

Options Considered For Recently Renovated Space above Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board Offices

Option One	Community lease
Description	Offer the opportunity to lease the space to all interested groups and select tenants based on criteria set Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012
Who Implements?	Community Leases (CF)
What Process?	EOI process open to all groups. <i>Or the Local Board can decide to forgo the EOI at the discretion of the Local Board.</i>
Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offers opportunity to all community groups • Open and transparent process
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As TRC isn't a NGO or community organisation, the community occupancy guidelines don't allow for a commercial or private entity to occupy a community space • Not being able to accommodate everyone that might be interested (need to manage expectations raised in process) • Local board acts as the landlord only which is contrary to their desire to work collaboratively with other groups and jointly undertake co-design activities that deliver against local board plan outcomes • Unlikely to find an anchor tenant which is the desired arrangement to minimise requirements on Council
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raising expectations of groups through the EOI process • Conversations have been had at a political level and the board has indicated a strong desire to give use of the space to a particular group
Financial Implications	Income to the local board will be minimal (\$1.00 p/a. Leases with higher rentals are from legacy councils and will revert to \$1.00 when the leases expire)
Resourcing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No staffing requirements for the facility • Staffing resources to manage lease agreement process and monitoring for compliance • Maintenance officially sits with council

Option Two	Commercial Lease
Who?	Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board with either Tamaki Redevelopment Company, ADHB or Oranga Tamariki
Description	Lease of part or all of the premises on commercial terms
Who implements?	Panuku via commercial lease
Pro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivers on community outcomes • Potential financial returns from space which could come back into the LB budget • Leverages inputs from other agencies, who are contributing funds and resources • Location in the community hub • Risks reduced by one party taking responsibility for management of space • Flexibility and responsiveness • Scope for sub-leasing to community groups • Can start relatively quickly
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception that other community groups are deprived of the opportunity of the using the space • Commercial arrangement may not be aligned with delivery of the best community outcomes • In order for Panuku to arrange a commercial lease, the space may be required to transfer into the Panuku portfolio ie: it would transfer out of the LB's hands (would be contested by LB) • What assurances can the board have that the space would come back to the LB after the terms of the lease expire?
Financial implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for commercial/market rate leasing arrangement which could come back into the board's budget to re-allocate • Board could consider a subsidised rent which reflects that increased collaboration would contribute positively local board outcomes in key areas

Option three	Strategic partnership with key agencies to deliver key agreed outcomes
Who?	Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board, TRC, ADHB and Oranga Tamariki to develop and deliver the Tamaki Community Co-Design Lab
Who implements?	Panuku (commercial lease) ; Corporate Property or Community Places
What process?	(see above)
Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responds to the board’s aspiration of collaboration with key strategic partners with resource and reach in local board area • Focuses organisations involved in the partnership and challenges them to leverage collective outcomes of benefit to local community • Sends a positive message to central government of collaboration between local boards and central government on social issues facing communities • Is an innovative approach to addressing shared social outcomes • Attempts to build better collaboration and co-ordination between key agencies operating in Tamaki • Responds to community concerns about a ‘lack of joined up’ approach in Tamaki • Co-location of TRC, ADHB, Oranga Tamariki with the Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board creates a community hub with the Library, Panmure Hall, LB offices (one stop shop) • Potential to work collaboratively for alignment between the outcomes of the Co-Lab with the LBP outcomes • Potential to have more meaningful impact of key social issues (like youth unemployment or community safety) by working to achieve ‘collective impact’ with key strategic partners • Aligns with the direction set by the local board to prioritise groups interested in the community space who will generate employment opportunities for the local community • Auckland Council has a shareholders agreement which requires the organisation to support and enable TRC to achieve its identified outcomes
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This sits outside the ‘business as usual’ approach of Auckland Council • There would be potentially no financial return to the local board for the lease of its space • If the space leased via a commercial lease, Panuku may require it to be transferred to their portfolio. • There is a risk that it may not return to the local board at the end of the agreed lease period • This option may not be preferred by TRC and partners as they won’t have complete autonomy over space (ie: it seeks to form a strategic partnership which is over and above the leasing agreement)
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives and agreed outcomes of the strategic partnership (of the Co-Lab) may be broader than the LBP outcomes so board would need to accept that there would be some broadening of scope • There may be a perception from communities that the local board is over-investing in the project • It is an innovative approach so requires a flexibility/responsiveness that is challenging to facilitate from a large organisation such as council • The facility in this regard is part of a contribution to leverage key shared social outcomes. How we (Auckland Council) manage the facility shouldn’t be the driver, rather the social outcomes should drive this opportunity.

Option four	Mixed Use –Hybrid Community/Commercial lease to benefit and deliver community outcomes (Preferred Option)
Who?	Community Facilities and TRC to develop and deliver the Tamaki Community Co-Design Lab
Who implements?	Community Facilities
What process?	Local Government Act 2002, Reserves Act 1977 and Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012
Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify the board’s aspiration and goal for “Community facilities and spaces that work for our communities” in the Local Board Plan 2014-2017 • Co-location with the Tamaki Regeneration Programme as part of the Social and Economic Regeneration Programme • Co-location with the Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board creates a community hub with the Library, Panmure Hall, LB offices and CAB (one stop shop) • Potential to work collaboratively for alignment between the outcomes of the Co-Lab with the LBP outcomes • Potential to have more meaningful impact of key social issues (like youth unemployment or community safety) by working to achieve ‘collective impact’ with key strategic partners • Aligns with the direction set by the local board to prioritise groups interested in the community space who will generate employment opportunities for the local community • Auckland Council has a shareholders agreement which requires the organisation to support and enable TRC to achieve its identified outcomes • Any revenue generated from the leased space would reduce general rates burden and be used for community purposes • Explores a new option for leveraging meaningful community outcomes using Council space.
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This sits outside the ‘business as usual’ approach of leasing for community space • Staffing resources to manage hybrid lease agreement process and monitoring for compliance • This option may be marginally less attractive to TRC and partners as they won’t have complete autonomy over shared space
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives and agreed outcomes of the TRC and the board may require integration to achieve best results. • Setting a precedent for another occupancy which is out of scope under the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012