield Reserve on the corner of Club Lane is a passive reserve which provides a good separation between our residential street and the commercial centre of Takapuna. The park forms part of the amenity of our community of our street and its loss would adversely affect our home.

I have used this area myself and I have seen others utilise the area.

I have read the Panuku recommendation included in the Agenda for 21 March as a Item 14. The document references consultation with the Local Board and it is clear that disposal of the land was not supported by the feedback under section 11.

I believe the statements under section 12 do not reflect the wishes or beliefs of the owners and ratepayers of Blomfield Spa. Panuku state under section 12;

12. "Panuku has liaised with the Parks and Recreation Policy team during the rationalisation process. The Parks and Recreation Policy team advised that 4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna has limited function as a neighbourhood park for people living in the area. There is no neighbourhood park service gap in this area and there are other civic spaces nearby, both privately and publically owned that have a similar function. The size of the section makes it limited for uses other than passive recreation. There are no open space connection attributes or treasure values evident."

The Parks and Recreation policy team's statement of the reserve "*providing limited function as a neighbourhood park for people living in the area is not correct*". The passive reserve serves the role of a pocket park and separation from the commercial interface. For this reason alone the proposal is rejected.

Parks and Recreation also state that there is no neighbourhood park service gap in this area as there are other civic spaces nearby. I disagree with this statement as well as the subjective measure for the distance and abundance of civic spaces is relative to the character of the locality. Takapuna's reserves are part of the character of the location and

the loss of any reserve space changes the nature and character of the community. If the Parks and Reserves policy team has quantified a measure of sufficient parks for a location I believe it calls for more clarity. Some civic spaces in Takapuna attract visitors from elsewhere in Auckland to enjoy the beach amenity while this reserve provides a very different benefit for those that live in the area.

I agree that the size and location of the reserve makes it suitable for passive recreation, as a pocket park.

Finally, the resource management under the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part has increased the density of commercial and residential activities considerably in Takapuna. A greater need for open space reserves arises as intensification occurs. Accordingly, the disposal of this space is not supported by the ratepayers of Blomfield Spa.

Note -It seems to me to be very coincidental that the neighbouring property at 6 Blomfield Spa is now on the market to sell just in the last few days after not selling to its target market - which were developers last year!

I may be unable to attend the meeting this afternoon as I have prior appointments but I will try, otherwise my husband will be in attendance,

Regards

Rosie Houghton

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Good evening

I am here to speak to the agenda item “the disposal of Blomfield Reserve”.

Like most of my fellow citizens and ratepayers I am appalled that this matter is on the agenda again.

Last year the Board elected by the Community said NO to the disposal of this land.

At this point it would seem prudent to remind Board Members and Councillors that you sit in your current positions as “trustees” for those of us who elected you and the responsibility that comes with this.

Panuka seems to be a law unto themselves. Last night I made myself

familiar with the Board of Directors; one has to wonder if they know and understand the manner that their staff are undertaking this work.

Yet again no consultation with the public.

We seem to have Town Planners who have no knowledge or even care about the ramifications of the situations they are inflicting on the environment. They clearly have not travelled the world and seen the open green spaces; Stanley Park in Vancouver, Hyde Park in London and even the numerous parks in Sydney and its suburbs; small parks in Europe.

These little pockets of parks exactly like Blomfield Reserve provide the oasis of calm among the chaos. They will be the main place in

the city as intensive development sucks up all the other trees.

I and others in the community fear that there is something extremely duplicitous and under hand going on here.

There are apparently two “known” buyers/entities competing for this reserve; one to enable a hotel complex to be built and the other for high rise apartments. Both these factions apparently need the Reserve.

Hence out of nowhere this matter is on the agenda again – Panuka again ...

Could I ask the representative/s of Panuka who surely must be in attendance at this meeting tonight to identify themselves and to put the truth of the matter out in the open forum.

NB To this outline I laboured the point that the Council is currently advertising the fact that the Nosh and Liquor King site is being developed into a park.

Also St Patricks Square is also having a significant refurbishment.

The Baby Factory on Northcroft Street is closing down on the 13th of April 2017 to make way for the demolition of the building for the development of the gasometer site.

Grant

I am the owner and resident of [REDACTED] I wish to address the recommendation by Panuku to sell the pocket park on a Section 40 offer back to the previous owner.

Please accept this email as a formal submission to the Local Board meeting tomorrow 21 March 2017.

I do not support the sale or loss of Blomfield Reserve at 4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna.

Blomfield Reserve on the corner of Club Lane is a passive reserve which provides a good separation between our residential street and the commercial centre of Takapuna. The park forms part of the amenity of our community of our street and its loss would adversely affect our home.

I have read the Panuku recommendation included in the Agenda for 21 March as a Item 14. The document references consultation with the Local Board and it is clear that disposal of the land was not supported by the feedback under section 11.

I believe the statements under section 12 do not reflect the wishes or beliefs of the owners and ratepayers of Blomfield Spa. Panuku state under section 12;

12. "Panuku has liaised with the Parks and Recreation Policy team during the rationalisation process. The Parks and Recreation Policy team advised that 4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna has limited function as a neighbourhood park for people living in the area. There is no neighbourhood park service gap in this area and there are other civic spaces nearby, both privately and publically owned that have a similar function. The size of the section makes it limited for uses other than passive recreation. There are no open space connection attributes or treasure values evident."

The Parks and Recreation policy team's statement of the reserve "*providing limited function as a neighbourhood park for people living in the area is not correct*". The passive reserve serves the role of a pocket park and separation from the commercial interface. For this reason alone the proposal is rejected.

Parks and Recreation also state that there is no neighbourhood park service gap in this area as there are other civic spaces nearby. I disagree with this statement as well as the subjective measure for the distance and abundance of civic spaces is relative to the character of the locality. Takapuna's reserves are part of the character of the location and the loss of any reserve space changes the nature and character of the community. If the Parks and Reserves policy team has quantified a measure of sufficient parks for a location I believe it calls for more clarity. Some civic spaces in Takapuna attract visitors from elsewhere in Auckland to enjoy the beach amenity while this reserve provides a very different benefit for those that live in the area.

I agree that the size and location of the reserve makes it suitable for passive recreation, as a pocket park.

Finally, the resource management under the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part has increased the density of commercial and residential activities considerably in Takapuna. A greater need for open space reserves arises as intensification occurs. Accordingly, the disposal of this space is not supported by the ratepayers of Blomfield Spa.

I am unable to attend the meeting tomorrow and will need to waive my right to be heard, as I have prior commitments. I remain available should you require clarification or clarity on the matters raised herein.

Regards

Steve Dunlop

Dear Grant

I am the owner and resident of [REDACTED] I wish to address the recommendation by Panuku to sell the pocket park on a Section 40 offer back to the previous owner.

Please accept this email as a formal submission to the Local Board meeting tomorrow 21 March 2017.

I do not support the sale or loss of Blomfield Reserve at 4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna.

Blomfield Reserve on the corner of Club Lane is a passive reserve which provides a good separation between our residential street and the commercial centre of Takapuna. The park forms part of the amenity of our community of our street and its loss would adversely affect our home.

I have read the Panuku recommendation included in the Agenda for 21 March as a Item 14. The document references consultation with the Local Board and it is clear that disposal of the land was not supported by the feedback under section 11.

I believe the statements under section 12 do not reflect the wishes or beliefs of the owners and ratepayers of Blomfield Spa. Panuku state under section 12;

12. "Panuku has liaised with the Parks and Recreation Policy team during the rationalisation process. The Parks and Recreation Policy team advised that 4 Blomfield Spa, Takapuna has limited function as a neighbourhood park for people living in the area. There is no neighbourhood park service gap in this area and there are other civic spaces nearby, both privately and publically owned that have a similar function. The size of the section makes it limited for uses other than passive recreation. There are no open space connection attributes or treasure values evident."

The Parks and Recreation policy team's statement of the reserve "*providing limited function as a neighbourhood park for people living in the area is not correct*". The passive reserve serves the role of a pocket park and separation from the commercial interface. For this reason alone the proposal is rejected.

Parks and Recreation also state that there is no neighbourhood park service gap in this area as there are other civic spaces nearby. I disagree with this statement as well as the subjective measure for the distance and abundance of civic spaces is relative to the character of the locality. Takapuna's reserves are part of the character of the location and the loss of any reserve space changes the nature and character of the community. If the Parks and Reserves policy team has quantified a measure of sufficient parks for a location I believe it calls for more clarity. Some civic spaces in Takapuna attract visitors from elsewhere in Auckland to enjoy the beach amenity while this reserve provides a very different benefit for those that live in the area.

I agree that the size and location of the reserve makes it suitable for passive recreation, as a pocket park.

Finally, the resource management under the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part has increased the density of commercial and residential activities considerably in Takapuna. A greater need for open space reserves arises as intensification occurs. Accordingly, the disposal of this space is not supported by the ratepayers of Blomfield Spa.

I am unable to attend the meeting tomorrow and will need to waive my right to be heard, as I have prior commitments. I remain available should you require clarification or clarity on the matters raised herein.

Regards

Steve Haslett

