

I hereby give notice that an ordinary meeting of the Central Facility Partnerships Committee will be held on:

**Date:** Monday, 8 December 2014  
**Time:** 1.00 pm  
**Amended Meeting Room:** Room 9  
**Venue:** Level 14  
135 Albert Street, Auckland

---

## Central Facility Partnerships Committee

### OPEN AGENDA

---

#### MEMBERSHIP

Shale Chambers  
Desley Simpson, JP  
Harry Doig  
Peter Haynes  
Chris Makoare  
John Meeuwsen  
Christina Spence

Waitemata Local Board  
Orakei Local Board  
Puketapapa Local Board  
Albert/Eden Local Board  
Maungakiekie-Tamaki  
Waiheke Local Board  
Great Barrier Island Local Board

#### Alternates

Greg Moyle  
Kate Cooke  
Julie Fairey  
Glenda Fryer  
Brett Clark  
Shirin Brown  
Judy Gilbert

Waitemata Local Board  
Orakei Local Board  
Puketapapa Local Board  
Albert/Eden Local Board  
Maungakiekie-Tamaki  
Waiheke Local Board  
Great Barrier Island Local Board

(Quorum 3 members)

**Desiree Tukutama**  
**Local Board Democracy Advisor**

**27 November 2014**

Contact Telephone: (09) 307 6071  
Email: [desiree.tukutama@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](mailto:desiree.tukutama@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz)  
Website: [www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz)



<b>ITEM</b>	<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
1	Welcome	5
2	Apologies	5
3	Declaration of Interest	5
4	Confirmation of Minutes	5
5	Leave of Absence	5
6	Acknowledgements	5
7	Petitions	5
8	Deputations	5
9	Public Forum	5
10	Extraordinary Business	6
11	Notices of Motion	6
12	Election of Chairperson	7
13	Election of Deputy Chairperson	9
14	Central Facility Partnership Fund - Guidelines, Terms of Reference and Meeting Schedule 2014/2015 Round	11
15	Central Facilities Partnership Fund Proposals for the 2014/15 Financial Year	23
16	Consideration of Extraordinary Items	



**1 Welcome**

**2 Apologies**

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

**3 Declaration of Interest**

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

**4 Confirmation of Minutes**

There are no minutes to confirm.

**5 Leave of Absence**

At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.

**6 Acknowledgements**

At the close of the agenda no requests for acknowledgements had been received.

**7 Petitions**

At the close of the agenda no requests to present petitions had been received.

**8 Deputations**

Standing Order 3.20 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Central Facility Partnerships Committee. This means that details relating to deputations can be included in the published agenda. Total speaking time per deputation is ten minutes or as resolved by the meeting.

At the close of the agenda no requests for deputations had been received.

**9 Public Forum**

A period of time (approximately 30 minutes) is set aside for members of the public to address the meeting on matters within its delegated authority. A maximum of 3 minutes per item is allowed, following which there may be questions from members.

At the close of the agenda no requests for public forum had been received.

## 10 Extraordinary Business

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

- (a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and
- (b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, -
  - (i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
  - (ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.”

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting, -

- (a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if -
  - (i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and
  - (ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but
- (b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”

## 11 Notices of Motion

At the close of the agenda no requests for notices of motion had been received.

## Election of Chairperson

File No.: CP2014/27966

### Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is for the Central Facility Partnerships Committee to elect a Chairperson.

### Recommendations

That the Central Facility Partnerships Committee:

- a) Elects a Chairperson in accordance with Schedule 7, Clause 25 of the Local Government Act 2002 according to sub-clause (a) noting that no member has a casting vote; **OR**
- b) Elects a Chairperson in accordance with Schedule 7, Clause 25 of the Local Government Act 2002 according to sub-clause (b) noting that no member has a casting vote.

### Background

2. The process for election of the Chairperson is outlined in the Local Government Act 2002, Schedule 7, Clause 25.
3. The board must first resolve which voting system they will apply.  
Subclause 3) system (a):
  - i) A person is elected if receiving the majority of votes and;
    - 1) if there is no clear winner in round one, a second round is held and the candidate with the fewest votes is excluded; and
    - 2) if there is no clear winner in round two, three etc, the candidate with the fewest votes is excluded each time; and
    - 3) in any round, if 2 or more candidates tie for the lowest number of votes, the person to be excluded from the next round is resolved by lot.  
Subclause 3) system (b):
  - ii) A person is elected if receiving the majority of votes and;
    - 1) There is only one round of voting; and
    - 2) If two of more candidates tie for the most votes, the tie is resolved by lot.
4. There is no casting vote in either system.

### Maori Impact Statement

5. This decision, whilst of interest to Maori, is not considered one which impacts directly on Maori.

### Legal and Legislative Implications

6. Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002, Clause 25 outlines the voting system to be used for the election of a chairperson and deputy chairperson.

### Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

### Signatories

Authors	Desiree Tukutama - Democracy Advisor
Authorisers	Judith Webster - Relationship Manager



## Election of Deputy Chairperson

File No.: CP2014/27967

### Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is for the Central Facility Partnerships Committee to elect a Deputy Chairperson.

### Recommendations

That the Central Facility Partnerships Committee:

- a) Elects a Deputy Chairperson in accordance with Schedule 7, Clause 25 of the Local Government Act 2002 according to sub-clause (a) noting that no member has a casting vote; **OR**
- b) Elects a Deputy Chairperson in accordance with Schedule 7, Clause 25 of the Local Government Act 2002 according to sub-clause (b) noting that no member has a casting vote.

### Background

2. The purpose of this report is for the Central Facility Partnerships Committee to elect a Deputy Chairperson. The process for election of the Deputy Chairperson is outlined in the Local Government Act 2002, Schedule 7, Clause 25.
3. The board must first resolve which voting system they will apply.  
Subclause 3) system (a):
  - i) A person is elected if receiving the majority of votes and;
    - 1) if there is no clear winner in round one, a second round is held and the candidate with the fewest votes is excluded; and
    - 2) if there is no clear winner in round two, three etc, the candidate with the fewest votes is excluded each time; and
    - 3) in any round, if 2 or more candidates tie for the lowest number of votes, the person to be excluded from the next round is resolved by lot.
  - ii) A person is elected if receiving the majority of votes and;
    - 1) There is only one round of voting; and
    - 2) If two of more candidates tie for the most votes, the tie is resolved by lot.
4. There is no casting vote in either system.

### Maori Impact Statement

5. This decision, whilst of interest to Maori, is not considered one which impacts directly on Maori.

### Legal and Legislative Implications

6. Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002, Clause 25 outlines the voting system to be used for the election of a chairperson and deputy chairperson.

## Implementation Issues

7. There are no implementation issues.

## Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

## Signatories

Authors	Desiree Tukutama - Democracy Advisor
Authorisers	Judith Webster - Relationship Manager

## Central Facility Partnership Fund - Guidelines, Terms of Reference and Meeting Schedule 2014/2015 Round

File No.: CP2014/27310

### Purpose

1. To seek the Central Facility Partnership Committee (the committee) agreement and adoption of:
  - the Central Facility Partnerships Committee Terms of Reference 2014/2015 (Attachment A); and
  - the Central Facility Partnerships Funding Guidelines 2014/2015 (Attachment B) which include the meeting schedule for 2014/2015 funding round.

### Executive Summary

2. The Central Facility Partnerships Committee is a joint committee established by the seven central local boards. It has decision-making responsibility to allocate the legacy central facility partnerships funding in support of capital development projects that will assist Auckland Council to meet its identified strategic community outcomes.
3. All seven member local boards have endorsed the draft terms of reference and guidelines for 2014/2015.
4. The re-establishment of the Central Facility Partnerships Committee is an interim approach until a region-wide community grants policy is finalised.

### Recommendations

That the Central Facility Partnerships Committee:

- a) Adopt the Central Facility Partnerships Committee Terms of Reference 2014/2015 (Attachment A).
- b) Adopt the Central Facility Partnership Funding Guidelines 2014/2015 (Attachment B) including the meeting Schedule 2014/2015.

### Discussion

5. The legacy central facility partnerships fund invites organisations to submit applications for capital development projects and feasibility studies that will assist Auckland Council to meet identified strategic community outcomes.
6. Where a proposal fits identified strategic priorities and other criteria, council may contribute to the capital cost of the project. The level of financial assistance is informed by the level of community benefit and public access to the facility once the project is completed.
7. Organisations participating in central facility partnerships benefit from funding, as it enables them to leverage grants from other donors, and through technical assistance and support. Funding from council allows organisations (many of which are not-for-profit voluntary groups) to meet their objectives sooner and in some cases, develop a better facility than may otherwise have been possible.
8. Central facility partnerships benefit the council by delivering quality, community accessible facilities, without council providing all the funding.

9. The wider Auckland community benefits from facility partnerships funding by having access to a greater number of quality community facilities
10. Auckland Council inherited several different approaches for managing facility partnerships. A new, integrated policy is being developed and is expected to be completed for the 2015/2016 year.
11. In the absence of an integrated regional policy, and to enable facility partnership funding to be allocated, the Regional Development and Operations Committee (RDOC) resolved on 24 May 2012 and again on 14 March 2013 that an interim approach be implemented by devolving the legacy facility partnership funding to "local board sub-regional funding committees." for the 2012/2013 and 2013/14 years respectively.
12. The following resolutions were made on 24 May 2012 by the Regional Development and Operations Committee:

*"Resolution number RDO/2012/89*

*b) That the Regional Development and Operations Committee endorses in principle the following with regard to the Community assistance programme:*

- i. repackaging of the draft Community occupancy policy as guidelines to assist local board decision-making;*
- ii. devolving legacy facility partnership budgets for the 2012 / 2013 financial year to existing local board sub-regional ('cluster') funding committees for distribution under the appropriate legacy council policy;*
- iii. continuation of the interim funding approach for the 2012 / 2013 financial year, noting that there will be no proposed changes to the decision-making or budget structures already in place for the 2011/2012 financial year."*

13. On 14 March 2013, the Regional Development and Operations Committee resolved that the interim community funding arrangements in place be continued for 2013/2014.

*"Resolution number RDO/2013/32*

*That the Regional Development and Operations Committee:*

*a) endorse the continuation of the interim community funding programme for the 2013/2014 financial year, in accordance with current budgets and decision making delegations, due to the complexity of the range of funding models currently operating across the region, with the expectation that a new funding policy be in place for the 2014/2015 financial year, or before."*

14. In accordance with Clause 30(7) of the Local Government Act 2002, the committee was automatically dissolved following the 2013 Local Government elections.
15. On 6 March 2014, the Regional Strategy and Policy Committee endorsed the rollover of council's current community funding programmes and grants arrangements for the 2014/2015 financial year.

*Resolution number REG/2014/36*

*b) endorse existing funding arrangements and grants schemes being rolled over for the 2014 /2015 financial year.*

16. On the 15 May 2013, the Central Facility Partnerships Committee resolved:

*"Resolution number CFPC/2013/6.*

- b) That the Central Facility Partnerships Committee endorse a two stage application process for the 2013/2014 round.*
- c) That the final decision of the 2013/2014 funding round dates and committee meeting dates be delegated to the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Central Facility Partnerships Committee.*
- d) That variations, extensions and/or changes to Auckland City legacy facility partnership agreements made by the local boards prior 15 May 2013 be endorsed by*

*the Central Facility Partnership Committee, and that this resolution be forwarded to all relevant local boards for their information.*

- e) *That any further variations, extensions and/or changes to Auckland City legacy facility partnership agreements fall under the Central Facility Partnerships Committee.*
- f) *That officers report back to the Central Facility Partnerships Committee at its next meeting on progress of all existing facility partnerships.”*
17. The seven central local boards consequently established a joint committee of local boards that deals specifically with central facility partnerships funding scheme. Each of the seven central local boards appointed a representative to the Central Facility Partnerships Committee to ensure that the facility partnerships fund can be implemented in a timely manner.
18. The Central Facility Partnerships Committee has a different focus to the Central Joint Funding Committee, with the latter having a focus on community and heritage funding. In contrast, facility partnership is a capital development fund that establishes partnerships between council and external organisations.
19. Applications for 2014/2015 facility partnerships have been sought from 1 July 2014 – 15 August 2014. Officers have assessed the applications and the committee will consider and make decisions on 8 December 2014 regarding stage one projects to be progressed.
20. After the committee has decided which projects to support, the local board where the project is based will have active and ongoing engagement with the project. The local board's role may include setting expectations for community access to the facility.

## Consideration

### Local Board Views and Implications

21. The legacy funding schemes are a key way for local boards to support their communities.

### Maori Impact Statement

22. The legacy community funding schemes are of general interest to communities and accessible to a wide range of groups, including Māori.

### General

23. The recommendations contained in this report fall within the committee's delegated authority.

## Implementation Issues

24. Funding applications will be called during two rounds for the legacy central facility partnerships funding scheme, as follows;

#### Central Facility Partnership Fund 2014/2015

- i) Stage One – Expression of Interest opened in 1 July 2014 and closed on 15 August 2014 with decisions on projects to progress to stage two on 8 December 2014.
- ii) Stage Two – Process will include only capital project who have been progressed from stage one process and will include all feasibility study applications. Stage two closes on 13 February 2015 for decisions on 13 April 2015.

## Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A	Central Facility Partnership Committee Terms of Reference 2014/2015	15
B	Central Facility Partnership Funding Guidelines 2014/2015	17

## Signatories

Authors	Shamila Unka - Team Leader Sport & Recreation
Authorisers	Ken Maplesden - Sport and Recreation Adviser Lisa Tocker - Manager, Recreation Facilities & Service Delivery Central Ian Maxwell - Manager Parks, Sports & Recreation Judith Webster - Relationship Manager

Item 14

## Draft - Terms of Reference 2014/15

### Central Facility Partnerships Committee

#### Membership

The Central Facility Partnerships Committee has a member from each of the following Local Boards:

- Albert-Eden
- Great Barrier
- Maungakiekie-Tamaki
- Orakei
- Puketapapa
- Waiheke
- Waitemata

#### Decision Making

The Central Facility Partnerships Committee has the authority to make funding decisions in 2014/2015 in relation to the Central Facility Partnership Fund.

#### Chairperson

The Central Facility Partnerships Committee will appoint and may remove its own chairperson and deputy chairperson.

#### Meetings

The Central Facility Partnerships Committee will meet as required. It is envisaged there will be two procedural meetings and no less than one funding decision meeting in each financial year.

#### Workshops

Decision meetings will be preceded by a workshop. The purpose of the workshops is to discuss and seek additional information on the applications.

#### Standing Orders of Local Boards

The Standing Orders of Local Boards as set by the Auckland Transition Agency on 27 October 2010 will apply to this Joint Committee.

#### Variation to Agreement (Terms of Reference)

Any changes to these Terms of Reference require a resolution from each participating Local Board endorsing the changes. The changes can then be adopted by the Central Facility Partnerships Committee.



## Central Facility Partnership Funding Guidelines

### Background

The Facility Partnership fund is a grant scheme available to organisations to assist with facility development projects. Auckland Council has inherited several different approaches for managing and providing community facility partnerships from the former Auckland, North Shore, Manukau and Waitakere City Councils. A new regional policy is being developed to consolidate these inherited approaches and create a consistent, integrated approach. This policy is not yet completed.

In the absence of an integrated regional policy, and to enable facility partnership funding to be allocated, the Regional Development and Operations Committee (RDOC) resolved on 24 May 2012 and again on 14 March 2013 that an interim approach be implemented for 2013/14.

On 6 March 2014, the Regional Strategy and Policy Committee endorsed the rollover of Council's current community funding programmes and grants arrangements for the 2014/2015 financial year (REG/2014/36).

RDOC also resolved that the interim approach would be implemented by devolving the legacy Facility Partnerships funding to "local board sub-regional funding committees."

The following resolutions were made on 24 May 2012 by the Regional Development and Operations Committee:

*"Resolution number RDO/2012/89*

- b) *That the Regional Development and Operations Committee endorses in principle the following with regard to the Community assistance programme:*
  - i. *repackaging of the draft Community occupancy policy as guidelines to assist local board decision-making;*
  - ii. *devolving legacy facility partnership budgets for the 2012 / 2013 financial year to existing local board sub-regional ("cluster") funding committees for distribution under the appropriate legacy council policy;*
  - iii. *continuation of the interim funding approach for the 2012 / 2013 financial year, noting that there will be no proposed changes to the decision-making or budget structures already in place for the 2011/2012 financial year."*

On 14 March 2013, the Regional Development and Operations Committee resolved that the interim community funding arrangements in place be continued for 2013/2014.

*"Resolution number RDO/2013/32*

*That the Regional Development and Operations Committee:*

- a) *endorse the continuation of the interim community funding programme for the 2013/2014 financial year, in accordance with current budgets and decision making delegations, due to the complexity of the range of funding models currently operating across the region, with the expectation that a new funding policy be in place for the 2014/2015 financial year, or before."*

On the 15 May 2013, the Central Facility Partnerships Committee resolved:

*"Resolution number CFPC/2013/6.*

- b) *That the Central Facility Partnerships Committee endorse a two stage application process for the 2013/2014 round.*
- c) *That the final decision of the 2013/2014 funding round dates and committee meeting dates be delegated to the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Central Facility Partnerships Committee.*
- d) *That variations, extensions and/or changes to Auckland City legacy facility partnership agreements made by the local boards prior 15 May 2013 be endorsed by the Central Facility Partnership Committee, and that this resolution be forwarded to all relevant local boards for their information.*

- e) *That any further variations, extensions and/or changes to Auckland City legacy facility partnership agreements fall under the Central Facility Partnerships Committee.*
- f) *That officers report back to the Central Facility Partnerships Committee at its next meeting on progress of all existing facility partnerships."*

## Introduction

These guidelines have been developed to assist local boards and /or funding committees in making decisions regarding the allocation of facility partnership funding. The guidelines are based on legacy council policies with some operational improvements.

The guidelines are also intended to provide community groups wishing to apply to the Facility Partnership Fund with an overview of:

- Eligibility criteria
- the application process

## Fund scope

The purpose of facility partnerships is to support not-for-profit community groups develop community accessible facilities that deliver on council outcomes.

The provision of council funding assists organisations to leverage additional grants from other donors and develop a better facility than may otherwise have been possible.

Where a proposal fits with the council's identified strategic priorities and other relevant criteria, the council may contribute, by way of a grant, to the capital cost of the project. The level of council assistance is informed significantly by the level of benefit and access the wider public will have to the completed facility.

Facility Partnership projects benefit the council by supporting it to meet strategic outcomes through the provision of quality, publicly accessible facilities without the council having to provide all the funding.

## Principles

The Facility Partnerships Fund is underpinned by a number of principles. Projects should demonstrate the following:

- partnership approach
- evidence based demand
- maximum community use of facilities
- increase participation
- easy accessibility by the wider community
- partner organisations have the capability to deliver the project and community outcomes
- project viability (funding plan, feasibility, business plan)
- multiuse projects
- improved levels of service
- facility sustainability.

## Eligibility criteria

To be eligible for facility partnership funding, projects must:

- be applied for by legal entities that have not-for-profit status (e.g. be registered as an incorporated society or charitable trust), or are a school or educational institution
- be for a facility development
- be in the Central area or if in a neighbouring area be of proven regional significance with high use by Central area residents
- be a partnership project with multiple funders, including self-funding from the applicant
- have a total project value of over \$50,000 (GST exclusive)

- align with and have support from regional/national bodies (as applicable/where relevant) and
- the project could also be a feasibility study for a facility.

*Not eligible*

- Proposals from individuals, commercial and/or profit orientated organisations
- Projects that are primarily health, education, welfare facilities or places of worship
- Retrospective applications/projects that have already started
- Debt funding
- on-going operational cost
- maintenance/asset renewal
- design, architectural or technical reports as part of a feasibility study.

**Prioritisation**

In addition to alignment with the Principles the following criteria should be used to prioritise projects:

- the extent to which the proposal will increase community participation
- the degree to which the proposal caters for council's priority targeted communities and activities
- whether existing facilities meet local and regional needs whether the proposed facility will meet proven local and regional and needs
- potential partners and their involvement in the project
- allocation of the potential partners own resources, including a financial contribution and the level of access the partner has to other sources of funding/resources
- the financial sustainability of the new facility to ensure that the ongoing operational costs of the facility can be met without council assistance
- who is likely to benefit from the facility
- the status of any resource and/or building consent applications already lodged
- a track record that shows an ability to undertake and complete the proposal and operate the facility as put forward
- capacity building of the community (grows skills within the community)
- the amount of community support for, and involvement in, the project
- acceptable community access to the facility
- positive spin-offs for the community, with minimal negative effects
- potential for funding from other providers
- the overall cost of the project is credible and funding is achievable
- the proposed start and finish dates for the project and whether they span more than one financial year
- how advanced the project planning is
- how advanced the funding plans are
- whether the proposal covers prospects and timing for funding from other agencies
- the appropriateness of the scale of the proposed project including the amount of funding sought from council
- the willingness of the potential partner to develop and engage in a shared vision for the facility.

**Parameters and minimum requirements for facility partnerships**

- Successful applicants will be required to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding and/or Facility Partnership Agreement.
- The Memorandum of Understanding and/or Facility Partnership Agreement will clearly state the intentions of each party, shared objectives and the outcomes each party wishes to achieve.
- Council's contribution to the facility is to be acknowledged on publicity material and signs commensurate with the level of council's funding.
- The facility must be promoted for community use.
- Affordable hire charges should be comparable to, and sometimes approved by council.
- Regular reports are to be provided to council on community use, hire fees, promotions, income and expenditure of the facility.

- If requested, council access to the facility for customer surveys or community research is to be provided.
- If requested, the facility is to be made available as a welfare centre in the event of an emergency.
- Evidence must be provided of an agreed minimum level of funding raised by the organisation.
- The funding mix will be discussed and agreed by both parties. Council needs to know as soon as possible if there are any proposed changes to this mix.
- The start and finish dates of the project need to be within the timeframes agreed to at the time of executing the Memorandum of Understanding and/or Facility Partnership Agreement.
- If funds are not uplifted by the agreed dates, approved funding may lapse at council's discretion.
- Appropriate business processes for tendering and all aspects of work associated with developing the facility are to be used.
- That "NZS 3910:2003 Conditions of Contract for Building and Civil Engineering Construction", or a variation thereof, will be the basis of any construction contract, given the conditions of contract contained therein are well known and widely accepted by contractors as industry standard
- Facilities are to be insured to full replacement value.
- Council will monitor the terms of the agreement in line with good management practices.
- Council will have input into the sale/lease of the facility's naming rights.
- Council will recover some of its financial contribution if the use of the facility changes significantly within the terms of agreement or agreed timeframe.
- Council takes no liability for ongoing operational or maintenance funding, nor responsibility for long-term asset replacement. It may, at its discretion, agree to contribute to operational funding based on a maximum level of council assistance. The future operational model will be agreed prior to construction commencing.
- No council funding will be released until all funding is in place for the project to be completed.
- Payment will be in instalments based on work completed.

In addition, the term of community access will be commensurate with the grant approved as per the table below:

grants for \$25,000 - \$100,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The partners will negotiate and agree to a minimum level of community access of at least 5 years</li> </ul>
grants for \$100,001 - \$250,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The partners will negotiate and agree to a minimum level of community access of at least 10 years</li> </ul>
grants for \$250,001 - \$750,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The partners will negotiate and agree to a minimum level of community access of at least 15 year</li> </ul>
grants for \$750,001+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The partners will negotiate and agree to a minimum level of community access of at least 20 years</li> </ul>

### Process

There will be one funding round per financial year consisting of a two stage approach.

#### Stage 1 Expressions of Interest

- groups submit a high-level proposal (expression of interest)
- proposals are screened to ensure they meet the guidelines, align with the council's strategic needs and that they will benefit the community
- proposals are summarised and presented in a workshop and to the Central Facility Partnership Committee
- some proposals will be declined at this point, while others will progress to stage 2
- officers will work with groups identified by the Committee to develop a full proposal
- no funding decisions are required at this stage
- unsuccessful proposals can be re-submitted for consideration in subsequent years.

#### Stage 2 Further assessment and funding decisions

- council officers will work with the successful organisations to gather further information in respect of the proposal
- selected proposals are assessed against criteria

- full proposals are discussed in a workshop and formally considered by the Committee who will make a funding decision.

If a proposal is unlikely to be progressed through the Facility Partnership Fund, a clear signal should be provided to the project proponents including whether a project may be of interest to council in subsequent years. This allows those projects to be progressed independent of council and/or revised where possible and re-presented at a later stage.

<b>Stage 1 Activity</b>		
1	Stage 1 – Expression of Interest (EOI) applications and feasibility study applications open	1 July 2014
2	Stage 1 – Expression of Interest applications close	5pm 15 August 2014
3	Applications processed	12noon 23 October 2014
4	Workshop with Central Facility Partnership Funding Committee	3 November 2014
5	Decisions to progress applications to stage 2 by Central Facility Partnership committee	8 December 2014
<b>Stage 2 Activity</b>		
1	Stage 2 Applications progressed from Stage 1 - EOI's	9 December 2014
2	Stage 2 Applications and feasibility applications close	5pm 13 February 2015
3	Applications processed	12noon 28 February 2015
4	Workshop with Central Facility Partnership Funding Committee	9 March 2015
5	Decisions by Central Facility Partnership Funding Committee	13 April 2015



## Central Facilities Partnership Fund Proposals for the 2014/15 Financial Year

File No.: CP2014/22763

### Purpose

1. This report advises the Central Facility Partnerships Committee (the committee) of the stage one expression of interest (EOI) applications received, and to consider and make recommendations for the progression of applications to stage two of the 2014/2015 central facility partnership funding round.

### Executive summary

2. The purpose of the central facility partnership fund (the fund) is to assist with the development of accessible multi-use community facilities with an emphasis on maximum use, increased community participation and to support community groups to leverage funds from other funding organisations.
3. The fund provides financial support to not-for-profit organisations undertaking asset development work with a total project value over \$50,000 or a feasibility study for a facility up to \$50,000.
4. Ten stage one EOI applications were received. The total funding requested is \$4,104,815 as a contribution to total cost of projects of \$19,969,596.
5. The total funding pool available for the 2014/2015 funding round is \$1,500,000. There is also additional funding available that was reallocated back to the fund last financial year of \$1,453,854 from the Mt Albert and Avondale pool projects that have not progressed.
6. Applications were assessed and recommendations have been provided based on the established criteria of the fund.

### Recommendations

That the Central Facility Partnerships Committee:

- A. Progress the following stage one EOI projects to stage two:

Project	LB Area	Project Description	Total cost of the project	Funding requested
Auckland Rowing Association	Regional	Stage 1 development of a Regional Watersports Centre in Highbrook; earthworks and retaining to provide hardstands, water access, boat ramp, parking.	a) \$6,441,000 total project b) \$1,650,000 Stage 1	\$508,050

Item 15

Avondale Intermediate School	Whau	To heat and cover the Avondale Intermediate School pool: this application is for the construction of a covered enclosure.	\$550,000	\$400,000
Epsom Girls Grammar School	Albert-Eden	Resurface and develop covered court spaces with lights.	\$4,049,250	\$1,249,250
Ellerslie Sports Club	Orakei	Redesign and construct a new clubrooms building including an amenities block at Michaels Ave Reserve.	\$2,443,500	\$500,000
Mt Wellington Tennis Club	Maungakiekie-Tamaki	Upgrade and re-surface existing courts and spaces.	\$137,230	\$100,000
Selwyn College	Orakei	Upgrade the existing outdoor court surfaces.	\$157,616	\$127,515
Three Kings United Football Club	Puketapapa	Build new clubrooms for football club at Keith Hay Park in line with Keith Hay Park concept plan.	\$3,924,000	750,000
<b>Totals</b>			<b>\$12,911,596</b>	<b>\$3,634,815</b>

B. Not progress the following stage one EOI projects to stage two:

Project	LB Area	Project Description	Total cost of the project	Funding requested
Cochlear Implant Foundation NZ at Auckland Hearing House	Albert-Eden	A rebuild and expansion project at their Greenlane premises.	\$6,638,000	\$192,000
Great Barrier Island Golf Club	Great Barrier	To replace the toilets at the Great Barrier Island Golf Club.	\$70,000	\$63,000

Rudolf Steiner School Trust at Michael Park School	Orakei	To add toilet facilities, improve the infrastructure and upgrade the catering / kitchen facilities at the Auditorium based at the Michael Park School.	\$350,000	\$215,000
<b>Totals</b>			<b>\$7,058,000</b>	<b>\$470,000</b>

## Comments

7. All Central Local Boards have agreed to re-establish the Committee for 2014/2015, and have endorsed the draft Terms of Reference and Guidelines 2014/2015.
8. The total funding pool available for the fund 2014/2015 round is \$1,500,000. There is also additional funding available that was re-allocated back to the fund last financial year, comprising \$1,453,854 from the Mt Albert and Avondale pool projects that were not progressed.
9. The fund is operational expenditure in the 2014/2015 budget and if not allocated, it cannot be rolled over into the 2015/2016 financial year, unless there is a commitment to pay i.e. a committee resolution or contractual agreement.
10. The council will pursue partnerships where a strategic need has been identified and the partnership approach is considered the best course of action.
11. When considering whether to progress a project to the next stage the committee should consider alignment with the 10 key criteria of the fund: community partnerships, identified need, planning, timelines, outcomes and benefits, strategic fit, track record, risk and mitigation, financial sustainability and project budget.
12. At the May 2013 meeting, the committee resolved to adopt a two stage application process in line with the former Auckland City Council policy.
13. A two stage process enables council to consider each proposal against a set of criteria and allocate resources to those applications it wants to develop further, before committing funding. It allows staff to work closely with groups that progress to the next stage to ensure high quality information can be presented when funding decisions are made.
14. Stage one requires groups to submit an Expression of Interest (EOI). This report presents a summary of the ten EOI applications received and provides staff recommendations for consideration and seeks committee feedback on which applications to progress to stage two.
15. Stage two applications will be reported to the committee at a workshop 9 March 2015, and a decision making meeting 13 April 2015.

## Project Overviews and summary of applications:

### Auckland Rowing Association (ARA)

16. Stage 1 development of a Regional Watersports Centre on the Tamaki River in Highbrook, East Tamaki: earthworks and retaining work to provide hardstands, water access, boat ramp, parking at an estimated cost of \$1.65million.
17. The committee granted the Auckland Rowing Association (ARA) \$400,000 from the central facility partnership fund 2013/2014.
18. ARA at the time of their 2013/2014 application signalled that it would re-apply in 2014/2015.
19. This proposed major project has an estimated total project cost of \$6,441,000, and will be built in three stages: Stage 1 is around creating water access through building a boat ramp, hardstands and parking spaces; Stage 2 is the building and positioning of pontoons, Stage 3 is the provision of multi-purpose buildings.
20. Since June 2014, the ARA has submitted applications to all other facility partnership schemes operated by council and are currently awaiting outcomes, which will be known by this committee's financial decision making meeting on 13 April 2015.
21. A regional facility for rowing was identified in The Auckland Regional Physical Activity and Sport Strategy report as a priority for Auckland. The Tamaki Estuary was identified as one of the few waterways capable of hosting a 2000m course for training, competitions and regatta.
22. The project aligns to the outcomes of the Auckland Plan and the Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan.
23. The Highbrook site will provide a base for a number of Central and South Auckland schools, clubs and general public as well as regional and age-group representative teams for rowing, waka ama, paddling and canoe sports.
24. The growth of ARA's membership is constrained by lack of suitable facilities, which also impacts on the recruitment and performance of representative crews, who currently operate without permanent training facilities or equipment storage.
25. Waka Ama similarly lack access to facilities to support their growth at regional and representative level. Given the growth in both sports and the lack of appropriate sub-regional competitive and training facilities, it is recommended to progress this application to stage two.
26. Since June 2014, the design and consent work has been completed for the Highbrook development; the ARA has undertaken liaison and consultation with eight Iwi groups as required by the proposed Unitary Plan; archaeological investigation of the site has been undertaken with further investigations planned to take place during preliminary earthworks.
27. Consent has been lodged with council and tender documents are being prepared with a view to earthworks commencing in March 2015 in-line with their funding timelines.
28. The group has secured use of land to develop which will be handed over to council as a reserve for the future.

Project budget/financials:

Total Project Cost	\$6,441,000
Stage 1 Project cost	\$1,650,000
<i>Confirmed Funding:</i>	
-Auckland Council - CFPF 2013/2014	\$ 400,000
-Pub Charity	\$ 141,950
<i>Applications submitted:</i>	
-AC other Facility Partnership Funds totaling \$560,000	
Howick Local Board - \$150,000	
Mangere/ Otahuhu - \$125,000	
Otara/Papatoetoe - \$125,000	
Franklin - \$ 25,000	
Manurewa - \$ 35,000	
FP Fund West - \$368,000	
FP Fund North - \$368,000	
Organisation contribution	\$ 355,000
Amount requested	\$ 508,050

- a. ARA's funding plan requires them to raise \$4,476,000 for stages 2 and 3 (pontoons and building works) to complete the project.
- b. Staff believe that ARA has an efficient committee with a strong governance structure so it would appear that this funding plan is achievable.
- c. The Howick Local Board has indicated that they will make all decisions on their facility partnership funding applications when their 'Howick Local Board Sport and Active Recreation Facility Plan' has been completed and reported early 2015.

Recommendation:

That the Auckland Rowing Association application progress to stage two as it shows strategic alignment and it has made progress in design, planning and fundraising phases during the past five months.

Avondale Intermediate School

29. To heat and cover the Avondale Intermediate School pool: this application is towards the construction of a covered enclosure for the pool.
30. The Avondale Intermediate school pool is a community based asset within the Whau Local Board area. The pool is run by the school and is used by: a swim school, after school care programme and it provides a venue for children to learn to swim within their community.
31. The school is applying to both this fund and the west facility partnership fund. The application to the west fund is to heat the pool. Some funding has already been confirmed (\$30,000 from Portage Licencing Trust)
32. This application is to cover, fence and light the Avondale Intermediate School swimming pool in order to increase the utilisation from its current 5-6 months of the year, to an estimated 8 -9 months per year.
33. The total project budget has estimated costs of \$550,000 for both heating and covering the pool. \$400,000 has been estimated for the construction, lighting and ventilation aspects of the project. This application is seeking the full amount from the fund for this aspect of the project.

34. Background: Avondale Primary School was granted an amount of \$1,000,000 from Auckland City Council's Facility Partnership Fund for the development of a covered, heated indoor swimming pool complex on the school grounds, with an estimated total development cost of \$2,500,000. Council and the school entered into a facility partnership agreement with an agreed project completion date of 30 June 2012. The school was granted two 12 month extensions to the project completion date, but was unable to secure the required balance of the project cost. With the project no longer viable, the committee resolved at the June 2014 meeting to withdraw the balance of unspent funding allocated to the school and reallocate into the Central Facilities Partnership Fund for 2014/2015. (Refer resolution CFPC/2014/3).
35. The draft Community Facilities Network Plan identifies a gap in aquatic provision in the inner-west corridor and includes the following action: *Action 41 - Investigate the provision of aquatic and leisure facilities in the western corridor from Mt Albert to Glen Eden to address potential gap in provision and population growth.*
36. Given the size and location of the Avondale Intermediate School pool, an upgrade of this scale, would not fill the aquatic need in the inner-west corridor as the gap in provision is significant. However, it may support school swimming, learn to swim classes and "squad" or sport swimming training demands.
37. There is a need for strategic alignment with Council's draft Community Facility Network Plan and the Auckland Leisure Unit. The upgrade of the facility could be a short-term approach to sustaining the existing aquatic activity in the area.
38. This asset is outside of the fund's geographical area and while there may be benefits to some residents in the central isthmus; these benefits have not been quantified in this application.
39. In developing up this application to a stage two level, the school could be supported to add detail around community partners, funding partners and budget details. The school needs to instigate a project steering group with a clear vision and driving force. This steering group could then investigate and develop a suitable operational model.
40. A well-developed stage two application would consider and show how to: schedule and monitor a variety of user groups; manage risks or issues associated with extended use; manage water quality and plant maintenance.

Project budget/financials

Total Project Cost		\$550,000
<i>Funding Confirmed</i>		
- (Portage Licencing Trust)		30,000
<i>Funding applications submitted</i>		
- West FPFund - heating	120,000	
- Lotteries	40,000	
Organisation contribution		<i>Not signaled in application</i>
Amount requested		\$400,000

- a. A funding plan needs to be completed.
- b. The applicant group has been informed that council does not fully fund projects and the school must make some contribution itself.



Project budget/financials

Total Project Cost		\$6,638,000
<i>Confirmed funding</i>		\$837,000
-Joyce Fisher Charitable Trust	\$ 537,000	
-Lion Foundation	\$ 250,000	
-Transpower Community Care Fund	\$ 50,000	
Organisation contribution		\$1,500,000
Amount requested		\$ 192,000

- a. The funding plan is realistic with a significant range of funders involved.
- b. The Foundation has an established asset base.

Recommendation

That the Cochlear Implant Foundation of NZ /Auckland Hearing house application not progress to stage two as it is primarily a health services project and does not meet the criteria of the fund.

Epsom Girls Grammar School

49. Project is to create flexible use outdoor court space by resurfacing, lighting and covering the current outdoor courts, in order to release pressure on existing indoor spaces.
50. The school is proposing to re-surface, re-configure and re-mark the existing court space so as to be more responsive to a variety of uses, and to then cover the courts, to provide all weather playing and training space, for both school and community users.
51. Council has recently (2012/12013) contributed \$200,000 from this fund towards the Lady Woolf Fisher indoor courts /stadium project at this school due to the community use aspects of indoor court use, helping to mitigate central Auckland's indoor court space shortage. The community use aspects are being reported regularly and show a split of 35% usage by the school and 65% usage by community groups making use of the enhanced facility.
52. Council also contributed \$900,000 to the Raye Freeman Performing Arts Centre at Epsom Girls Grammar in 2003.
53. Sport New Zealand's National Facilities Strategy for Indoor Sports, shows there is a 24 court deficit of indoor court space within the central Auckland area.
54. This project aligns with the Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan as a fit-for purpose facility allowing more people to be more active.
55. By covering the outdoor courts, an alternative all-weather venue will be provided which will be suitable for a range of sports and will help alleviate the identified deficit.
56. The "Sports Arena and Courts project" is stage 3A and 3B of the Sports Complex project with the sports centre facility being completed in September 2014. It is envisaged that together the Arena and Courts could provide a useable flexible space for events.
57. The covered facility is designed for extended use and to create shelter in the winter wet periods and to create shade for the summer hot times of the day.
58. The approximate cost of this project is \$4,049,250, with the initial court re-surfacing and re-marking part of the project costing around \$900,000. However, the school has indicated they may stage the project as funds become available.
59. The school has indicated that they would want exclusive use of the courts from 7am to 4:30pm and outside of these times the community could use the facility. The exact times would need to form part of any funding agreement and reflect council's investment.

60. The current tennis courts are well utilised due to an “open gate” policy and are used by nearby residents and casual visitors year round.
61. Staff recommend that this project be progressed to stage two subject to further discussions around staging of the project and clarity around school/community use, which is harder to capture and measure on outdoor, open access court space.

Project budget/financials

Total Project Cost	\$4,049,250
<i>Confirmed funding</i>	
Fundraising/Sponsorship	\$ 500,000
<i>Funding applications to be submitted</i>	
- NZ Lottery Grants Board - \$1,000,000	
- Lion Foundation - \$ 200,000	
Organisation contribution	\$1,100,000
Total Funding achieved	\$2,800,000
Amount requested	\$1,249,250

- a. This budget is well developed and staged to allow flexibility in delivery.
- b. The school has a proven track record to manage this type of project.

Recommendation

That Epsom Girls Grammar School application progress to stage two. The project shows strategic alignment and will give increased capacity for current and future demands.

Ellerslie Sports Club Incorporated (Inc.)

63. A project to redesign and construct a new clubroom building including an amenities block at Michaels Ave Reserve at an estimated cost of \$2,443,500.
64. Ellerslie Sports Club Incorporated (the sports club) is the overarching umbrella for Ellerslie Association Football Club Inc. and Ellerslie Cricket Club Inc. In the 2013/14 funding round, the fund supported this project with seed funding of \$340,000 to help the sports club attract further financial sponsorship and support.
65. The sports club is seeking an additional grant for 2014/15 of \$500,000 as a further contribution towards additional costs that have been identified for the project.
66. The sports club lease part of the Ellerslie Recreation Centre located Michaels Ave Reserve.
67. Council adopted a master plan for Michaels Ave Reserve in 2008. The plan incorporated an artificial field installation in 2012/13 (stage one), an upgrade of lower fields with sand carpets and field lights (stage two to be completed in 2014/15), new public toilets, new changing facilities and a club room for the sports club (stage three still to be confirmed / consulted on).
68. The implementation of the concept plan is a staged approach to provide quality playing surfaces, greater field capacity and improved amenities. Stage one has been completed and stage two of the project will be completed in this financial year.
69. While council has lead the design process for the development in partnership with the sports club, no budget has been allocated for the development or the designs for stage three (which includes the whole building). The intention was that council would fund the public amenities on the lower level and the sports club would raise funds for the top level. However, as yet no budget has been allocated to the amenities side of the capital development.

70. Specific needs have now been identified for this stage of the project as it has become apparent that the current clubrooms are no longer fit for purpose. Additional usage from female members of both the football and cricket clubs has placed increased pressure on the existing amenities. Club membership continues to grow for both sports.
71. The sports club is working with the local community around design options for the clubroom and amenities block and there has been interest from third parties (e.g. physiotherapy) in being tenants in the new building.
72. The project aligns to Orakei Local Board Plan, the Michaels Ave Reserve Master plan, the Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan and outcomes of the Auckland Plan.

Project budget/financials

Total Project Cost	\$2,443,500
<i>Confirmed funding</i>	
- Auckland Council central facility partnership fund	\$ 340,000
Organisation contribution	\$ 115,000
Amount requested	\$ 500,000

- a. The sports club will be seeking additional contributions from NZCT, ASB Community Trust and Lotteries Community Facilities Fund, once there is a finalised design and a revised cost estimate (estimated to be February 2015)
- b. The committee of the sports club has experience in property development and project management.

Recommendation

That the Ellerslie Sports Club Incorporated application progress to stage two, as it shows strategic alignment with council's developed plans.

Great Barrier Island Golf Club Incorporated (Inc.)

73. A project to replace the toilet and amenities block at the Great Barrier Island Golf Club, at Claris on Great Barrier Island.
74. This application is for an upgrade to the very old and out of date (decrepit) toilet: the existing one was originally the old police station cell (described as a porta cabin that was converted to be a toilet). Replacement is estimated to cost \$70,000 being \$60,000 for a new ablution block and \$10,000 to upgrade the septic tank system.
75. The club has approximately 250 members (of an Island community of approximately 800). The current facilities are used around 25 hours per week by the community, but the toilets are open for use 24 hours per day.
76. The club owns the buildings and holds a current community lease with council on the land. The club's lease was granted from 1 September 2007 with a final expiry on 31 August 2022.
77. Great Barrier Island Local Board provided \$14,253 in 2013 for a new roof for the club. The club reports that it uses almost all of its revenue, on running the generators and equipment that allows the golf club to exist and function.
78. The club has been alerted to the fact that if this application were to be progressed, this fund requires some financial contribution towards any upgrade project. The club has signalled it would be able to contribute up to 10% of the total cost of the toilet upgrade.
79. The club sees the facility as a community asset and has successfully undertaken fundraising golf tournaments for agencies such as St Johns Ambulance and the Coastguard. The golf course is also available all year round for visitors to Great Barrier Island to enjoy.

80. School-aged children can play for free and the club has introduced an Active Kids coaching programme using new, specialised equipment for children.
81. During school holidays, the club works with the Aotea Family Support Group to transport children to the club to learn golf. The club is seeking to work with local schools during school terms, by taking equipment to the schools to introduce more children to the game of golf.
82. This upgrade project is seen as improving the club's essential services to its members, to visitors and to provide a much needed stopping off point for any tourists or hikers exploring the island, particularly with boating based visitors arriving over the summer months. Likewise interest within the local community is predicted to increase when the toilet is upgraded.
83. In a memo at the May 2014 meeting the committee noted that council is not in the business of providing amenities and toilet blocks for sports clubs. These amenity builds are not in scope for this fund, but would however be considered if a toilet or amenities block was to form part of a wider development for greater access and use of a community facility.

Project budget/financials

Total Project Cost	\$70,000
<i>Confirmed funding</i> -No funding signalled in this application	
Organisation contribution	\$ 7,000
Amount requested	\$63,000

- a. If funding is not granted then the toilet upgrade project will not proceed.
- b. Club says it can contribute 10%

Recommendation

That the Great Barrier Island Golf Club application is not progressed to stage two as this project is primarily a maintenance/asset renewal project and therefore ineligible under the criteria.

Mt Wellington Tennis Club

84. The Mt Wellington Tennis Club is seeking to upgrade their facilities with a view to position itself as a multi-sport club, by providing a variety of flexible sport spaces and surfaces.
85. The club has estimated this stage of the project to cost \$137,000 and is seeking \$100,000 from this fund.
86. The project covers 1) creating a new artificial turf space for young children 2) installing floodlights over three courts 3) installing a new artificial surface on two courts and adjustable height nets 4) improving the site fencing 5) installing an additional electronic access system.
87. The club is situated on Dunkirk Rd, Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve, and is affiliated to Tennis Auckland. Council owns the building and the land and the club owns the surface improvements.
88. Mt Wellington Tennis Club has been working with council and Sport Auckland on the sports partnership initiative. Council's Sports Partnership team reports that the current committee is innovative, energetic and capable.
89. The club has 55 registered members affiliated to Auckland Tennis for tennis and has similar numbers for its futsal coaching programme. The club's main point of difference is the way in which it is open and accessible for informal and flexible use.

90. The club's recent strategic planning process has identified a demand to become a multi-sport entity and in 2013 the club received land owner approval to amend its lease to allow multisport activities on the grounds. The club is seeking to diversify its activities in order to remain financially sustainable by responding to community needs.
91. The project shows strategic alignment and significant community benefit: It meets the outcomes of the Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board Plan and other council strategic documents.
92. The club is endeavouring to future proof itself by partnering with other sports such as futsal and volleyball by introducing flexible height nets on the flexi-court spaces.
93. There is evidence of commitment and support from a variety of aligned groups such as Marist Brothers Rugby Club who can use the courts as a wet weather training facility and different codes who can train and play side by side through the use of upgraded surfaces and dividing nets.

Project budget/financials

Total Project Cost	\$137,230
<i>Funding applications to be submitted</i>	
- ASB Community Trust      \$17,230	
- Mt Wellington Foundation \$20,000	
Organisation contribution	\$ 37,230
Amount requested from Council	\$100,000

- a. The club financial commitment is currently dependent on third party funding therefore making the whole project external funding.

Recommendation:

That the Mt Wellington Tennis Club application progress to stage two, as it is aligned with strategic outcomes for multi-sport/use facilities and increased participation.

Rudolf Steiner School Trust at Michael Park School

94. A project to add toilet facilities, improve the infrastructure and upgrade the catering / kitchen facilities at the auditorium based at the Michael Park School at a cost of \$350,000.
95. The Rudolf Steiner School Trust leases the auditorium and land to the school for its use during school hours, currently 40 hours per week. The school use the auditorium mainly for lessons, seminars, music practice during the day, while evening use is predominantly school community meetings (4 per year), school events ( 8 per school term), school plays (9 weeks per year), school conference ( 4 days per year).
96. The school has 86 children in its kindergarten and 333 children on its school roll.
97. The auditorium is hired out for external events (10 times in 2013) and is available for hire to the school and for community groups. Currently, there are around a dozen community groups utilising the facilities on a regular bases.
98. The trust plan to expand the capability of the auditorium to host other larger arts and community-related events and increase its community reach, by adding toilets, improving the layout and upgrading the kitchen and catering area.
99. The auditorium was initially built with the purpose of being a community resource. However, because it has only one set of toilets and no commercial catering facilities, it has limited potential to be hired out for larger scale performance related or public events. It seats 356 people currently and while the upgrade will not extend capacity, the school sees that improving existing facilities will help the auditorium to meet the needs of its audience.

100. The trust has spoken with community groups such as the Ellerslie Residents & Ratepayers Association, who support the development.
101. The trust has recently employed a coordinator to lead the development of a fundraising plan that will identify potential partners, grants and fundraising activities to cover the costs of the school's identified projects such as this auditorium upgrade.
102. The council's draft community facilities network plan has identified the region is well provided for with performance type facilities. The main issues for arts and culture sector are rehearsal, storage and administration facilities to support arts and culture groups and opportunities for affordable and creative spaces for artists to work in.
103. The draft plan has identified that local arts and cultural activity will be delivered through multi-purpose community facilities or explored through partnering or encouraging community institutions and organisations to provide spaces for arts and culture activity.

Project budget/financials

Total Project Cost		\$350,000
<i>Funding applications to be submitted :</i>		
Fonterra Grassroots fund	\$ 5,000	\$100,000
The Lou and Iris Fisher Charitable Trust	\$45,000	
Kiwanis Foundation Grants	\$ 5,000	
Transpower Community care Fund	\$45,000	
Organisation contribution		\$ 25,000
Amount requested		\$215,000

- a. The trust has yet to submit any other funding applications.

Recommendation

That the Rudolf Steiner Schools Trust at Michael Park School application not progress to stage two, as council's draft Community Facilities Network Plan has not identified a lack of community or art performance facilities in Ellerslie.

Selwyn College

104. This project is to upgrade the outdoor hard courts with artificial turf (astro-turf) to enable the school and community to maximise the court facility for netball, basketball, and tennis as well as sports such as soccer, ultimate frisbee, touch rugby, hockey and fitness training.
105. Total cost of the project is \$157,616 and the school is seeking \$141,854 from this fund.
106. The heavy usage on the current courts and competing demands from traditional sports with new sports has created a demand for year round access and use of flexible court space.
107. The application states that the courts are used by the school for 85 hours per week and are available to other school and community users for all other hours (but are weather and light dependent). The court areas are open access as there are no fences or gates, around them.
108. The school states that the facility is more than just a school asset and is a true community space, as it is currently used by a University, other local schools, several sports clubs and for casual use by the local community.
109. With an upgrade the school expects even more community groups to take advantage of an artificial playing surface. A community access schedule can be developed with the College through its business manager to ensure a balance between school and other use.
110. The courts are in very poor condition with many potholes: Selwyn College was built in 1956 and the courts added soon afterwards. They have not been re-surfaced since then as it was considered that piecemeal repairs would not necessarily have contributed to more useable space or surface.

111. The application could be progressed to stage two on its ability to provide an improved level of service and an increase in opportunities for participation. A resurfaced outdoor space such as this would help alleviate the shortage of outdoor space in this locality.

Project budget/financials

Total Project Cost (best of 3 quotes)	\$157,616
<i>Confirmed funding</i>	
- Fuji Xerox donation                      \$15,761	\$30,101
- The Lion Foundation                      \$15,000	
<i>Funding applications submitted to</i>	
-The Ted Manson Foundation              \$157,616	
Organisation contribution (from Fuji Xerox donation)	\$ 15,761
Amount requested	\$127,515

- a. Staff has confidence that the college can deliver on this project.
- b. The application needs further work by the school to identify and confirm any additional funding partners and to map the use of the space by community groups.
- c. Courts can be configured as 3 netball courts and 1 basketball court OR convert to 6 tennis courts.

Recommendation:

That the Selwyn College application progress to stage two, as it aligns with strategic outcomes for multi-sport/multi- use facilities and increased community opportunities for participation.

Three Kings United Football Club

112. A project to build new clubrooms at Keith Hay Park and incorporate suitable areas within the planned design, to cater for changing demographics.
113. Three Kings United Football Club (the club), is New Zealand's largest football club with approximately 7300 members, players and supporters. It is estimated that 20% of the club's 2,300 playing members are of different ethnicities.
114. The club was granted \$340,000 by the committee in 2013/2014 funding round as seed funding towards its long planned "New Clubrooms" project. The project is aligned to the concept plan that has been developed by council for Keith Hay Park.
115. The club has worked closely with council staff and the other Keith Hay Park facilities to align the timing of this project, and to incorporate the four council changing facilities that are currently preventing the car park from being completed.
116. The club is placing special emphasis on providing better changing facilities, particularly for the increasing numbers of female users and members. The current changing facilities are not appropriate for members from other ethnic groups (such as Muslim players) who are part of the increasing diversity apparent within this club and its community.
117. The club has initiated talks with schools, with holiday programme providers and with other park users, codes and sports as to their potential use of the new clubrooms, leading to a more community focused resource, for times when football is not using it. These overtures and informal surveys have led the club to become concerned to cater for increasing diversity in gender groups, age groups, ethnic groups and the greater range of cultural differences.

118. The club's response has been to ensure the changing room and toilet facilities will be designed for a more diverse mix of playing members and other user's needs, within the new clubhouse build, (particularly for the growing numbers of women players) but this will incur extra costs. This application is seeking funding to help address some of those additional costs, incurred in catering for a different emerging demographic.
119. The club has six women's teams and has 67 girls' teams under 17 years of age: half of these teams would play at Keith Hay Park each week. Since 2009 there has been an increase of 19% in female players in the club. (Across the region it is a 13% growth). The growth has meant an expansion of an extra five teams at the club and an additional estimated 31 female teams across Auckland Region.
120. The club's current facilities are inadequate given the growth the club has experienced over the past five years. There have been several iterations for the positioning and layout of the clubrooms but the approved plans are now closely aligned to the number one field and are central to the park's other playing pitches.
121. The building timeline, if all fundraising is achieved according to plan, would be summer of 2015/2016 to coincide with the final stages of the car park and the removal of the council owned changing rooms.
122. Community support for this development has been captured through public submissions in May 2012 as outlined in the document "Analysis of Keith Hay Park Concept Plan Feedback". Community groups will be more likely to feel welcome in a facility that will cater for a variety of sporting and cultural requirements.

Project budget/financials

Total Project Cost	\$3,924,000
<i>Confirmed funding</i>	
- Council June 2014 CFPF	\$ 340,000
<i>Funding applications currently submitted :</i>	
- ASB Community Trust \$500,000	
- NZCT \$300,000	
- Lion Foundation \$150,000	
Organisation contribution	\$230,000
Amount requested	\$ 750,000

- a. The club committee in working towards its targeted funding plan has demonstrated an ability to network with sponsors and seek funding from a variety of avenues in order to achieve financial goals and operational sustainability.

Recommendation

That the Three Kings United Football Club application progress to stage two as it aligns with the Keith Hay Park Concept Plan, and council's strategic outcomes for accessible opportunities for diverse communities.

**Requirements for Stage 2**

123. Officers will work one-on-one with applicants that are progressed to stage two by the Committee.
124. Applicants will have until 14 February 2015 to submit a full stage two application.

125. The stage two applications should show clear evidence of :

- Aligning with the key principles of the Scheme;
- A realistic timeframe that provides evidence of the ability to carry out the project within the next 18 months;
- A quote or quantity surveyor estimate;
- A realistic funding plan indicating when and where funds for the project are likely to come from;
- A contribution from within the organisation;
- A clear outline of where funding for design, concepts or pre construction work will be funded from;
- A realistic Council grant request (ie of approximately 30% of the project costs);
- Landowner approval for the works; and
- Tenure of the site covering the period of community access required.

## Consideration

### Local board views and implications

126. The decisions sought by this report are within the delegated authority of the Central Facility Partnerships Committee, and do not invoke the Auckland Council Significance Policy.

## Implementation Issues

127. All applicants identified to progress to stage two will be notified and officers will work with the organisations.

128. Full applications will be presented to the Committee at a workshop on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2015 with a Committee meeting on Monday 13<sup>th</sup> April 2015 to make decisions and allocate funding.

129. Unsuccessful applicants will be notified in writing and staff will advise the reasons for their applications being declined.

## Māori impact statement

130. The Facility Partnership scheme is a general programme of interest that is accessible to a wide range of groups, including Māori. In the assessments at stage two of the process, impacts supporting or negatively impacting Maori outcomes will be developed and reported.

## Implementation

131. All Facility Partnership grants are subject to the development of a Facility Partnership Agreement. All the terms and conditions must be jointly agreed upon before the sign off by both parties.

## Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A	Worksheet for the stage one EOI applications 2014-15	39
B	Updates on legacy, 2012-13, 2013-14 CFPF Projects	43

## Signatories

Authors	Suzanne Dennehy - Sport and Recreation Advisor Shamila Unka - Team Leader Sport & Recreation
Authorisers	Ken Maplesden - Sport and Recreation Adviser Lisa Tocker - Manager, Recreation Facilities & Service Delivery Central Ian Maxwell - Manager Parks, Sports & Recreation Judith Webster - Relationship Manager

**Table 1: Summary of EOIs received during 2014/15 round**

Page #	Organisation	LB Area	Project description	Total Cost of Project	Funding Requested	Officer recommendation	Officer reasoning
3	Auckland Rowing Association	Regional	Stage 1 development of a Regional Watersports Centre in Highbrook: hardstands, water access, jetty	a) \$6,441,000 total project b) \$1,650,000 Stage 1	\$ 508,050	Progress	Project shows strategic alignment and it has made progress in design, planning and fundraising phases during the past five months.
5	Avondale Intermediate school swimming Pool	Whau	To heat and cover the Avondale Intermediate School pool; this application is for the construction of a covered enclosure.	\$ 550,000	\$ 400,000	Progress	With the following conditions: A project steering group is in place by stage 2 application closing date; A funding plan and timeline is developed with a whole of project view; An operational model is investigated and proposed; Key community partners are identified; Community use from the CFPC Local Board area is demonstrated
6	Cochlear Implant Foundation NZ at Auckland Hearing House	Albert-Eden	A rebuild and expansion project at their Greenlane premises.	\$ 6,638,000	\$ 192,000	Not Progress	Project is primarily a health services project and does not meet the criteria of the fund.

<b>Attachment A</b>	<b>Item 15</b>	7	Epsom Girls Grammar School	Albert-Eden	Resurface and develop covered court spaces with lights.	\$ 4,049,250	\$ 1,249,250	Progress	Project shows strategic alignment and will give increased capacity for current and future demands.
		8	Ellerslie Sports Club Inc.	Orakei	Redesign and construct a new clubrooms including an amenities block at Michaels Ave Reserve.	\$ 2,443,500	\$ 500,000	Progress	Project shows strategic alignment with council's developed plans
	9	Great Barrier Island Golf Club	Great Barrier	To replace the toilets at Great Barrier Golf Club.	\$ 70,000	\$ 63,000	Not Progress	Project is primarily a maintenance/asset toilet renewal project and therefore ineligible under the criteria.	
	10	Mt Wellington Tennis Club	Maungakiekie-Tamaki	Upgrade and re-surface existing courts and spaces.	\$ 137,230	\$ 100,000	Progress	Project is aligned with strategic outcomes for multi-sport/use facilities and increased participation.	
	11	Rudolf Steiner School Trust at Michael Park School	Orakei	To add toilet facilities, improve the infrastructure and upgrade the catering / kitchen facilities at the auditorium based at the Michael Park School.	\$ 350,000	\$ 215,000	Not Progress	Council's draft Community Facilities Network Plan (CFNP) has not identified a lack of community or art performance facilities in Ellerslie.	

12	Selwyn College	Orakei	Upgrade the existing outdoor court surfaces.	\$ 157,616	\$ 127,515	Progress	Project is aligned with strategic outcomes for multi-sport/use facilities and increased participation.
13	Three Kings United Football Club	Puketapapa	Build new clubrooms for football club at Keith Hay Park in line with the Keith Hay Park concept plan.	\$ 3,924,000	\$ 750,000	Progress	Project aligns with the Keith Hay Park Concept Plan, and council's strategic outcomes for accessible opportunities.
				<b>\$ 19,969,596</b>	<b>\$ 4,104,815</b>		



**Central Facility Partnership Project updates:**

Legacy Projects					
Project	LB Area	Project Description	Expiry date	Grant Amount	Update
St Heliers Community Centre and Church	Orakei	Large scale redevelopment of the existing site	30-Jun-15	\$1,250,000	Project has commenced. Two payments made November 2014.
Nga Hau Maiangi	Maungakheke-Tamaki	Pontoon development & new club redevelopment at Ian Shaw Reserve	30-Jun-15	\$1,250,000	Pontoons completed, piles manufactured and ready to be installed. First payment made Nov 2014.
Akarana Marine Sports Trust	Orakei	Redevelopment of the existing site at The Landing	30-Jun-15	\$1,000,000	Progress report received 3 <sup>rd</sup> November 2014. \$1,000,000 grant confirmed from ASB Community Trust. Resource consents logged
Tri star Gymnastics club	Puketapapa	Stage two developments and fit out of the mezzanine section.	30-Jun-15	\$650,000	All funding now in place for project. Resource consents updated and in hand: contract was let late October.. Project physical works have started ; first payment due to go out Nov./Dec 2014
2012/13 Round – Capital Projects					
Project	LB Area	Project Description	Expiry date	Funding Allocated	Project Status/ update
Barrier Social Club	Great Barrier Island	To replace the leaking roof	30-Jun-15	\$20,000	Project completion report received April 2014.
East City BMX Club	Orakei	Funding to upgrade and improve the track and facilities at Merton Road Reserve	30-Jun-15	\$150,000	Project Completion report received September 2014. Final retention payment has gone out now that container has been removed from site.
Epsom Girls Grammar School - Indoor Sports Gym	Albert-Eden	Funding towards indoor court space	30-Jun-15	\$200,000	Completion report received and final payment gone out. Community access report received

Mt Roskill Grammar School - Artificial Playing Surface Trust	Puketepapa	To fix damage to the underlay of the existing turf and replace the existing turf with a water turf	30-Jun-15	\$400,000	Fundraising underway. Scheduled to commence October 2014. Resource consents logged
Friends of Onehunga Community House	Manungakeikei-Tamaki	Restoration of Room 7, at Onehunga Community House	30-Jun-14	\$45,000	Project completed and fully paid out April 2014. Civic opening ceremony in May 2014.
Ponsonby Cruising Club	Waitemata	Installation of lift for physically impaired and blind sailors	30-Jun-15	\$25,000	Lift installed: Project Completion report received August 2014.
Te Papapa Onehunga Rugby, Football and Sports Club	Manungakeikei-Tamaki	Redevelopment of clubrooms to improve access	30-Jun-15	\$300,000	Project progressing. FPA yet to be signed. Applying for Land owner approval and consents.
West End Lawn Tennis Club	Waitemata	Clubhouse upgrade	30-Jun-15	\$250,000	Update report received and resource consent granted. Project funding to be confirmed Dec 2014. FPA to be developed mid-January 2015.

2012/13 round – Feasibility Studies

Project	LB Area	Project Description	Expiry date	Funding Allocated	Project Status/ update
Auckland Badminton Association and Auckland Table Tennis Association	Albert-Eden	Feasibility study for Auckland Table tennis and Auckland Badminton Association to scope a shared space on the existing site.	NA	\$30,000	Draft report received October 2014.
Auckland Deaf Society	Albert-Eden	Feasibility study to investigate the development of a community centre on the Balmoral site	NA	\$35,000	Final report received April 2014.
Eastern Suburbs Gym Club	Manungakeikei-Tamaki	Feasibility study to asses purchasing a new building vs. developing the current building	NA	\$25,000	Final report received. Club looking for a new site for a large scale development.

Maungarei Community Christian Trust	Manungakekei-Tamaki	Feasibility study to extend the use of the existing land and buildings to operate a community centre	\$19,000	\$19,000	Final Report received. Working with council staff.
-------------------------------------	---------------------	--	----------	----------	--

**2013/14 Round – Capital Projects**

Project	LB Area	Project Description	Project Cost	Funded	Project update
Auckland Grammar School	Albert-Eden	To develop an artificial turf with lights to release pressure on the existing grass fields	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 400,000	Discussions with school re FP Agreement underway. Community access hours to be agreed.
Auckland Rowing Association Incorporated	Regional	Stage 1 of a regional water sports centre to create water access for rowing and other aquatic sports, through the installation of hardstands, a boat ramp and parking areas..	\$1,800,000 stage 1	\$400,000	Regional focus. High level alignment. Seeking further support this funding round.
Ellerslie Sports Club	Orakei	To build a club rooms for both cricket and football on Michaels Ave Reserve as part of the Stage 3 of the Michael Ave Reserve Concept Plan.	\$ 2,300,000	\$ 340,000	Discussions with Club: seeking further funding from this round.
Great Barrier Island Community Heritage and Arts Village Trust	Great Barrier	To complete renovation and refurbishment of the Grey Homestead as a heritage museum.	\$ 87,854	\$ 67,528	Funding Partnership agreement ready for signing
Three Kings United Football Club	Puketepapa	To build a new clubhouse in accordance with the council developed Keith Hay Park plan.	\$ 3,920,000	\$ 340,000	Seeking further funding from this round.

Waiheke Island Rudolf Steiner Education Trust	Waiheke	To establish an education and family support centre by partnering with other community groups alongside the Rudolf Steiner Kindergarten in Oneroa.	\$ 248,000	\$ 150,000	Project deferred: staff are working alongside the group to pursue a variety of options. The Trust has indicated they would take the opportunity to "re think the project" and perhaps submit a Feasibility Study in Feb 2015.
---	---------	--	------------	------------	---

**2013/14 round – Feasibility Study Projects**

Project	LB Area	Project Description	Project Cost	Funded	Update
Auckland Basketball Services Ltd (ABSL)	Sub-Regional	To identify opportunities and determine options to remedy basketball court capacity shortage within central Auckland.	\$25,000	\$20,000	Facility Partnership Funding agreement currently being finalised: consultant in place.
Auckland Bowls Association	Orakei	To scope the potential for a "Centre for Bowls" to be developed in central Auckland that would incorporate both indoor and outdoor greens to create year round access for playing bowls, as well as central headquarters, office space and clubroom facilities.	\$30,000	25,000	Facility Partnership Funding agreement has been discussed with Auckland Bowls: will continue developing up scope and brief for consultant.
YMCA Auckland	Waitemata	To identify options or opportunities for the YMCA around the potential to increase the capacity and the footprint of the YMCA City Stadium in Pitt St.	\$40,000	25,000	Facility Partnership Funding agreement currently being scoped with YMCA Auckland facility management.