

TE HIKU COMMUNITY BOARD MEMBER'S REPORT

Member Name: Sheryl Bainbridge

Subdivision: Doubtless Bay

Date: to 20 July 2020

REPORT

1) Meetings

- 30 May meeting with residents re. Rangitoto Reserve, Mangonui weed issue. Also subsequent discussions, emails and phone calls
- 2 June Virtual Community Board meeting via Teams. Funding applications approved included Friends of Rangikapiti and Mangonui Cemetery. Also at the council meeting held on 5 June a \$10,000 grant to the Mangonui Information Centre was approved.
- 10 June met with resident Mr Charles Adamson regarding a road repair where excess metal had been swept into the vicinity of a stormwater drain. Emailed the CEO office and appreciate having received a call from Aaron of the roading dept on 11 June to talk about the issue including contract conditions and the potential impact on stormwater drainage in this instance. The excess metal is to be removed.
- 18 June Strategic plan workshop Kaitiaia.
- Street light concept meeting with Aaron Reilly FNDC and members of Mangonui Development group about street lighting Waterfront Drive

2) Issues

Rangitoto Reserve:

I visited this reserve with the adjoining landowner Ian Palmer and others, who have concerns about the infestation of noxious plants i.e. that they are covering native and other vegetation, and that by spreading seeds they are becoming a public nuisance as well as an eyesore. The most invasive plant is mothplant, followed closely by tobacco weed and wattle. The community members feel that there should be a reserve management plan in place, and some information regarding authorisation of volunteers to help reduce weed infestation and perhaps provision of tools and/or spray.

The reserve is situated at the eastern entrance to the Mangonui Harbour and there are two distinct parts to the reserve, one being an area with grass, trees and weeds, which is separated from an historic pa site by a fortification trench. Due to the historic and archeological importance of the pa site, it is presumed that using machinery for weed removal would not be an option. The community members' long term vision is to remove the weeds and then plant as much as possible in natives.

Ian Palmer has prepared the following in response to emails with Council staff, and it would be appreciated if a report could come to the Board addressing this and other issues.

"Approved Volunteer Group (AVG) and Volunteer Agreement (VA)

Melissa Wood suggests that we apply to become an AVG authorised by FNDC by way of a VA. However the "Community Request" form provided is not an application to become such a group but rather a means to request Council to undertake certain works. Which prompts:

- *Is there an established path to becoming a AVG with criteria that need to be met?*

- *Is this AVG pathway applicable in our circumstances where there are a very limited number of people willing to do the actual volunteer work (so far, only me and members of my family)?*
- *Who drafts the Volunteer Agreement (Council or applicant) and what aspects does it need to cover?*
- *Can we please see a copy of an existing VA to better understand what we would be heading towards.*
- *How many such groups has FNDC so far authorised? (I'd like to understand is this a well-trodden path or something new)*
- *How long does it typically take from applying to approval of a VA?*
- *Does FNDC typically give material support to AVGs (e.g. PPE, tools, herbicides etc)?*

FNDC Responsibilities

Irrespective of whether we go down the AVG path, the reality will remain that we will only ever have the resources and capabilities to tackle a very limited portion of the invasive plant issues on the RRR; i.e. we might be able to restore the non-Pa area close to our property and access road to some better state, but the Pa site itself is too large and the issues too complex for us. Therefore our primary reason for approaching Council is to press them to address the issues on land that they are responsible for. There are various 'community good' reasons for Council to take action including the wider spread of invasive weed plants by wind born and bird ingested seeds, and also the protection of a highly prominent piece of land with considerable cultural and historic importance.

I note per the email rail below the uncertainty within FNDC as to their responsibility towards the RRR, however the attached gazettal item makes the situation unambiguous.

There is the resultant legal implication that the FNDC appears to be in contravention of various sections of the Reserves Act 1977, including re Section 41 by not having developed a Management Plan (MP) for the RRR (which should have been in place by April 1983, five years after the Act came in to force). While a MP for RRR would need to deal with a number of issues, a key one would be weed management. Therefore a logical first step towards a MP would be for FNDC to commission consultants to prepare a Weed Management Plan for the RRR that takes account of reserve's specific weed issues and the archaeological sensitivities.

Iwi Engagement

While we could approach local Iwi ourselves, given the sensitivities I'm reticent to jump into that until we know where we are heading; e.g. is the FNDC going to move towards developing a MP, in which case it is probably more appropriate for them to instigate an Iwi consultation process.

Funding Sources

What prompted us to approach Council again about this issue (having previously done so with little result in 2017/18) was the announcement in the Budget of \$1.1 Bln of funding for conservation work. This funding is allocated into a number of different programs and we hoped that the FNDC (or NRC) would be able to access something out of the various 'pots' to do something towards stemming the degradation of RRR. Have we exhausted this angle?"

Recommendation:

That the Te Hiku Community Board requests a report to its August meeting on the way a management plan will be prepared and implemented for Rangitoto Reserve; the report to include ways to address the adverse impact of a significant weed problem on neighbouring properties while maintaining the integrity of the pa site which is of archaeological, cultural and historic significance and responding to queries from neighbouring property owner Ian Palmer as above.

3) Resource Consents

Nil

4) Requests for Service

Followed up several unactioned requests for service.







Rangitoto Reserve 1996