

# Memo

1 September 2016

To: Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board  
cc: Neil Taylor (LBS), Tess Liew (Strategic Broker)  
From: Mark Evans

---

**Subject: BIDs bulk funding accountability 2015-2016**

The purpose of this memo is to update the local board on the Business Improvement Districts' (BIDs) expenditure of the bulk funding provided in 2015-2016.

## Background

On 29 July 2015, the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board resolved (Resolution number OP/2015/73):

- a) allocate a total of \$140,000 from the 2015/16 local board budget to Hunters Corner Town Centre Society Incorporated towards crime prevention, safety and economic development initiatives. This would be a net payment of \$61,668 after deducting CCTV value and the June 2015 funding, and subject to accepting the accountability detailed in their respective funding agreements.
- b) allocate a total of \$110,000 from the 2015/16 local board budget to Papatoetoe Main Street Society Incorporated towards crime prevention, safety and economic development initiatives. This would be a net payment of \$56,668 after deducting the CCTV value and the June 2015 funding, and subject to accepting the accountability detailed in their respective funding agreements.
- c) allocate a total of \$110,000 from the 2015/16 local board budget to Otara Business Association Incorporated towards crime prevention, safety and economic development initiatives. This would be a net payment \$31,668 after deducting the CCTV value and the June 2015 funding, and subject to accepting the accountability detailed in their respective funding agreements. ...

As a result of the resolution, funding agreements were drawn up for the following three BIDs:

- Papatoetoe Central Main Street Society Incorporated
- Hunters Corner Town Centre Society Incorporated
- Otara Business Association Incorporated.

Noting the difficulties faced by each BID around crime and improving local economic development, the local board undertook to assist them, providing them the discretion to control the extent of funding applied to each purpose, provided it met the criteria:

1. "Crime prevention" includes contributing to the costs of:
  - a. Operating and monitoring CCTV systems
  - b. Crime prevention activities
  - c. Ambassador programme
  - d. Public education programmes to reduce crime in the town centres.
2. "Economic development" includes:
  - a. Administrative costs of the business association
  - b. Promotion and advertising of the town centre, including branding
  - c. Events and decorations in the town centre
  - d. Co-ordination of activities by businesses.

Each BID had to provide reports to help inform the local board (fully detailed in Attachment A) covering updates on:

- a breakdown of the number of major and minor incidents per week
- numbers of ambassador contacts with the Police
- number of incidents successfully resolved by the ambassadors
- evidence of uptake of safer business practice by businesses as a result of ambassador activities
- number of ambassadors that have gained long-term employment after completing the course
- number of promotions and advertising of the town centre, including branding
- events and decorations in the town centre
- coordination of activities by businesses.

## **Reports**

There has been a variance in the style and detail of reports received from each BID, despite schedules being provided on the funding agreements (as seen in Attachment A).

Scanning the reports received, the main areas for further consideration across all the BIDs are:

- Lack of financial information provided
- Lack of numbers of participants engaged in supported activities
- Lack of success stories - no insight provided into what is working well. An example of this is the use of ambassadors – while an important resource, their true worth was not conveyed sufficiently, including the value of people gaining meaningful long-term employment afterwards.

## **Issues**

Of most concern is the loss of the crime prevention officer in Otara. In 14-15, they received:

- Crime prevention officer funding – \$70,000
- Ambassador contributions - \$21,500.00
- Economic Development discretionary funding - \$30,000.

In 15-16, they received:

- Bulk funding totalling - \$73,333
- CCTV monitoring contract - \$25,000.

The difference in the two sums provided is \$21,167 (noting the crime prevention officer role's salary was about \$50,000).

## **CCTV**

The existing public safety camera systems have undergone significant changes in the last year:

- monitoring of Old Papatoetoe has now moved from Hunters Corner to Otara
- old network links have been recently upgraded to fibre, removing the “lagging” issue with cameras being slow to respond to the controller
- Otara's control platform (that allows the cameras to be moved, viewed and footage recorded) has been replaced (within existing budget) to remove connectivity problems. This new platform allows other sites to be managed remotely, even when they are different makes and models of systems.

## **Consideration and potential next steps**

### *BID presentations*

There is significant value in having the three BID chairs (and/or town centre managers) present to the local board, highlighting their own town successes and issues.

Further, the local board could clearly articulate their own expectations around any funding support to the BIDs, including what information they need to help inform future decisions, while hearing first-hand the issues faced by the respective BIDs.

### *Otara's crime prevention officer*

This role was very important for the BID, but citing financial constraints, the position was vacated in November 2015. Based on the perception that there was to be flexibility in the funding, the local board may wish to consider exploring this further, gaining a better understanding of the BID's financial status and crime prevention plans long-term, in relation to the affected position.

### *CCTV*

There is potential opportunity (during the 17-18 work programme planning sessions next year) for the local board to consider using the existing budget set aside for CCTV programmes in a different way. The local board has the opportunity to assist the various town centres in its area by considering this budget (\$85,000) when planning the 17-18 work, by looking at options, such as:

- Continue to maintain the cameras and networks as before, retaining \$35,000 for this purpose
- Stop the monitoring contracts altogether, saving \$50,000
- Share the saved \$50,000 amongst all the BIDs (at local board discretion) and let them make the decision to monitor cameras (or collectively monitor, sharing staff costs) or invest it in economic development initiatives.

Alternatively, the local board could support improvements in the working relationships between all three BIDs, with a view to combining both the monitoring sites into one, sharing staff costs.

If this was something the local board wished to explore, it could be subject a future workshop with the relevant portfolio holder.