



Kawhia Community Board

AGENDA

27 November 2015

1.00pm

Members of the Kawhia Community Board

Mr CE Jeffries (Chair)
Ms A Gane
Mrs DM Pilkington
Mr AJ Rutherford
Mr DM Walsh

Meeting Secretary: Mr CA Tutty (Governance Supervisor)

KAWHIA COMMUNITY BOARD

27 November 2015

Notice is hereby given that an ordinary meeting of the Kawhia Community Board will be held in Waipapa Marae, 5489 State Highway 31, Kawhia on Friday 27 November 2015 commencing at 1.00pm.

20 November 2015

DC Clibbery
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

AGENDA

ORDER OF BUSINESS:

ITEM	PRECIS	PAGE
PRESENT		1
IN ATTENDANCE		1
APOLOGIES		1
ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN GENERAL BUSINESS		1
CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – 2 OCTOBER 2015		1
REPORTS		1
Item 74	REPLACEMENT OF DRINKING FOUNTAINS	1
Item 75	POUEWE STREET BOARDWALK	7
Item 76	DRAFT MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 30 SEPTEMBER 2015	12
Item 77	KCB PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF ORDINARY MEETINGS DATES JANUARY TO OCTOBER 2016	13
Item 78	COMMUNITY BOARD CHAIRS' WORKSHOP	14
Item 79	KCB MATTERS REFERRED FROM 2 OCTOBER 2015	18
GENERAL		18

PRESENT

IN ATTENDANCE

APOLOGIES

ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN GENERAL BUSINESS

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – 2 OCTOBER 2015

REPORTS

Item 74 REPLACEMENT OF DRINKING FOUNTAINS

**To: Chairperson & Members
 Kawhia Community Board**

From: Community Facilities Officer

Date: 27 November 2015

Relevant Community Outcomes

- The Otorohanga District is a safe place to live
 - Ensure services and facilities meet the needs of the Community
 - Manage the natural and physical environment in a sustainable manner
 - Foster an involved and engaged Community
 - Protect the special character of our harbours and their catchments
-

Executive Summary

The Chairperson of the Kawhia Community Board would like to lift the visual aspect of the skate park and wharf areas by replacing the existing drinking fountains in these areas. Alternatives are suggested in this report and a budget would have to be approved for next year for these if the decision is made to install one or two drinking fountains.

Staff Recommendation

It is recommended:

That the report from the Community Facilities Officer be received.

Report Discussion

At present there is:

A bowl shaped drinking fountain near the skate park (see Attachment A). I have been led to believe from local people that this fountain is constantly the target of young ones trying to block it and putting sticks and stones down the outlet.

and

A time-regulated drinking and foot washing tap at the beginning of the wharf. This tap is to remain especially for that purpose of feet washing, so a new drinking fountain would be extra.

There are two options – see Attachment B.

Option 1 Install two new drinking fountains of the type that has been installed in Rotorua and Hamilton in recent times. (One of these will replace the one currently at the skatepark.) There are colour choices or a custom mural can be used. It also has the option for filling bottles. The placement of the tap on top of the fountain leaves it open to vandalism. Budget amount \$6000.

Option 2 Install two new drinking fountains using a vandal proof design of the type which the Community Facilities Officer is currently recommending for Otorohanga's Reg Brett Reserve (skatepark) Budget amount \$7500.

From an operational, practical point of view, option two is preferable and from an aesthetic point of view option one is preferable.

It is requested that a decision be made by the Kawhia Community Board on which option, if any, for water fountains in Kawhia be proposed for consideration in the 2016/17 Budget.

Dianne Hooker
COMMUNITY FACILITIES OFFICER

Attachments

- a. Photos of existing drinking fountain/tap
- b. Option 1 information and price and Option 2 information and price

Attachment A

Skatepark



Wharf Tap



Attachment B

Option 1

TapWaterWells

em210pm: PVC Drinking Fountain With Mural

Stainless Steel Bowl & Bowl Guard >

- Manufactured from strong 1.6mm 316 S/Steel.
- Bowl Guard Grate prevents blockages.

Drink Bottle Filler >

- Vandal & frost resistant.
- Hygienic recessed water outlet prevents contact with drink bottles.
- Push button operated with minimal pressure.
- Drips drain into waste water outlet.

High Impact PVC Up stand >

- & Modern durable vandal proof material.
- **Mural Wrap:** 3M U180C High performance, cast conformable Graphic Vinyl Film
- **Laminate:** 3M 8518 High performance, cast conformable Vinyl Graphic Protection Film UV and Graffiti Resistant.
- Mural easily replaced or changed
- Mural can be retrofitted to existing em210p Drinking Fountains
- Design your own Mural or use one of our stock designs
- Secured to base with mounting plate.
- Up stand provides security for plumbing and optional filter unit.
- Connects to mains water supply.
- Standard Heights 70cm and 85cm
- New Zealand Manufactured
- Materials can be recycled
- 2-year product guarantee.



< Brass Chrome Plated Faucet

- Vandal & frost resistant.
- Hygienic guarded water outlet.
- Push button operated with minimal pressure.

For further information please contact
www.tapwaterwells.co.nz

Ph: 0800 473 487 email: ian@tww.co.nz

Option 2 –

Vandal Resistant Outdoor Drinking Fountain

Heavy Duty Stainless Steel Drinking Fountain Built to Last

Order/Specify As:

AQUAGO **CCSSPD**

Designed with Durability in Mind:

- ✓ Built to last & will suit any outdoor environment
- ✓ Heavy duty stainless steel
- ✓ Rigid construction
- ✓ Chrome plated brass body bubbler
- ✓ Bubbler pinned into position to prevent rotation
- ✓ Bubbler protected with outer protection shield
- ✓ Recessed vandal resistant push button bubbler with 'snake-eye' vandal resistant fasteners



Ideal for Areas Where Vandalism May Occur:

- ❖ School Playgrounds & Courtyards
- ❖ Sport & Recreational Parks
- ❖ Neighbourhood Playgrounds & Skate Parks
- ❖ Reserves & Walkways

Size:

1200mm Bollard
800mm Above ground (recommended height)



CHEM CHEK
COMMUNITY LTD

AQUAGO
WATER SUPPLY SYSTEMS

www.chemchek.co.nz

45 Rennie Drive, Airport Oaks, Mangere, Auckland 2022 | PO Box 107 133, Auckland Airport, Auckland 2150 New Zealand
Phone: (09) 275-3010 Fax: (09) 371-3968 Email: sales@chemchek.co.nz South Island Phone: (09) 457 2125

ChemChek Ltd 2015

Item 75 POUEWE STREET BOARDWALK

To: **Chairman and Members
Kawhia Community Board**

From: **Chief Executive**

Date: **27 November 2015**

Relevant Community Outcomes

- Ensure services and facilities meet the needs of the Community
-

Executive Summary

Issues relating to the previously proposed Pouewe Street Boardwalk are discussed.

Staff Recommendation

1. That the report be received.
2. That works are conducted on the 'narrow' section of Pouewe Street to reposition the road edge line, install marker posts and signage with the intention of improving the safety of pedestrians walking along the southern side of the road.

Report Discussion

A report was presented to the Board at its meeting of 2 October 2015, advising that tender prices for the proposed Pouewe Street Boardwalk were significantly in excess of the allocated budget, and seeking direction from the Board on how to respond to this.

A resolution was made '*that community support for such a project be investigated*'.

This resolution was given effect by the holding of a public meeting, led by the Board Chairman, in Kawhia on 31 October, at which a broad range of matters were raised.

To avoid contention over what the outcome of that meeting was, a description provided by the Board Chairman is as follows (in italics):

The outcome of the public meeting was that instead of the proposed boardwalk the preferred option is to extend the seawall out into the harbour far enough to enable a footpath to be constructed on the harbour-side of the trees. Yes, it's acknowledged that the boardwalk proposal did not receive favour, however the last sentence suggests that that's the end of the matter, and it simply isn't.

It needs to be clear that at no time has the community stated that it is not supportive of the additional funding required – it simply wasn't supportive of the boardwalk proposal. The community has requested that the preferred option be costed out and that a further meeting be held in Kawhia at which time a decision will then be made as to whether any additional funding required will be supported. This community will make that decision.

The community (I thought) had also made it clear that it wanted Council to give favourable consideration to simply transferring the \$100K allocation set aside for the boardwalk proposal and making it available for the footpath option. We can't see how that is going to create any difficulties for the Council as any reallocation will remain within the roads and footpath activity.

It would be appreciated if this matter could be clarified, considered and supported at the 17 November meeting please.

In response to the above request, the following points are raised as part of this clarification and consideration:

Safety Issues

The Boardwalk project was primarily driven by a belief on the part of some KCB members that there was a significant pedestrian safety issue that needed to be addressed.

The perceived safety issue is that there is an approximately 70 metre long section of Pouewe Street where the line-marked edge of the road carriageway is in close proximity to the bank at the harbour edge (within 1.0 metre in places) with the result that there is no space for a separate footpath, and that pedestrians must instead walk on the edge of the road, where there is potentially little separation between vehicles and pedestrians.

KCB members expressed the opinion that the matter should be addressed by moving pedestrians away from the road, which could only be achieved by undertaking relatively major works.

The potential hazard associated with this area is however in the opinion of Council staff reduced by the fact that the section of road is straight, giving drivers excellent visibility of pedestrians (and vice versa), is subject to a 50kph speed limit, and that flows of both vehicles and pedestrians along this section of road are normally very low, with pedestrian flows in particular only being significant during peak holiday periods, and outside of these times it is relatively rare to see people walking along this section.

The low vehicle numbers on the road make interactions between vehicles on both sides of the road infrequent, so there are generally ample opportunities for vehicles on the southern lane of the road to pull out to maintain safe distances from pedestrians if needed. A very low number of wider heavy vehicles also contributes to reduced potential for traffic to be dangerously close to pedestrians.

Whilst Council has been aware of the possible pedestrian safety issues in this area for many years, there have been no recorded accidents or near-miss incidents in this area since such recording began prior to 1980, and neither have there been any public complaints. As such the real extent of the associated safety hazard was considered to be limited, hence in the opinion of staff did not justify undertaking major and expensive works to rectify.

Views to this effect were expressed in a report to KCB on 14 December 2014.

This view of there being only a relatively limited safety hazard on Pouewe Street appears to have been supported by the community at the recent public meeting, where issues of road safety are understood to not have featured strongly in the discussions, with much more attention being devoted to matters such as erosion prevention, maintenance costs, and funding issues.

Without a strong community perception of there being a very significant safety issue, it seems difficult to justify any further work towards associated major improvements.

A possible means to enhance safety on Pouewe Street without major works could however be to move the edge line of the road slightly further away from the edge of the seal, and to place marker posts along this edge line to better define the pedestrian area and keep vehicles further away from it. These modifications could be accompanied by a road sign warning drivers of the presence of pedestrians. Such works would have only a very modest cost.

Another option that has been suggested by some is the installation of 'speed humps' to slow vehicles, but it is believed that such measures would be inappropriate at this location because of the possibility that drivers might move more to the side of the road in an attempt to avoid the humps, which could create an even more hazardous situation.

Previous Investigation of Options

Investigation of a potential greater physical separation of pedestrians from the road commenced in the 2014/15 financial year at the request of the Board.

A report was presented to the Board on 12 December 2014 which outlined 4 options to achieve this, which included timber boardwalks, retaining walls, and installation of road kerb and channel.

Installing a retaining wall with handrail, backfilling and constructing a concrete footpath on it was presented as one of these options. Preliminary investigation and design for this option had been conducted, and a cost estimate of \$230,000 made for a full length wall and path with handrail. This significant cost was in part because it would represent a coastal reclamation with all the regulatory complexity that goes with it, and the Board members indicated a preference for a boardwalk instead because it was perceived as being both simpler and more attractive.

Though some questions were raised regarding the justification for works of such relatively large scale, the Board resolved that further investigation be conducted of the boardwalk option, subject to revisions to the concept presented which included a lowering of the boardwalk height to eliminate a need for handrails, and shortening of the boardwalk length.

A revised design was prepared with these requested changes, and based on this a provisional cost of \$100,000 was indicated in the budget estimates, which were discussed at a KCB workshop on 6 March 2015, at which the Board members present indicated a desire to proceed with the project, and to make a request to Council for the funding of it, which Council subsequently approved, and the project was included in Council's Long Term Plan for the 2015/16 year.

Issues of Erosion

The need to protect the shore on Pouewe Street from erosion was never raised as an issue when the boardwalk project was first proposed, and had not been identified as an issue previously. It was never used as justification for the project when a request for funding was made to Council. Recent inspections of the site by Council staff have supported a previously held view that there has not been any significant recent erosion here, and that the position of the shore has changed little in at least the last 15 years.

There have never been any discussions with NZTA about there being a need for erosion protection at that site, and hence no subsidised funding has been allocated for this purpose in the current 3 year NZTA funding block, so at this time subsidy cannot realistically be obtained to offset the cost of retaining walls.

If at some time in the future there is considered to be an urgent need to protect the road from erosion the necessary works would be done as emergency works or preventative maintenance and it would be expected that NZTA would subsidise the essential road-protecting components of those works, but this would not be expected to include a substantial reclamation or construction of a footpath.

Funding Issues

The proposal to create greater separation of pedestrians and traffic on Pouewe Street through a major project evolved without a clear picture of how it would be funded, though there were initial suggestions of it being loan funded within the Kawhia/Aotea community. It was only at a relatively late stage that the proposal was made by the KCB for Council to fund it, and it had never been certain that Council would agree to this.

It is however suspected that if the views of the Kawhia community in respect of road safety issues at that site (or lack of them) had been known at the time of Council's budget estimates, Council would not have agreed to provide the \$100,000 allocation for this project in the first place, and this needs to be borne in mind in the consideration of a possible alternative use of these funds in Kawhia.

A substantial amount of money has already been spent on investigations, design, consultation, obtaining building and resource consents, driving test piles, and conducting a tender process for the Boardwalk. \$16,000 of this year's \$100,000 allocation has already been spent, in addition to the \$6,000 that was spent on the preliminary investigations during the previous year. To put in a

retaining wall with reclamation would require a new resource consent (which would be more complex than that required for a boardwalk, as an ecological assessment would be required because of potential loss of habitats), associated consultation, preparation of a design and tender document, and conduct of another tender process, which would together have a cost of at least \$10,000, and probably more. There would also be a cost to manage any awarded contract, which would cost several thousand dollars. As such there would almost certainly be less than \$70,000 left from the current budget for the actual physical works, which is around one-third of the previously estimated cost for a full-length retaining wall and path.

Even if the length of retaining wall and path was limited to the minimum 'essential' length where the road is closest to the foreshore, it would still be likely that the cost of works would be around \$100,000, requiring at least \$30,000 of additional funding from some other source, which might not be forthcoming.

If this additional funding could not be found, the outcome would be that around \$35,000 in total would have been spent to provide nothing tangible.

Decision Making Processes

It is believed that recent events in respect of the Boardwalk perhaps highlight a need for a different approach to community consultation on proposed Council activities in and around Kawhia.

Formal consultation was undertaken by Council staff with relevant groups in Kawhia in respect of the possible environmental effects of a Boardwalk.

More general views of the community were expected to be expressed through the KCB, the members of which are well connected with their communities. In this case it does however appear that a significant divergence of views between some KCB members and the broader community had developed.

It is however recognised that effectively undertaking this broader consultation is difficult unless it includes details of the financial implications of the proposed actions on the people being consulted.

In the case of the Boardwalk these financial implications were unclear until Council agreed to the KCB's request for it to fund the project, and at that point the responsibility for further consultation fell on Council, and occurred as part of Council's long term plan on a high-level District wide basis, rather than being referred back at a detailed level to the Kawhia Community. Furthermore at that point – where there would be no associated cost to the Kawhia community other than through its relatively small contribution to general District rates – the likelihood of objection to something that it might be perceived as 'getting for free' – was likely to be low, and indeed no LTP submissions on this project were received.

This lack of written submissions is however fairly typical; when community comment had been previously invited on the new sea wall around the foreshore reserve, almost no response was received.

The good turn-out to the recent public meeting (which is not unusual in this community) does however suggest that Kawhia/Aotea people are interested in local matters, and that better advantage could perhaps be taken of this in decision making.

This is however not without challenges. Having meaningful engagement with the community often requires a significant amount of information to be gathered to help guide discussions. For example where there are a number of potential alternative approaches, sufficient information needs to be gathered to describe these options, their advantages and disadvantages, potential impediments and likely costs, both in the short and long term.

The gathering of this information may require surveys, investigation and design work, all of which has costs, which progressively increase as options are refined. Decisions to narrow down the range of options therefore often need to be made at a relatively early stage, to keep these costs at an acceptable level. The current case, where community consultation on detailed project

issues is being conducted at the very end of a planning process, is an extremely inefficient exercise.

It is therefore suggested that in any future cases where significant new works in Kawhia area envisaged

- The Board conducts some initial early engagement with the community in respect of these works, through public meetings.
- That wherever possible clear decisions on the proposed funding sources for such works are made at an early stage, so that the potential financial implications for the community can be outlined as part of this community engagement

Conclusion

The key factor on which the Boardwalk project was based was a perceived matter of safety. Recent engagement with the community seems to have indicated a general view that these safety issues are not sufficiently great as to warrant substantial expenditure on major works at the site.

As such, without the original justification for the funding allocated for the Boardwalk, it would appear inappropriate for it to be reallocated for another unrelated purpose.

Whilst it is understood that it has been proposed to have further engagement with the community in respect of pursuing another means of separating pedestrians and traffic at this site (such as a retaining wall) the diminishing pool of funding would appear to now make it very difficult to deliver such a project.

Dave Clibbery
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

**Item 76 DRAFT MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 30
SEPTEMBER 2015**

**To: Chairperson & Members
Kawhia Community Board**

From: District Accountant

Date: 27 November 2015

Relevant Community Outcomes

- Ensure services and facilities meet the needs of the Community
 - Promote the local economy and opportunities for sustainable economic development
 - Foster an involved and engaged Community
-

Executive Summary

The Draft Management Accounts for the period ended 30 September 2015 are attached under separate cover.

Staff Recommendation

It is recommended:

That the Draft Management Accounts for the period ended 30 September 2015 be received.

Brendan O'Callaghan
DISTRICT ACCOUNTANT

**Item 77 KCB PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF ORDINARY MEETINGS DATES
JANUARY TO OCTOBER 2016**

**To: Chairperson and Members
Kawhia Community Board**

From: Chief Executive

Date: 27 November 2015

Executive Summary

The proposed schedule of meeting dates for the period January to October 2016 to be considered and adopted.

Suggested Recommendation

It is recommended that:

The proposed schedule of ordinary meeting dates for the period January to October 2016 be approved in accordance with Clause 19 of the Seventh Schedule of the Local Government Act 2002.

Report Discussion

PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF ORDINARY MEETING DATES JANUARY - OCTOBER 2016

Friday	22 January 2016
	25 March 2016
	27 May 2016
	22 July 2016
	23 September 2016
	21 October 2016 <i>First meeting of the new Board</i>

Time: **1.00pm** unless otherwise indicated on the Agenda.

Venue: Kawhia Community Boardroom, Kawhia.

DC Clibbery
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Item 78 COMMUNITY BOARD CHAIRS' WORKSHOP

**To: Chairperson & Members
 Kawhia Community Board**

From: Governance Supervisor

Date: 27 November 2015

Relevant Community Outcomes

- Ensure services and facilities meet the needs of the Community
 - Foster an involved and engaged Community
-

Executive Summary

The Chairs' report from attending the Community Board Chairs' workshop recently in Taupo.

Staff Recommendation

It is recommended:

That the Chair's report be received.

Report Discussion

Attached is the report from the Chair on his attendance at the Community Board Chairs' Workshop held recently in Taupo.

CA Tutty
GOVERNANCE SUPERVISOR

Attachments

- c. Chair's Report on the Community Board Chairs' Workshop

Report on the Community Board Chairs' Workshop held in the Events Centre, Taupo on Saturday 14 November 2015.

Boards in attendance:

Kawhia
Kaikohe Hokianga
Wanganui Rural
National Park
Taihape
Whangamata
Raglan
Kaitake
Bay of Islands/Whangaroa
Clifton
Waihi Beach
Te Puke
Te Hiku
Opotiki
Otaki
Rotorua Lakes
Hawkes Bay (?)

Facilitators:

Mike Reid (Principal Advisor LGNZ)
Mick Lester (Chairman Community Boards Executive Committee)

Matters raised and discussed:

1. Some Board Chairs sit on Council – speaking rights/no voting rights
2. Annual levy to Community Boards Executive Committee (CBEC) – how much do we pay and what does it 'buy' us?
3. Rotorua – rural wards disestablished and replaced with a rural community board. Same scenario at Wanganui. Worth considering?
4. General concern about lack of training given to new Board members. Boards have the right to establish their own Code of Conduct – don't have to be bound by the Councils code.
5. Not enough emphasis given on explaining the different roles between that of a Councillor and that of a Community Board member.
6. Despite a Colmar Brunton poll that indicated that 60% of those polled in the Hawkes Bay region were opposed to an amalgamation, the Local Government Commission went ahead anyway. Final result – 61% against/39% for!
7. Councils need to be careful about establishing CCO's for water as one of the down sides is that water charges will no longer be counted as 'rates' and as such rate rebates will be affected.
8. Small community boards vital to retain local identity/interests. Councils need to involve them more in planning documents. For example, Council's vision, goals, objectives, etc. in its LTP directly impact on the boards – they should have a say and input into these types of decisions.

9. The proposed changes to the RMA are very complex. Central Government having difficulty getting 'partners' on board simply because they don't fully understand the complexity of some of the proposed changes – the review could take some time!
10. Council staff need a quantum shift in thinking – they need to be helping people to achieve their objectives rather than quoting chapter and verse and giving them reasons why they can't do this or that.
11. Is electing the Mayor at large still the preferred option? Or should Council elect its leader. Divisions between Mayors and Councillors (and Board members) was discussed – Auckland City classic case in point. The mayor and all other elected members need to share the same vision, goals and objectives – not always the result when Mayor elected at large. Need to mitigate infighting and become more focussed and productive.
12. All elected members are entitled to obtain another view/opinion if they are unhappy about staff advice.
13. Community Boards need active support from parent Councils – however inputs need to be a two-way thing – i.e. Council should also be guided by its Community Boards. Determine expectations of both parties early in the relationship.
14. Council staff are a vital link in the chain and its important to maintain open lines of communication with Boards/establish trusting relationships.
15. Regular meetings between the Mayor and Board Chairman are recommended – both parties need to know and understand what the respective issues are so that they can collectively work towards resolving those issues – many cross boundaries, so working in isolation not in the best interests of everyone.
16. Opotiki Community Board receives an annual grant of \$40,000 which gives them the ability to make local decisions without having to go back to Council for everything – proving to be very successful. Something similar for us would be very worthwhile.
17. Never forget the electoral basis you were elected to – local Boards represent their communities – unhelpful for Councils to turn down Board recommendations – seen as not supporting the wishes of communities and creates divisions. Levels of delegation need to be clear.
18. Involvement of Board Chairs during appointment of CEO (as part of the consultation with HR company prior to determining candidate profile/recruitment/interview/appointment.
19. Some Boards involved in performance appraisal of CEO, prior to Council review. Apparently works well and Council appreciates the feedback from the Boards.
20. As the agenda belongs to the Board, the Chairman should be involved in what goes in or out of that agenda.
21. Levels of remuneration for Community Boards is pitiful and in many cases doesn't fairly compensate for time spent on community affairs – remuneration of elected members under review and we can expect an improved situation. Remuneration based solely on population no longer considered the only determining factor.
22. Absentee owners are still entitled to the same level of services and should be involved in consultation and information sharing.
23. Whangamata launching an 'app' which will make information and free downloads more readily available. Downside is the need to maintain information regularly.
24. Councils should not overlook the input/knowledge available from its Community Boards.
25. Community Board conference in Methven in 2016/17 – seek provision of a budget to allow attendance at that conference.
26. Members were reminded that attendance at meetings via video/audio link is permissible.

27. Members were advised to be cautious about the use of workshops – some may even be illegal, as the public is being denied the opportunity for input. Workshops should be confined to providing briefings and discussion options – they should not be used to predetermine the outcome of subsequent Board considerations. It was suggested that public forums be held in lieu of workshops.
28. Also suggested that public forums be held prior to Board meetings commencing.
29. There should be no general business items taken during the meeting unless the matter(s) are urgent or extraordinary requiring a resolution. Members should raise GB matters with the Chair prior to the meeting and if necessary these can be included on the agenda or deferred until the next meeting agenda. All members' reports should be in writing and included on the agenda. This includes Councillor reports – i.e. same as Councillors reporting on their involvement on other organisations.
30. How obvious is it on the Council website that it has Community Boards? What information on those Boards is available on the website and how accessible is that information?
31. Code of Conduct – Boards may adopt their own – a document of expectations only – a 'toothless' document?
32. Conflicts of Interest - up to individual members to declare an interest. Chair can ask if a conflict of interest exists – make sure process is documented!
33. Discussion on improving community engagement via Facebook, Twitter, Apps, etc. Some Boards have had success with 'drop-in' meetings at maraes, sportsclubs, schools – roadshows – Council communications and PR staff need to be driving the development of these tools.
34. Some Chair prepare a written report for each agenda – there would need to be a very close relationship with Board members and key staff in order for this to happen in order to receive input into that report.
35. There should be a change-over process between the old Board and the new in order to provide a briefing on current issues and matters coming up.
36. It would be useful to have a meeting with candidates standing for election to explain what's involved in the role.
37. Some Boards have greater success with attracting the public to its meetings by holding them after 5.00pm – once every 6-8 weeks is not an onerous imposition on members and staff.

I found this workshop most informative and extremely interesting. It was of some comfort to recognise that most if not all Boards have similar issues – they just deal with them in different ways.

There are a number of bullet points above that I would like Board members to consider and discuss, if not at the 27 November meeting then certainly at the first meeting in 2016.

The value of the networking resulting from these workshops is invaluable in itself and I have already been having some email dialogue with a couple of other Chairpersons about the political structure of their respective Councils/Boards.

Thank you for the opportunity to attend this workshop – I sincerely hope that a budgetary provision is made available to allow attendance at the 2016/17 conference.

C.E. (Kit) Jeffries

Chairman

Kawhia Community Board

Item 79 KCB MATTERS REFERRED FROM 2 OCTOBER 2015

**To: Chairperson and Members
 Kawhia Community Board**

From: Governance Supervisor

Date: 27 November 2015

Executive Summary

1. BOARD MEMBERS

26 September 2014

- i. To give consideration to Council's 'New Resident' Pack, in particular to inserting issues of a local nature.

2 October 2015

- ii. To hold a public meeting in the Kawhia Community Hall on Saturday 31 October 2015 at 10.00am to present relevant information on the proposed walkway.

2. ENGINEERING MANAGER

2 October 2015

- i. To address the matter of providing suitable lighting in the vicinity of the Kawhia Library.
- ii. To investigate the cost to install five additional bollards from the Jervois Street toilets towards the fish shop.
- iii. To arrange for Council's Roading Manager to investigate the suggestion of providing suitable signage/placing out of traffic cones to encourage charter boat users to park behind the Kawhia Community Hall.

CA Tutty
GOVERNANCE SUPERVISOR

GENERAL