

**Date:** Wednesday 9 April 2014  
**Time:** 9.00am  
**Meeting Room:** Kaipātiki Local Board Office  
**Venue:** 90 Bentley Avenue  
Glenfield

---

## **Kaipātiki Local Board**

# **OPEN MINUTE ITEM ATTACHMENTS**

---

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>Local Board Services Quarterly Report - Kaipatiki Local Board</b>	
	A. Shepherds Park Fitness Equipment	3
<b>16</b>	<b>Local board decisions for 2014/2015 Annual Plan</b>	
	A. Local board deliberation meetings April 2014 – Change Log	5
	B. Kaipātiki Local Board Advocacy areas for 2014-2015	7
<b>18</b>	<b>Greenslade Reserve Public Convenience</b>	
	A. Submission regarding Greenslade toilet/changing room block'	9
<b>27</b>	<b>Local board feedback on local boards funding policy review</b>	
	A. Draft recommendations for Local Boards Funding Policy feedback report	11



Supplementary to Item 14

#### **Shepherds Park Fitness Equipment**

The adult fitness equipment at Shepherds Park were the first installed on the North Shore and the cheapest option that was selected to measure public support. This equipment had a three to four year lifespan, depending on use. They have been a great success and heavily used which has necessitated Council contractors undertaking regular maintenance of the equipment and continual repairs/modifications. They were due to be replaced over two years ago, but until funding became available repairs have continued to a point where it is no longer viable to keep fixing them.

Two pieces of equipment were identified for renewal in 2013/14, but when they were assessed it was found that all of the equipment needed replacing. This process was underway when Council's maintenance contractor identified they had deteriorated to the point that they had to be removed for safety reasons. The renewal project is to install four new stations, each with two activities which gives a total of eight exercises. The equipment is made in New Zealand and will be installed in May 2014.



Local board deliberation meetings April 2014 - Change Log  
Kaipatiki

OPEX

Department	Project alpha	Project #	Activity alpha	Before								Change								After								Type of Change	
				2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022		
CDAC	Community Volunteer Awards	PO1111012	Local community development initiatives	68,135	26,206	26,206	26,206	26,206	26,206	26,206	26,206	26,206	-63,000	-21,000	-21,000	-21,000	-21,000	-21,000	-21,000	-21,000	5,135	5,206	5,206	5,206	5,206	5,206	5,206	5,206	Movement between projects
Local Board Services	Local civic functions	PO2310826	Local planning, policy and governance	13,900	13,900	13,900	13,900	13,900	13,900	13,900	13,900	13,900	-7,900	-7,900	-7,900	-7,900	-7,900	-7,900	-7,900	-7,900	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	Movement between projects
Local Board Services	Local board discretionary fund	PO2211104	Local planning, policy and governance	7,144	23,624	19,341	5,571	5,912	13,166	21,521	15,015	71,357	31,045	26,822	29,475	35,239	34,055	32,898	30,700	78,501	54,669	42,163	35,046	41,151	47,221	54,419	45,715	Movement between projects	

CAPEX

Department	Project alpha	Project #	Activity alpha	Before								Change								After								Type of Change
				2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	
Parks, Sports & Recreation	Foundation infrastructure	PC2130401	Local Parks	442,142	653,419	658,417	532,870	418,551	203,225	203,225	203,225		80,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	40,000	442,142	563,419	668,417	542,870	428,551	213,225	213,225	243,225	Deferral
Parks, Sports & Recreation	Cycle and walking track (Greenway)	PC3201004	Local Parks	9,440	138,240	191,813	500,000	191,027	314,880	314,880		50,000	50,000							99,440	88,240	191,813	500,000	191,027	314,880	314,880		Budget broughtforward
Parks, Sports & Recreation	Public convenience (Birkenhead War Memorial)	PC2130410	Local Parks	381,079									-115,000	115,000						266,079	115,000							Deferral
Parks, Sports & Recreation	Playground (Birkenhead War Memorial)	PC2130407	Local Parks	249,611									-115,000	115,000						134,611	115,000							Deferral
Parks, Sports & Recreation	Pedestrian coastal access (Larkings Landing)	PC2130429	Local Parks			27,070	204,800								-27,070	-204,800												moved to new project
Parks, Sports & Recreation	Capital grant - Onewa Domain Netball Centre	new	Local Parks (opex capital grant)										231,870							231,870								new project



Supplementary to item 16

**Kaipātiki Local Board Advocacy areas for 2014/2015**

Our key advocacy areas for 2014/2015 are:

- Progress the development of a Local Board Funding Policy as soon as possible which is evidence based and ensures that all local boards are funded equitably. We will advocate that this funding policy considers the community assistance policy (once developed).
- Advocate to Auckland Council to provide equitable funding for sports codes across the region, including sports played on both grass and alternative surfaces and the development of partnership models (including specifically Netball North Harbour).
- Develop a sustainable funding approach for the community co-ordinator and community houses which recognises the key role played by the community co-ordinators and community houses for community development. Specifically, the board continues to advocate for increased funding to the Kaipātiki Community Facilities Trust of a quantum which will ensure the continued delivery of their core services as well as increased funding to each of the Community Houses and Centres.
- Specific support for the Glenfield Community Centre if required, given the weatherproofing issue of the building.
- Support for the transfer of the commercial operation on the first floor of the Norman King Building to the community portfolio.
- Amendment of the criteria for the Local Board Auckland Transport Capital Fund so that the funding can be used towards projects which are not legally road but which are critical to enabling transport connections, e.g. cycleways, laneways, and the securing of land access rights.
- Reinstatement of Auckland Transport budgets for both Birkenhead Town Centre and Glenfield Town Centre within the period of the long term plan.
- Support for the reprioritisation of the intersection improvement work planned for Chartwell Avenue/Diana Drive/Chivalry Road, given North Shore City Council's previous investment in this work through land acquisition, and the detailed design work completed to date by Auckland Transport.
- Provision of a walking and cycling route over the Auckland Harbour Bridge, and the involvement of the community (both across Kaipātiki, and specifically the residents of Northcote Point) to achieve this.
- Advocate to Auckland Transport to move the bike and scooter facility at Birkenhead Wharf to a location more acceptable to the Kaipātiki Local Board and local residents and stakeholders.
- Support the renewal of the pool at Birkenhead.
- Support the use of the cottages at Chelsea Reserve for the community, including specific investigation of the Manager's House for use as an art facility. In the immediate future, the local board supports enhanced refurbishment of the cottages at Chelsea Reserve which reflects the status of the buildings as important heritage assets in Kaipātiki and ensures the properties are future proofed where possible for use as community facilities.
- Increase funding to art facilities in Kaipātiki specifically to Northart to better align with the funding to other facilities across the region. The board has previously advocated for additional funding to enable expansion of the gallery into existing commercial space and for the establishment of a satellite facility in Birkenhead.





Supplementary to item 18

**Submission regarding Greenslade toilet/changing room block**

Submission regarding the development of toilet/changing room block on Greenslade reserve, as raised in the Kaipaitiki Local Board Business Meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2014.

Currently the board has been recommended to spend a total of \$427,671.00 on the design and construction of toilets and changing rooms at Northcote's Greenslade reserve.

In December last year the board questioned whether the project's scope was appropriate. I write this submission in support of this questioning. As representatives of our local youth, I am disappointed at this level of proposed spending. I wish to question how the board can justify this and offer my recommendation.

Firstly, it appears that only one of the toilets is for public use. The other toilets, changing rooms and storage are designated for club use only. I question why the rate payers are expected to pay for facilities which will be denied to the majority of us? This does not seem appropriate.

Secondly, building changing rooms seems rather strange in today's climate. From our understanding, most players no longer use changing rooms. They arrive in their sports gear and leave in it. Is the board certain that sufficient numbers of players will use the proposed changing rooms?

Thirdly, it appears there is an assumption that increasing the use of Greenslade reserve and providing changing facilities will increase expenditure in Northcote shopping centre. Is there any evidence to support this assumption? By how much will expenditure increase? If there is expected to be a reasonable increase in expenditure then surely the Main Street Association should contribute to the cost.

However, I question whether the construction of changing rooms really will increase expenditure. In my experience, Northcote town centre is a very 'laid back' place. We go to Northcote centre in our best clothes and in our worst, in our slippers, jandals, pyjamas, sweaty gym gear and everything else. Just go to the Northcote food court one night and you will see this. It's one of the things myself and other youths love about Northcote, no one cares how anyone dresses there. I do not believe changing rooms will increase expenditure sufficiently to justify the proposed level of spending. If the players want to buy something from the town centre, they will go, regardless of how they are dressed. Changing rooms will make little difference.

The proposed spending is relevant and concerning to local youth because to us it reads a future of debt. According to the Auditor General, Auckland Council currently owes over \$5 million in debt. By 2021 this debt is expected to reach over \$12 million.

My generation already carries a burden of debt and it worries many of us. Unnecessary and inappropriate spending must be stopped. If Auckland is to be a 'liveable city' it must also be an affordable one. I speak on behalf of the next generation of ratepayers – a generation who's first 5 years of paychecks will be spent on their student loans, a generation who may never be able to afford their own home, and according to current spending levels, a generation who's rates are already being spent.

Supplementary to item 18

And lastly a side note: if there is this much money around, why doesn't the board give funding for a youth centre, something young people petitioned North Shore City Council for, for more the 10 years. Considering all of this, I would recommend options C or D as outlined in the board's agenda dated 12<sup>th</sup> February.

Sharon Ryan

Deputy Chairperson Kaipatiki Local Youth Board  
Budget Adviser, North Harbour Budgeting Services

[Srya040@aucklanduni.ac.nz](mailto:Srya040@aucklanduni.ac.nz)  
02111 20742

Supplementary to item 27

## Draft recommendations for *Local Boards Funding Policy* *feedback report*

That the [name] Local Board:

- A. Notes that council has moved towards a single rating system resulting in the region being rated on an equal basis. However, equity in asset and service provision has not yet been addressed
- B. Notes that locally driven initiatives and local asset based services account for approximately one and ten percent, respectively, of council's total operating costs, and recommend that further work is undertaken to determine whether 11 percent of Auckland Council's budget is an appropriate share for local activities
- C. Support the 20 February 2014 Finance and Performance Committee resolution directing staff to consider service level equity issues for local asset based services as part of the development of the Long Term Plan and asset management plans and engage with local boards on this and report back on a timetable
- D. Request that the engagement process and the work programme to address service level equity issues (including asset provision) is agreed with the local boards
- E. Endorse the process and timelines for the Local Boards Funding Policy, provided that the work on service level equity issues (including asset provision) is progressed in parallel to the local boards funding policy
- F. Request that the work programme to address service level equity issues (including asset provision) includes a staging of the key deliverables, with prioritised asset classes and service levels for review be presented to the Local Boards Funding Policy Political Working Party on 6 May 2014
- G. Recommend that clarity on the treatment of both the Waiheke and Great Barrier local boards, and understanding the implications for the other local boards is required prior to the adoption of the policy
- H. Request that work be undertaken to:
  - i. determine the appropriate amount of budget for local boards to successfully deliver upon their role, noting the current allocation is based on legacy council budgets
  - ii. determine whether more activities and the corresponding funding should sit in the locally driven initiatives category
  - iii. identify programme budgets to move to local board budgets as current local budgets are dominated by overhead costs with little funding for programmes and service delivery.

Supplementary to item 27

- iv. investigate programme budgets held by the Community Development, Arts and Culture department, in particular, given the key role for local boards in community development
  - v. investigate and improve the methodology of allocating overheads across the local boards as currently different approaches are used across activities
  - vi. determine whether Business Improvement District (BIDs) corporate overheads should be shifted to local asset based services, as the administrative components (i.e. staffing) are allocated based on the rate collected via the BID, and agreed by the BID and the governing body, not the local boards
- I. Notes that current locally driven initiative allocations allow for minimal discretion for most local boards and any reduction will impact on existing service levels
- J. Note that each of the general rate reallocation scenarios (scenarios A, B and F) will lead to funding increases and decreases across the local boards
- K. Recommend that general rate allocation scenarios are developed and phased in overtime so where no local board receives any reduction in funding. ~~for consideration~~
- L. Note a targeted rate is available to enhance service levels above an agreed standard service level, once standard service levels are established
- M. Recommend that:
- i. asset based service levels are funded by the general rate.
  - ii. locally driven initiatives are funded via the general rate as local initiatives are core council activities, essential to cohesive communities and Auckland being the world's most liveable city
- N. Note that local rates can lead to inequity and affordability issues and can lock in legacy council funding models
- O. Recommend that with respect to the allocation methodology for locally driven initiatives under general rate funding, agree that population should be the main factor, as population tends to be a key driver of the demand for services: ~~{other options for boards to consider including}~~
- i. ~~and that an adjustment for deprivation should also be applied, as areas of deprivation have characteristics that may indicate a greater dependency on local services~~
  - ii. and that an adjustment for geographic isolation should also be applied
  - iii. ~~and that an adjustment for rates collected should also be applied~~
- P. Forward these resolutions to the Local Boards Funding Policy Political Working Party and the Finance and Performance Committee for their consideration

Supplementary to item 27

**Removed recommendations:**

- ~~recommend that:~~
  - i. ~~asset based service levels are funded by the general rate~~
  - ii. ~~that locally driven initiatives are funded via a local rate as local rates make for transparency in that communities pay for the services they receive, and enable local boards to modify the rates paid by their local community~~
- ~~recommend that further work is undertaken on local rates to fund local asset based services (excluding assets that cover several local boards) and locally driven initiatives, and that this work takes into account affordability issues in more deprived areas~~