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Terms of Reference

Responsibilities
This committee deals with all strategy and policy decision-making that is not the responsibility of another committee or the Governing Body. Key responsibilities include:

- Development and monitoring of strategy, policy and action plans associated with environmental, social, economic and cultural activities
- Natural heritage
- Parks and reserves
- Economic development
- Protection and restoration of Auckland’s ecological health
- Climate change
- The Southern Initiative
- Waste minimisation
- Libraries
- Acquisition of property relating to the committee’s responsibilities and within approved annual budgets
  - Performing the delegations made by the Governing Body to the former Parks, Recreation and Heritage Forum and Regional Development and Operations Committee, under resolution GB/2012/157 in relation to dogs
- Activities of the following CCOs:
  - ATEED
  - RFA

Powers
(i) All powers necessary to perform the committee’s responsibilities, including:
  (a) approval of a submission to an external body
  (b) establishment of working parties or steering groups.
(ii) The committee has the powers to perform the responsibilities of another committee, where it is necessary to make a decision prior to the next meeting of that other committee.
(iii) The committee does not have:
  (a) the power to establish subcommittees
  (b) powers that the Governing Body cannot delegate or has retained to itself (section 2)
Exclusion of the public – who needs to leave the meeting

Members of the public

All members of the public must leave the meeting when the public are excluded unless a resolution is passed permitting a person to remain because their knowledge will assist the meeting.

Those who are not members of the public

General principles

- Access to confidential information is managed on a “need to know” basis where access to the information is required in order for a person to perform their role.
- Those who are not members of the meeting (see list below) must leave unless it is necessary for them to remain and hear the debate in order to perform their role.
- Those who need to be present for one confidential item can remain only for that item and must leave the room for any other confidential items.
- In any case of doubt, the ruling of the chairperson is final.

Members of the meeting

- The members of the meeting remain (all Governing Body members if the meeting is a Governing Body meeting; all members of the committee if the meeting is a committee meeting).
- However, standing orders require that a councillor who has a pecuniary conflict of interest leave the room.
- All councillors have the right to attend any meeting of a committee and councillors who are not members of a committee may remain, subject to any limitations in standing orders.

Independent Māori Statutory Board

- Members of the Independent Māori Statutory Board who are appointed members of the committee remain.
- Independent Māori Statutory Board members and staff remain if this is necessary in order for them to perform their role.

Staff

- All staff supporting the meeting (administrative, senior management) remain.
- Other staff who need to because of their role may remain.

Local Board members

- Local Board members who need to hear the matter being discussed in order to perform their role may remain. This will usually be if the matter affects, or is relevant to, a particular Local Board area.

Council Controlled Organisations

- Representatives of a Council Controlled Organisation can remain only if required to for discussion of a matter relevant to the Council Controlled Organisation.
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1 **Apologies**

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

2 **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.

3 **Confirmation of Minutes**

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 16 October 2018, including the confidential section, as a true and correct record.

4 **Petitions**

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

5 **Public Input**

Standing Order 7.7 provides for Public Input. Applications to speak must be made to the Governance Advisor, in writing, no later than one (1) clear working day prior to the meeting and must include the subject matter. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders. A maximum of thirty (30) minutes is allocated to the period for public input with five (5) minutes speaking time for each speaker.

5.1 **Public Input : Study by Ngai Tai ki Tamaki and NIWA re sediment discharging effects from Wairoa river into the Tamaki straight**

*Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report*

1. To present a six year study by Ngai Tai ki Tamaki and NIWA of the fine sediment discharging effects from the Wairoa river into the Tamaki straight.

2. Andrew Swales, NIWA and representatives of Ngai Tai ki Tamaki will present the study.

*Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s*

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the presentation regarding the six year study of sediment discharging effects from Wairoa river into the Tamaki straight and thank the representatives from Ngai Tai ki Tamaki and NIWA for their attendance.

5.2 **Public Input: Provision of a suburb park at Hobsonville Point - Hobsonville Point, Bomb Point Action Committee**

*Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report*

1. Grant Dixon, chair of the Hobsonville, Bomb Point Action Committee will address the committee in relation to the Bomb Point Reserve acquisition.
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the presentation and thank Grant Dixon, Chair of the Hobsonville Point, Bomb Point Action Committee regarding the Bomb Point reserve acquisition for his attendance.

5.3 Public Input: Glenfern Sanctuary – 2017/18 Annual Report and Research and Environmental Centre Update

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To present the Glenfern Sanctuary – 2017/18 Annual Report and Research and Environmental Centre Update.
2. Members of the Glenfern Sanctuary Management Trust will be presenting the annual report which is attached to the Summary of the Environment and Community Committee information report, Item 11 (AttachmentA) of this agenda.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the presentation and thank the Glenfern Sanctuary Management Trust for their attendance.

6 Local Board Input

Standing Order 6.2 provides for Local Board Input. The Chairperson (or nominee of that Chairperson) is entitled to speak for up to five (5) minutes during this time. The Chairperson of the Local Board (or nominee of that Chairperson) shall wherever practical, give one (1) day’s notice of their wish to speak. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders.

This right is in addition to the right under Standing Order 6.1 to speak to matters on the agenda.

6.1 Local Board Input: Upper Harbour Local Board - acquisition of open space at Hobsonville

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To address the committee regarding the acquisition of open space at Te Onekiritea Point, Hobsonville. Margaret Miles, chair and Lisa Whyte, deputy chair will be speaking on this matter.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) thank Margaret Miles and Lisa Whyte, Upper Harbour Local Board for their presentation and attendance regarding the acquisition of open space at Hobsonville.
7 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.”
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Staff have developed an Environment and Community Committee 2017/2018 Highlights Report (Attachment A) and Forward Work Programme for 2018/2019 (Attachment B).

3. The highlights report showcases a range of projects related to the committee’s delegations and priorities for 2017/2018. The projects highlighted focus on areas where communities have been involved or led the work.

4. The forward work programme includes a diverse range of projects, policies and plans with a focus on initiatives that have a high impact for Auckland for the 2018/2019 financial year. The Committee will be able to have oversight, as well as track progress on key projects that relate to its priorities. The highlights feature first-hand community feedback which shows some of the positive outcomes that have been delivered or enabled by the council’s work.

5. Both the highlights report and the forward work programme are in an accessible format that provides a clear line of sight between the committee’s focus and contribution towards Auckland Plan outcomes.

6. The next steps are to:
   • distribute the reports to the public through Auckland Council’s communication channels to demonstrate the range of projects the council undertakes and the impact they are having across the region.
   • track progress of the committee’s decisions for the forward work programme. This will be undertaken by Democracy Services as set out in Attachment C.

7. Any risks associated with delays in delivery of projects in the forward work programme will be managed and reported to the committee on a case by case basis.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:


Horopaki / Context
8. Key priorities for the Environment and Community Committee were agreed by the committee in March 2017. These continue to provide the focus for the Environment and Community Committee Forward Work Programme 2018/2019. These priorities include:
   • making progress with climate change adaptation and mitigation, and taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
   • enabling green growth with a focus on improved water quality, pest eradication and ecological restoration
• strengthening communities and enabling Aucklanders to be active and connected
• making progress related to the social and community aspects of housing Aucklanders in secure, healthy homes they can afford
• growing skills and a local workforce to support economic growth in Auckland.

9. The forward work programme and the Environment and Community Committee 2017/2018 Highlights Report have been developed to be in a more accessible format that demonstrates leadership and greater transparency about how Auckland Plan outcomes are being met and benefit the community.

10. Both documents have been designed to assist committee members in their decision making and governance roles and to better communicate the broad range of projects Auckland Council undertakes and their impact on communities.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

The 2017/2018 highlights report

11. The highlights report is a new initiative which will be developed yearly and presented with the committee’s forward work programme to demonstrate activity over the past financial year.

12. The report showcases some of the achievements, projects and programmes that our communities have been involved in over 2017/2018 through the use of case studies, videos and pictures.

13. The innovative digital and interactive format of the report demonstrates:
• how the council is working with and enabling communities with clear links to Auckland Plan outcomes
• the communities’ voices behind projects related to the committee’s work programme
• engagement and participation results as part of the council’s ‘6 Steps Up’ Strategy to engage and enable our communities.

14. Some key projects related to the committee’s work programme have not been included in the report, rather the report aims to highlight some of the activities that have involved our communities in 2017/2018. It is not intended as a comprehensive report on all actions that have been undertaken.

The forward work programme 2018/2019

15. The chair and deputy chair of the committee worked closely with staff to develop the forward work programme.

16. The forward work programme enables the committee to:
• agree and have oversight over key activities and priorities under its delegations
• monitor progress of the key decisions it has made
• provide direction to staff who undertake advisory work to support the programme.

17. The forward work programme includes a variety of projects, policies and plans which contribute towards achieving the six Auckland Plan outcomes and deliver on the committee’s priorities as identified above.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
18. The highlight report showcases activities and investment across a range of local board areas that align to the work of the committee. It gives visibility to work that is occurring in local board areas and the impact it is having for communities.
19. The report can also be used by local boards to communicate with their communities.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement
20. Building strong and vibrant Māori communities that thrive socially, culturally, economically and environmentally is the focus of the Māori identity and wellbeing Auckland Plan outcome.
21. The highlights report demonstrates how work with the committee aligns with the Auckland Plan (Māori identity and wellbeing) outcome.
22. The forward work programme incorporates a number of significant projects that will have a big impact for all Aucklanders including Māori. For example, this includes: Auckland’s water strategy, the Low Carbon Strategic Action Plan and the regional Pest Management Plan review.
23. Formal monitoring of progress on expenditure and delivery of Māori outcomes (via Te Toa Takitini) is undertaken though the Finance and Performance Committee.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
24. The public distribution of the reports will be delivered within existing budgets.
25. The forward work programme reflects commitments already made by the council that are funded in the Long-term Plan. Any changes to allocated project budgets will be reported on an individual basis.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
Implementation risks associated with the forward work programme 2018/2019
26. Resource constraints may delay implementation of some items on the forward work programme. Risks associated with the delivery of key projects will be managed and reported on a case by case basis as appropriate.

Risks associated with the 2017/2018 highlights report
27. Development of the report did not include evaluating the community impacts of each of the projects. The extent of associated benefits has not specifically been determined. The report features first-hand community feedback which shows some of the positive outcomes that have been enabled by the council’s work.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
28. The reports will be distributed across the council’s communication channels including Our Auckland news site, Kotahi (internal website), social media and communication with stakeholders and local boards.
29. Tracking progress of the committee’s decisions for the forward work programme will be managed by Democracy Services as set out in Attachment C.
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MESSAGE FROM THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

The Auckland Plan identifies six important outcome areas in which we must make significant progress, so that Auckland can continue to be a place where people want to live, work and visit. The Environment and Community Committee is committed to delivering these six Auckland Plan outcomes alongside Aucklanders, for the benefit of Aucklanders.

Our work as a committee encompasses strategy and decision-making related to the environmental, social, economic and cultural activities of Auckland. We are involved with a diverse range of projects, policies and plans which help to achieve the six Auckland Plan outcomes. The involvement of Aucklanders is vital to our success.

This report for the year 2017/2018 highlights a diverse range of projects that our communities have been involved in. Each of the projects delivers on one or more of the six Auckland Plan outcomes; whether the result is a sense of community, improved transport options, achievements for Māori, or more. Through the use of case studies and videos we want to bring alive the work that is being done across Auckland and how this aligns with the Auckland Plan outcomes.

We wanted the community voices behind the projects to lead the way in an innovative digital and interactive format. We are lucky to hear from members of our Auckland community involved with these initiatives who have shared their experiences and the impact it has had on their community.

The Environment and Community Committee continues to put Aucklanders first by responding to challenges, presenting solutions, creating opportunities, and encouraging community leadership. We are always looking for ways to make Auckland a better place for our diverse communities, the environment, and our infrastructure.

We look forward to the 2018/2019 year and what new initiatives this will bring for Aucklanders.
**Attachment A**

**Item 8**

---

**Inclusive Auckland / Diversity is our strength**

**Our diversity delivers many benefits to the city**

- Promotes a culturally rich, vibrant, exciting city
- Attracts talent, tourists and entrepreneurs
- Increases global awareness and tolerance
- Helps us compete on an international stage

**Auckland has 180 ethnicities and 175 languages**

**Tamariki Māori**

More than 50% speak some Te Reo in the home.

Whānau with young tamariki have identified that access to Te Reo and tikanga Māori is important to them.

**Auckland in 2036**

- Māori, Asian and Pacific ethnic populations are growing at a higher than average rate, which means that their share of the total population will increase in most areas.
- Changes in age distribution
  - 1/3 of Auckland’s population are children and young people.
  - 11.5% of Auckland’s population are residents 65+

**Auckland has a role in fostering a strong, inclusive and equitable society. We do this by:**

- Providing opportunities for all people to meet, interact and build relationships through our community services and facilities, parks and open space, and arts and cultural activities.

---

**Auckland’s Population**

In 2013, 1,415,550 people live in Auckland Region. By 2038, 2,222,700 people are expected to live in Auckland.

- 65% of Auckland population in 2013
- This proportion was 49% in 2013

**LGBTI**

- Auckland region has the largest Rainbow population in New Zealand.
- Nearly 45% of gay men and 33% of female same sex couples in New Zealand live in Auckland.

---

**Disability**

- One in five Aucklanders was identified as disabled in the 2013 Disability survey.
- People aged 65+ were more likely to experience some form of disability. Māori and Pacific people had higher than average disability rates.

---

**Changing Auckland**

- Auckland is a dynamic and attractive place to live. Its people are diverse in age, lifestyle, culture and community.
- Māori, Pasifika, Ethnic Communities, Children and Youth, Older Aucklanders, Disabled
- LGBTI, Urban residents, Rural residents, Faith based, Diversity in languages, New and established migrants
Our Achievements

Auckland Council’s Erosion and Sediment Control Guidance
Won the Resource Management Law Association Award for the best publication.

Auckland
Won the Cities4ZeroWaste Award at the international C40 Cities Bloomberg Philanthropies Awards

The Brylee Reserve Wetland project in Takanini
Won the Best Public Works Project under $5 Million category at the Institute of Public Works and Engineering Australasia NZ Excellence Awards

Safeswim
Won the Smart Water Category at the Smart Cities Asia Pacific Awards and the Innovation of the Year award at the Surf Life Saving Northern Region Awards of Excellence.

Gael Surgenor
Director of Community and Social Innovation for the Southern Initiative
Was nominated for the Women of Influence Awards in the Public Policy category for the positive outcomes she achieves for South Auckland communities.

Upsouth, the Southern Initiative crowd empowerment digital platform
Was shortlisted in the Digital Equity and Accessibility category at the Smart Cities Asia Pacific Awards.

PROGRESS AND RESULTS

$490,000 distributed through the Regional Environment and Natural Heritage Grants Programme

$43.7 million spent on open space acquisitions

$685,000 distributed through the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund

570 community parks supported by volunteers involved in ecological restoration

84 per cent satisfaction with the libraries website

9 public art works installed across Auckland

90,000 LEDs on the Auckland’s Harbour Bridge lit up with energy from 248 solar panels

3.5 million cycling movements were recorded - an increase of 4.9 per cent on the previous 12 months

115,905 volunteer hours in the council’s community parks

1,700 community groups and volunteers engaged in community led conservation through the council’s Pest Free Auckland initiative

582 homeless adults and families with children housed in 304 households by Housing First

$120 million available in the Long-term Plan for the development of sports and recreation facilities
The Auckland Plan sets the direction for how Auckland will grow and develop over the next 30 years. It highlights our key challenges of:

- population growth and its implications
- sharing prosperity with all Aucklanders
- reducing environmental degradation.

To address these challenges, the plan identifies six outcomes that will deliver a better Auckland, so that it can be a world class city where people want to live, work and visit.

**HE MIHI**

Tērā tō waka te hoa ake e koe i te moana o te Wai-te-matā kia ū mai rā ki te ākau i Ōkahu.

Let your canoe carry you across the waters of the Waitarotā until you make landfall at Ōkahu.
OUTCOME EXPLANATION

The belonging and participation outcome focuses on fostering an inclusive Auckland, reducing disparities in opportunities and promoting participation in society in a world of rapid change. It emphasises improving health and wellbeing, building resilience, valuing and celebrating Aucklanders’ differences as a strength and recognises the value of arts, culture, sports and recreation to quality of life.

Achieving a sense of belonging and supporting the ability of Aucklanders to participate requires activity under all the outcomes in the Auckland Plan.

Auckland Council undertakes a variety of functions that enhance belonging and participation for all Aucklanders. Through its committees and local boards, the council has a number of different ways that it listens, engages and supports its diverse communities. Groups are encouraged and supported to identify their own ways for working together and for getting on with making a difference in their community.
TE WHAI PĀNGA ME TE WHAI WĀHI ATU
BELONGING AND PARTICIPATION

KEY PROJECTS THAT SUPPORT THIS OUTCOME:

“Case Study

Te Maroro

Warkworth is home to a strong Kiribati community who are proud of their language and culture. The community recognised that there were limited resources at Warkworth library for the Kiribati community, especially for children and youth.

Auckland Libraries worked with the Rodney Kiribati community, Auckland Museum and Auckland Art Gallery on the Te Maroro project.

Te Maroro has a similar meaning to talanoa or wānanga and was the methodology used for responding to the aspirations of the Kiribati community. The project has resulted in a brand new set of alphabet, colours and numbers books and posters which were beautifully illustrated by members of the Rodney Kiribati community.

“When I looked at our Pacific collections in Auckland libraries, there was a real need to focus on uplifting our minority Pacific Languages and Cultures like Kiribati, Tuvalu, Rotuma and Tokelau through publishing more resources and making them accessible to those communities, especially for our Pacific children growing up in diaspora in Aotearoa.”

— Senior Curator Pacific
Upcycling: Collaboration between Cook Islanders and Sikhs

In Sikhism, Rumala Sahib are wrappings, draperies and coverlets used as altar cloths to protect prayer books and scriptures, or scarves worn during worship. The holy cloth is traditionally burnt or thrown away after use. In Takanini, the Supreme Sikh Society of New Zealand is now donating the fabric to a number of local organizations where it is being upcycled into beautiful products which are used by the wider community.

Around 200 women, with the Cook Island Development Agency New Zealand, Te Awa Ora Trust, the Mangere East Community Centre and the Auckland Regional Migrant Services under the Wise Collective, are using their skills and creativity to give the fabric a second life and showcase the work based on their own cultural backgrounds.

Five temples around New Zealand send their Rumala Sahib to Takanini for re-purposing.

Temple in a number of countries around the world including Canada, India, British Colombia and Australia are also following the example of the Takanini Gurudwara.

An added and very significant bonus in the sacred cloth being reused is the reduction of CO2 emissions. The Takanini Temple was burning on average one tonne of the fabric a year, releasing around 3.6 tonnes of CO2 into the atmosphere.

“We have managed to find a unique solution on what to do with the holy cloth without hurting anyone’s sentiment and in a way that sees different communities acknowledging and respecting others’ faiths.”

– Supreme Sikh Society New Zealand

“The new works are also being distributed to the wider community generating a source of income to the families of those involved – an amazing opportunity to create positive outcomes for hundreds of families from different ethnic groups across Auckland.”

– Supreme Sikh Society New Zealand
TE WHAKAMANA I NGĀ HAPORI / EMPOWERING COMMUNITIES

An empowered community is one where individuals, whānau and communities have the power and ability to influence decisions, take action and make change happen in their lives and communities. This includes communities of place, interest and identity.

The Empowered Communities Approach is a whole of council way of working that enables individuals, whānau and communities to play an active role in the decisions that affect their communities. It forms an important part of engaging and enabling our communities.

The Community Empowerment Unit is responsible for building an understanding of what the Empowered Communities Approach means in practice, and to support its implementation both internally and within Auckland’s communities.

KEY PROJECTS ENABLED BY THE EMPOWERED COMMUNITIES APPROACH:

Manukau
– Keeping Auckland beautiful

“‘We often facilitate the project for them in the first place. They find the volunteers, organise it, find their own team leaders and they get the project done. That’s real empowerment.’
– Community Manager, Manukau Beatification Charitable Trust

‘I feel like these small steps will contribute to a bigger picture of what our community will be like in the future.’
– Resident

Huapai
– Community led place making

“I think the Empowered Communities Approach is the way to go in the future and council seems to be wanting that to happen.”
– Convening Group Member

“After listening to the lectures organised by the council, a number of us who were on the rate payer’s group and had an intense interest in the community got on board with the project.”
– Convening Group Member

New Lynn – Safety through community empowerment

“Four of the local rough sleepers from this area got housed. To see them housed, smiling, that’s what I want to see.”
– Outreach Worker, Salvation Army

“I think these meetings and events make me think more about how to be a better citizen.”
– Resident

“We were coming together and we clearly had a belief that this situation had to be approached differently and go forward all on the same line and all looking for the same outcomes.”
– New Lynn Community Constable
Project twin streams

Project Twin Streams is a large scale environmental restoration project in West Auckland. It works collaboratively to engage the community in the restoration of the streams in their local neighbourhoods. Project Twin Streams is a people centred approach which puts the long term engagement of the community as key to its ongoing success.

With the support of the Waitākere Ranges and Henderson-Massey Local Boards the project contracts local community organisations Community Waitakere, EcoMatters, Mclaren Park & Henderson South Community Initiative and Te Ukaipo to deliver aspects of the project with community participation.

The project uses creative methods to engage people’s hearts and minds in reconnecting with their natural environment and raise awareness of environmental issues. This is particularly effective in engaging harder-to-reach groups (including youth at risk) and encourage valuing our waterways, as well as engendering a sense of belonging and pride in ‘their place’.

“We for me, being part of planting and doing that kind of dirty work in year 12 for the community service role, there were a lot of days were it would be raining and nicer to stay inside the school where it’s warm, but once we got out there it was fun!”

“We look at the project as having five key dimensions with a spiritual focus. We’re talking about the land, water, spiritual values and our connection with Māori and tangata whenua.”

“Over 98 Art projects completed (over 7000 participants) including:
- Community Gardens built
- Theatre/drama productions
- 1 Pā Harakeke (Flax weaving garden)
- Books published
- One song quest
- 9 movies

43 hectares of land purchased and converted into stormwater reserves
- 64,834 volunteer hours engaged in restoration and education activities
- 801,584 native trees and shrubs planted
- 1694.2 cubic metres of rubbish removed
- 9.3 km of walk/cycleways constructed in a network of 6 tracks
- Over 35 businesses engaged
- 81 houses and land purchases
- $37,300 community organisations funded

Environment and Community Committee highlights from 2017/2018 and Forward Work Programme 2018/2019
Belonging and Participation

Auckland Council community parks - Connecting Aucklanders to nature

Approximately 570 community parks are supported by volunteers involved in ecological restoration across the region. Volunteer activities include beach and community park clean ups, community planting, pest animal and plant control and environmental programmes including camps and walks. Across 2017/2018, there were 115,905 volunteer hours.

An integrated approach for volunteering is used which includes nurturing and learning, promoting and supporting greater community involvement, embracing the environment through education and developing ecological community networks for local board areas across the region.

Community outcomes include environmental and cultural connection, ownership, place making, collaboration, social connection and capital, neighbourhood watch and amenity value for the local area.
OUTCOME EXPLANATION

Building strong and vibrant Māori communities that thrive socially, culturally, economically and environmentally is the focus of the Māori identity and wellbeing outcome. Auckland’s bicultural roots provide a strong foundation for our intercultural society by providing opportunities for all Aucklanders to understand and engage in Māori culture and language, local Māori history, perspectives and values.

Auckland’s Māori identity sets us apart from other international cities. It brings visitors to our shore, attracts investment, and builds a sense of belonging and pride. Auckland is home to the country’s largest Māori population and mana whenua retain cultural traditions and heritage that make Auckland unique. Auckland embraces its uniqueness founded on te Tiriti o Waitangi and is shaped by its Māori history and presence.

Many agencies and organisations support and contribute to Māori identity and wellbeing, as the main focus of their work, or through the delivery of services and activities. This includes Māori and iwi organisations, government agencies and the council, as well as non-government and the private sector.
TE TUAKIRI MĀORI ME TŌNA ORANGA
MĀORI IDENTITY AND WELLBEING

KEY PROJECTS THAT SUPPORT THIS OUTCOME:

CASE STUDY

Te Kākano

The Te Kākano framework has been developed to improve the council’s services for tamariki Māori under five and their whānau. Using a kaupapa Māori approach, the Te Kākano framework is being tested through five pilots, across Auckland.

Council staff worked closely with mana whenua and mataawaka to ensure that whānau voices were central to the pilot design. Māori codesign specialists and kaupapa Māori evaluators were contracted to ensure the design process encouraged whānau to participate, respected tikanga and kawa at hui and wananga, enabled all design team members to feel comfortable using mātauranga Māori design and used mātauranga Māori methods.

The pilots are proving to be popular with local whānau. Howick is attracting over 180 children and Wellsford has been growing since its launch. Each of the pilots tests out different aspects of the Te Kākano model, for example using outreach and partnerships to reduce barriers and support whānau.

At the Wellsford pilot, Te Kākano is connecting learners by bringing the learning programmes of the Auckland Botanic Gardens to the under-5 community in Wellsford. Specialist educators from the Home Interaction Programme for Parents and Youngsters and a tikanga expert from Wellsford Kindergarten deliver the services in a way that makes it fun and authentic for tamariki. Parents and caregivers are engaged in the learning with the child, meaning that that the learning can continue at home.
Public Art

– Te Huinga by Chris Bailey

Created in 2017 and located at Fearon Park, Mt Roskill. The public art piece Te Huinga is a series of five stone sculptural elements that reference the pre-colonial stone working traditions of mana whenua in the local area. The dynamic piece, featuring a number of different types of stone, honours the way Māori once utilised local materials such as basalt stone from the nearby maunga. These are set in an artist-designed landscape feature, also made from stone, with native plantings.

The council worked with local iwi Ngāti Whā tua Ōrākei; Ngāi tai Ki Tāmaki, Te Akitai Waiohua and Te Kawerau ā Maki to ensure the piece contributed to the visibility and celebration of their stories and histories.

Te Huinga demonstrates a unique and distinctive piece of public art which responds to place. It distinctively celebrates, expresses and gives mana to mana whenua stories, history, mātauranga Māori (traditional Māori knowledge, wisdom and understanding) and communities.
Karapu Kōrero

Karapu Korero is a community owned and led initiative to kōrero Māori with learners of all levels at Te Atatu Peninsula Library.

This is an opportunity for speakers and learners of te reo Māori from the local community to come together in a relaxed setting, meet each other and converse in te reo Māori. The library provides the space, tea and biscuits.

Pā Rongorongo

The interactive citizen’s information hub, Pā Rongorongo, is located in Griffiths Gardens; an inner-city backyard for residents, workers and visitor.

In a New Zealand first, Pā Rongorongo lets Aucklanders and visitors build a walking or cycling tour that is unique to their own interests. Options include a categories such as arts and culture, cycleways, walking routes, heritage spaces, urban forests and Māori sites of significance.

This custom map can be sent as a text message link to their mobile phone or, in the future, printed out on site.

“Nice relaxed environment and we get to practise speaking and understanding te reo Māori.”

“Everyone is respectful of other people’s levels of te reo Māori.”

“It’s a great new public facility where te reo is spoken and Auckland’s strong Māori identity is celebrated through design.”
OUTCOME EXPLANATION

The homes and places outcome aims to ensure that all Aucklanders have a secure, healthy and affordable home to live in and that there are sufficient public places such as parks, streets and town centres to meet the needs of residents. These directly link to improved mental health and community connection which increase quality of life for Aucklanders.

The council works with central government, developers, builders, home-owners, investors and non-government organisations to achieve this outcome.

This includes accelerating quality development at a scale that improves housing choices, increasing tenure security and broadening the range of tenure models, improving the built quality of existing dwellings (particularly rental housing), investing in Māori to meet their specific housing aspirations, developing a quality-based and compact approach to urban growth and providing inclusive public places.
Te Arai South Regional Park acquisition

Ngāti Manuhiri vested 180 hectares of open space land, at no capital cost to the council, at Te Arai South. The land adjoins Te Arai Regional Park and land already vested in Te Arai North precinct. The additional land creates a total reserve area of approximately 500 hectares with 14 kilometres of coastal frontage. The reserve land:

- provides for a range of recreational activities
- exhibits high quality landscape, biodiversity, ecological and heritage values
- forms part of a more extensive network of reserve land and open space.

Open space acquisition 2017/18

- 13 new parks (9.5 hectares) across seven local board areas
- Six other parks open space acquired at no capital cost, including 180 hectares at Te Arai
- Land disposals equated to 0.1 per cent of the total land area acquired.
**Housing First**

The council and the Ministry of Social Development jointly support Housing First, a collective of five organisations including the Auckland City Mission and Lifewise, who are working together to end chronic homelessness in Auckland, not just manage it.

Housing First supports chronically homeless people of all ages who have multiple and complex needs. The Housing First model recognizes that it is easier for people to address issues such as mental health and substance abuse, once housed. The priority is to quickly move people into appropriate housing and then provide wraparound services. Housing First is focusing on the City Centre, Central, West and South Auckland where there are high concentrations of homeless people.

Since launching, the council’s support has helped Housing First house a number of homeless adults and children.

---

**Here’s how we’re doing May 2017 - 31 July 2018**

- **304** Households
- **278** Children Housed
- **582** Adults and families with children

---

**There Are Different Forms of Homelessness**

- **80%** Transitionally Homeless
- **15%** Episodically Homeless
- **5%** Chronically Homeless

---

**Direct access to permanent housing with supports**
**CASE STUDY**

**Grey Lynn Pump Track**

The all-weather asphalt track has been created in the north-end of Grey Lynn Park and can be used by BMX bikes, mountain bikes, skateboards and scooters.

This community-led project was developed with the support of the Waiatemata Local Board, the council and other partners such as Sport Auckland.

> "We want to get kids off devices, back on bikes and socialising in parks."
> – Community member

> "A highly supportive Waiatemata Local Board, with a champion in Rob Thomas, saw us gain permission for the project and 20 per cent of the funding. Now the rest was up to us."
> – Community member

**CASE STUDY**

**Te Henga land transfer**

The council has committed to transfer land at Te Henga to enable Te Kawerau a Maki to build a marae and papakāinga.

Te Kawerau a Maki are the only mana whenua group without an iwi-based marae. This transfer enables them to establish a marae within their traditional heartland and in the vicinity of their ancestral village at Waiti.

> "The decision marks a historic moment for Te Kawerau a Maki who were left without a marae for decades and will see the iwi strengthen their presence within their tribal heartland through the building of the new eco-marae and papakāinga, a settlement of great cultural significance."
> – Executive Manager of Te Kawerau a Maki

> "We look forward to continuing to grow a positive relationship in partnership with Auckland Council and to embracing the Te Henga and west coast community through the return of our marae."
> – Executive Manager of Te Kawerau a Maki
OUTCOME EXPLANATION

The transport and access outcome focuses on how we provide for the physical movement of people, goods and services within Auckland, between Auckland and other parts of New Zealand and internationally.

For Auckland to be a truly accessible city we need to make sure that people of all ages and abilities, including people with reduced mobility levels, can go about their daily lives and get from one place to another easily, affordably and safely. This means tailoring the way infrastructure and services are provided so they meet the needs of a wide range of Aucklanders.

Improving transport and access in Auckland requires an integrated approach and is a partnership between the council and central government. The Auckland Transport Alignment Project developed a long-term strategic approach to address Auckland’s transport challenges. This work emphasised the need to focus on getting much more out of existing infrastructure, maximising new opportunities to influence travel demand and ensuring investment is targeted to the greatest challenges.
Reinventing Cities in Henderson

Henderson has been identified as a key area for regeneration. The vision for Henderson is an ‘urban eco-centre, enhancing the mauri (spiritual life essence) of the twin streams Wai Horaiti and Wai O Panuku’.

The Falls car park and the Alderman car park are adjacent sites in Henderson, West Auckland. The sites are owned by Auckland Council and have been identified for sale for residential / mixed use development. The sites are open to the C40 ‘Reinventing Cities’ competition for innovative carbon zero development.

Transport and access opportunities for the sites include:
- very central location near a regenerating town centre
- near to a full range of town centre amenities and close to the Westwave Pool
- five minute walk from major public transport interchange
- a prominent ‘gateway’ site at the entrance to Henderson
- planned cycleway routes that will run right beside the site
- adjacent to the Twin Streams restoration project.
Te Ara Mua – Future Streets

Te Ara Mua – Future Streets is an exciting project to make streets in Māngere Central safer and easier for people to travel around, especially by walking or cycling.

The project involves making changes to some of the roads and connections in Māngere Central and introducing other activities to promote walking and cycling.

A range of design elements have been considered to manage traffic behaviour and improve walking and cycling opportunities.

Who is involved?

- The Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment
- The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
- Auckland Transport
- The NZ Transport Agency.
Te Whau Pathway

Te Whau Pathway will be a 12km shared path designed to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists along the western edge of the Whau River between Te Atatū Peninsula and Green Bay Beach. Te Whau Pathway is a project of regional significance that will link currently unconnected communities along the river and improve the environmental and recreational value of 30 parks along its route.

The pathway will provide safe walking and cycling connections to enable more people to get around our community, including better connections to 13 schools and cycleways.

New aquatic and leisure centre

In September 2017, the Environment and Community Committee agreed to invest in a new aquatic and recreation centre in the Whau Local Board area, subject to development of a Detailed Business Case.

The new aquatic and recreation centre will be quicker and easier for people to access.

Te Whau Pathway project is a collaborative partnership between the Whau Coastal Walkway Environmental Trust, the Whau and Henderson-Massey Local Boards, Te Kawerau a Maki, Ngāti Whātua Orākei, Auckland Transport and the council. The pathway is being built in stages. Completion of the entire pathway is expected to take 5-8 years, dependent on funding.
The environment and cultural heritage outcome focuses on ensuring that the natural environment and cultural heritage is valued and cared for. The natural environment is inextricably connected to Aucklanders’ sense of identity and place. It affects our health and wellbeing through the mental and physical interactions we have with it, and it provides the clean air we breathe and fresh water we drink.

Cultural heritage is the legacy of knowledge, things and intangible attributes of a group or society that are inherited from past generations, maintained in the present and passed on to future generations including customs, practices, places, objects, artistic expressions and values. The environment and our shared cultural heritage provide an anchor for the sense of belonging that communities have to their place.

Mana whenua, the council, central government, and community organisations are key partners in the ongoing protection and enhancement of Auckland’s Environment and Cultural Heritage. The council’s roles is in setting policy, undertaking waste management and waste minimisation programmes, education and monitoring, and funding of grants for environmental enhancement.
Kauri Dieback Track Closures

Kauri are a cornerstone of the indigenous forests of the upper North Island. They are also one of the longest-living tree species in the world (reaching ages of 1000 years-plus), as well as the largest.

Kauri dieback is threatening kauri with extinction. There is currently no cure for kauri dieback. It can be spread by just a pinhead of soil and you can’t tell by looking whether a tree is infected or not.

Action plans to protect regional parks from kauri dieback have been implemented in the Waitākere and Huna Ranges, with closures of many tracks and track upgrades underway. The council has also worked closely with the Ministry for Primary Industries to place a controlled area notice on the remaining open areas to protect this taonga species.

"The option that we have chosen today closes high-risk areas within the park, puts our current resources into the maintenance of tracks and is a practical approach that will really make a difference on the ground."
Catching and tagging bats in the Waitākere Ranges

Over the summer 2017/18, the biodiversity team trapped and tagged the elusive indigenous long-tailed bat, our only native land mammal.

Auckland is one of the only cities in the country to still have a resident population and understanding their habitat, population and movements allows us to help the ‘micro-bat’ survive.

‘Biosecurity chickens’ on Aotea Great Barrier

In April 2018, a group of around 200 chickens were brought to Aotea/Great Barrier Island as part of the council’s biosecurity experiment to fight against invasive Australian plague skinks, formerly known as the ‘rainbow’ skink. The chickens were released on the island to hunt down the plague skinks after they were discovered in 2013. The skinks threaten native lizards as they compete for food and habitat.

This provided an opportunity for the eggs that the chickens produce to be sent to the Auckland City Mission. The council has arranged for around 700 to 1000 eggs to be delivered to the Mission per week.

*The work we’re doing out on Aotea Great Barrier is significant on both a national and global scale. It’s vital we look at novel and creative ways of dealing with these invaders so we can better protect our indigenous populations, already under threat from habitat loss and pests.*
Attachment A

Item 8

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Haere rā ki ngā manu aute

In 1817 Thomas Tuai from the Ngāre Raumati hapū and his friend Titere from Rangihoua travelled to London. During their trip they produced a collection of sketches which are thought to be the earliest Māori ink sketches. The sketches returned to New Zealand with William Greenwood in 1840 and were presented by his children to the Auckland Free Public library to join Sir George Grey’s collection in 1897.

These sketches are to be part of a major exhibition that commemorates the 250 year anniversaries for the Royal Academy of the Arts and Cook’s voyages to the Pacific. The drawings were in a fragile state and not fit for display or travel. Due to the corrosive nature of iron gall inks, the paper around the drawn lines had become brittle and treatment was performed to stabilise and ensure long-term preservation isn’t compromised.

They were then mounted and matted on rigid conservation grade board so they can be handled safely without the risk of the drawings flexing and causing further damage. The exhibition opens late September 2018 until December and then travels to Musée Du Quai Branly - Jacques Chirac in Paris from mid-March to July 2019.
OUTCOME EXPLANATION

The opportunity and prosperity outcome aims to ensure that Aucklanders have the skills and opportunities to adapt to an economy with increased international connectivity, and to changing business models and employment opportunities due to technological developments. There is a particular focus on young people as future innovators and the need to invest in education, training and skill development so that more people can participate in the economy.

To achieve this outcome, the council is focusing on harnessing emerging technologies and ensuring equitable access to them, ensuring regulatory planning supports businesses, innovation and productivity growth, leveraging Auckland’s position to support export growth, increasing educational training (especially for those in need) and supporting Māori business and iwi organisations to be significant drivers of Auckland’s economy.
KEY PROJECTS THAT SUPPORT THIS OUTCOME:

"They are people who are passionate about this stuff, people from all walks of life."
~ Makerhood member

"Only we can change who we are. There’s a little saying in our community; only the hood can change the hood."
~ Founder at the Roots
Creative Entrepreneurs

CASE STUDY
Makerhood

The Makerhood is a movement to help young South Aucklanders rediscover the art of making. It is a network of people and organisations that are encouraging people to tinker, fix and make stuff rather than consume it, in both digital and non-digital expressions. They have a vision to see South Auckland as being known for inter-generational creativity, entrepreneurship and innovation.

The Makerhood aims to grow creativity, problem solving skills and an entrepreneurial mind-set to get young South Aucklanders 'work ready' for jobs that don't even exist yet. The movement supports students to draw on each other to be creative and entrepreneurial, show resilience and be able to not only face complex problems, but find alternative solutions.

The Makerhood have a range of tools that can be utilised including computers, virtual reality hardware and robots which are located in different spaces such as libraries. The Makerhood was started a year ago by the Southern Initiative who champions, stimulates and enables social and community innovation in South Auckland.
Recycling Centres

The council is establishing a network of community recycling centres which divert material from landfill. This re-using of items and re-purposing of materials also benefits the local community through affordable items and job creation.

The council’s resource recovery network continues to expand with five community recycling centres now open across Auckland in Devonport, Helensville, Waiuku, Whangaparaoa and Henderson.

The council is aiming to build a network of 12 centres across the district to contribute to the goal of zero waste Auckland by 2040. The network won the award for Best Commercial or Public-Sector Project at the WasteMINZ conference in November 2017.

“We’re diverting as much waste from landfill as we can and involving the community in the process.”
– Global Action Plan Oceania in NZ, Devonport Community Recycling Centret
2017-18 END OF YEAR RESULT TIME TO CELEBRATE!
CHECK OUT SOME LIBRARY HIGHLIGHTS FROM 2017-18

- **Total Visits**
  - 2017-18 increased by 7%
  - Physical Visits – 2%
  - Online Visits + 22%

- **Total Issues**
  - 2017-18 increased by 1%
  - E-Collection + 25%
  - New e-users (e-books & audio) + 17%

- 84% satisfied with our website.
  - An Increase of 9%

- 76% satisfied with our range of collection items up – 2% from last year

- **New registrations increased by 12,000 compared to 2016-17**

- **Active library members**
  - have increased from 489,000 to 503,000
  - an increase of 14,000 from 2016-17

---

**Guaranteed E-Book Selection**

In May 2018, Auckland Libraries launched a guaranteed e-book selection. There is no longer a wait for e-books to become available, readers have immediate access to a selection of popular e-book titles. This harnesses technology and ensures equitable access to high quality digital data and services.

E-book borrowing has seen an increase of 25 per cent on last year.
#1 Engage and Enable Our Communities

It puts our citizens, customers and communities at the centre of everything we do.

We want Aucklanders to have a strong voice in shaping their city. We’ll achieve this by:

- increasing the transparency and accessibility of the council
- demonstrating community-centred thinking, behaviour and design
- being a leader in improving diversity and inclusion outcomes in Auckland
- fit for purpose, joined-up, engagement and processes.
MEINGA KIA URU, KIA ĀHEI NGĀ HAPORI
ENGAGE AND ENABLE OUR COMMUNITIES

COMMUNITY EXPERIENCE

62 per cent of surveyed community groups that have worked on a project with the council are satisfied with the performance of the council.

61 per cent of surveyed community groups that have worked on a project with the council have a contact person who they can approach to discuss issues with.

 Those groups who have a contact person are more positive toward the council.

46 per cent of surveyed community groups agree that the council understands the needs and priorities of our community.

PEOPLE PANEL EXPERIENCE

The breadth of Aucklanders we engage with through the People’s Panel has been consistently growing.

Since 2015 the panel size has increased by 96 per cent to 35,404 panelists, driven by increases in engaging hard to reach communities.

45 per cent of Aucklanders agree that the council provides enough information to have their say.

There has been significant improvements in providing opportunities to have your say. In 2018 50 per cent of surveyed Aucklanders agreed that the council provides opportunities to have their say in shaping Auckland.
TE KOMITI TAIAO Ā-HAPORI HOKI
THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEE FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME

This report highlights a range of projects related to the Environment and Community Committee work programme that our communities have been involved in over 2017/2018. Each of the projects deliver on one or more of the six Auckland Plan outcomes and contributes towards Auckland growing in a way that will meet opportunities and challenges of the future.

Key activities for the Environment and Community Committee forward work programme include:

- making progress with climate change adaptation and mitigation, and taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- enabling green growth with a focus on improved water quality, pest eradication and ecological restoration
- strengthening communities and enabling Aucklanders to be active and connected
- making measurable progress towards the social and community aspects of housing all Aucklanders in secure, healthy homes they can afford
- growing skills and a local workforce to support economic growth in Auckland.

The Environment and Community Committee forward work programme enables the committee to deliver on its priorities, with a focus on initiatives that have a high impact for Auckland. The forward work programme includes a variety of projects, policies and plans which will continue to contribute towards achieving the six Auckland Plan outcomes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Plan Outcome/ Direction</th>
<th>Projects (reports to committee)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **TE WHATI PANGA ME TE WHATI WĀHANGATU**  
BELONGING AND PARTICIPATION | **Arts and Culture** |
| All Aucklanders will be part of and contribute to society, access opportunities and have the chance to develop to their full potential | • Enabling the delivery of new forms of Pacific creativity  
• Creating opportunities to increase arts and culture participation and access across Auckland’s diverse and fast-changing demographics; focused on Asian and migrant communities  
• Delivering a performing arts competition showcasing the musical and dance talents of Auckland secondary school students  
• Growing audience engagement in and access to the region’s substantive public art collection  
• Auckland International Cultural Festival becomes: Delivering a cultural festival including representation from over 50 cultural groups  
• Delivering a summer series of movie screenings and concerts in local parks  
• Co-ordinating Auckland Anniversary weekend celebrations across the Auckland Council Group  
• Delivering a range of civic events of regional significance annually  
• Supporting the delivery of Anzac Day commemoration parades and services in conjunction with veterans associations and other partners  
• Supporting events that align with events grants priorities. |
| Relevant belonging and participation focus areas:  
1. Create safe opportunities for people to meet, connect, participate in, and enjoy community and civic life  
2. Provide accessible services and social and cultural infrastructure that are responsive in meeting people’s evolving needs  
3. Support and work with communities to develop the resilience to thrive in a changing world  
4. Value and provide for Te Tiriti o Waitangi/the Treaty of Waitangi as the bicultural foundation for an intercultural Auckland  
5. Recognise, value and celebrate Aucklanders’ differences as a strength  
6. Focus investment to address disparities and serve communities of greatest need  
7. Recognise the value of arts, culture, sports and recreation to quality of life | **Social and community** |
| | • Develop and implement a strategic approach to increase participation by diverse communities with a particular focus on disability, refugee and youth  
• Supporting local projects in local communities and providing funding for innovation projects  
• Supporting local bureau to provide communities with access to information, advice, referral and client advocacy services  
• Delivering community development projects that align with the Thriving Communities Social and Community Development Action Plan  
• Building capacity in communities, positive community connections and creating safe public spaces.  
• Managing graffiti removal and prevention services in partnership with a range of community organisations, government agencies and volunteers  
• Improving policies, systems and practices, community action to reduce supply of alcohol and other drugs and increasing opportunities for young people to be healthy and reach their full potential  
• Providing a consistent platform for cross-sector collaboration on projects that are identified as priorities to improve safety  
• Work with and support our partners, using our assets, leverage and influence to prototype, demonstrate, learn, grow and share ‘what it takes’ and what is needed to achieve the transformative outcomes that matter for whanau. The programmes long term goal is a prosperous resilient South Auckland where tamariki and whanau thrive. |
## Auckland Plan Outcome/ Direction

### NGA KÄNGA ME NGA WÄHI HAERE NOA
### HOME AND PLACES

Aucklanders live in secure, healthy and affordable homes, and have access to a range of inclusive public spaces.

### Relevant homes and places focus areas:

- Increase security of tenure and broaden the range of tenure models, particularly for those most in need
- Improve the quality of existing dwellings, particularly rental housing
- Create urban places for the future

### Projects (reports to committee)

#### Homes

- Collaborate with and agree a cross government and communities sector action plan to help make homelessness rare, brief and non-recurring
- Contributing to Kia Whai Käinga Tātou Ka to te cross sectoral homelessness action plan
- Through the Auckland Climate Action Plan, one of the main themes is healthy and resilient buildings and places. This theme will intersect with the focus on the built quality of housing and creating urban places for the future.

#### Places

- Creating urban public spaces for the future - Te Motu a Hiaora (Pakeltutu Island) – report on Governance options and park management function
- Creating opportunities to deliver significant creative placemaking outcomes aligned with the Public Art Policy and Toi Whiti ki – Arts and Culture Strategic Action Plan for non-traditional audiences by increasing Mäori, Pacific, youth and diversity participation
- Delivering permanent standalone and integrated public art works that align with the Public Art Policy and Toi Whiti kī – Arts and Culture Strategic Action Plan to produce transformative placemaking outcomes
- Deliver $50 million of investment to increase the regions parks and open spaces
- $120M investment in contributing to Aucklanders through the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund - Approval of Guidelines
- Progress Western Springs College Community School Partnership for indoor courts
- Sport and Recreation provision contributing to Aucklanders quality of life (Aucklanders more active more often):
  - Indoor Court Provision Plan
  - Western Springs College Community School Partnership
  - $500k pa investment – Sport and Recreation Regional Grants Programme for 2019/20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Plan Outcome / Direction</th>
<th>Projects (reports to committee)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment and Cultural Heritage</strong></td>
<td>• On the Auckland Climate Action Plan, staff will develop the draft Auckland's Climate Action Plan based on community feedback and best practice. The draft Plan will then go out for public consultation in early 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement the Urban Ngahere Strategy: Auckland’s urban ngahere is the realm of Te Waoanui o Tāne (the forest domain of Tāne Mahuta) and consists of the network of all trees, other vegetation and green roofs – both native and introduced – in existing and future urban areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• $311 million investment programme to work with our communities to protect and restore Auckland’s precious natural environment including addressing kauri dieback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Confirming the statutory basis for effectively controlling weeds and animal pests so Auckland’s native plants and animals can thrive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing a shared vision, goals and long-term solutions for how to sustainably manage Auckland’s water and restore our waterways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• $452 million water quality improvement programme to increase our funding of water infrastructure and speed up delivery of cleaner harbours, beaches and streams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Awareness raising and behaviour change programmes to reduce household, community, business and schools’ carbon emissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restoring and protecting significant natural environments as Auckland grows, through green infrastructure and effective management of development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working together with all Aucklanders to achieve our aspirational goal of zero waste to landfill by 2040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning for how to most effectively manage our coastline to mitigate the impacts of climate change, such as sea level rise and extreme weather events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing an integrated approach to reduce sediment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural heritage**

• Coordinating and promoting a series of over 200 community led heritage related events. 
• Maintenance of public art pieces
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Plan Outcome/ Direction</th>
<th>Projects (reports to committee)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Tukiri Māori me ōna Oranga</strong></td>
<td>Working together to reduce persistent smoking addiction through development and implementation of a plan of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Māori Identity and Wellbeing</strong></td>
<td>Te Kakano: Improving our services for tamariki under five and their whanau through pilot services, in Howick, Wellsford, West Auckland, Takanini.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Māori identity and wellbeing focus area</td>
<td>Creating opportunities to deliver significant creative placemaking outcomes aligned for non-traditional audiences by increasing Māori, Pacific, youth and diversity participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Māori as key customer of council</td>
<td>Increasing leadership capacity to strategically broker, leverage, partner and programme to increase Māori arts and culture participation and access. The programme features the delivery of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Meet the needs and support the aspirations of tamariki and their whanau</td>
<td>- Waitangi ki Manukau: a whanau event to commemorate Te Tiriti o Waitangi offering an opportunity for community to celebrate Waitangi Day through the sharing of music, food and family based arts and culture activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Invest in marae to be self-sustaining and prosperous</td>
<td>- Matanaki Festival: a three week-long festival delivered in partnership with mana whenua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strengthen rangatahi participation in leadership, education and employment outcomes</td>
<td>Te Witi o Te Reo Māori: an annual project celebrating the revitalisation of Te Reo Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with and support our partners, using our assets, leverage and influence to prototype, demonstrate, learn, grow and share ‘what it takes’ and what is needed to achieve the transformative outcomes that matter for whanau. The programmes long term goal is a prosperous resilient South Auckland where tamariki and whanau thrive on these focus areas: Tamariki Wellbeing, Quality Jobs and Enterprise, Innovation and Technology, Healthy Infrastructure and Environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through the Auckland Climate Action Plan, council intends to embed a Māori lens on climate change. This is being achieved through early engagement with mana whenua, through the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum, as well as engagement with rangatahi groups and mataawaka.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Plan Outcome/ Direction</th>
<th>Projects (reports to committee)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nga Anichto me nga Whai Huatanga</strong></td>
<td>Enabling the delivery of social and innovative strategies to achieve the transformative outcomes in South Auckland where tamariki and whanau thrive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunity and Prosperity</strong></td>
<td>Implementing initiatives aligned to Auckland’s status as a UNESCO Creative City of Music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant opportunity and prosperity focus areas:</td>
<td>Develop and run five pilots that take innovative community action to make Auckland a friendlier place to live for a diverse range of Aucklanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increase educational achievement, lifelong learning and training, with a focus on those most in need</td>
<td>Join the Global Network of Age-friendly cities and communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with and support our partners, using our assets, leverage and influence to prototype, demonstrate, learn, grow and share ‘what it takes’ and what is needed to achieve the transformative outcomes that matter for whanau. The programmes long term goal is a prosperous resilient South Auckland where tamariki and whanau thrive on these focus areas: Tamariki Wellbeing, Quality Jobs and Enterprise, Innovation and Technology, Healthy Infrastructure and Environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One of the main Auckland Climate Action Plan’s themes is driving a prosperous economic future. Supporting a transition to a low carbon economy will be a central consideration within this theme, both through innovation and market change, as well as building the skills to adapt to this shifting economic context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Environment and Community Committee highlights from 2017/2018 and Forward Work Programme 2018/2019

### Committee Priorities:
1. Clearly demonstrate that Auckland is making progress with climate change adaptation and mitigation and taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
2. Enable green growth with a focus on improved water quality, pest eradication and ecological restoration
3. Strengthen communities and enable Aucklanders to be active and connected
4. Make measurable progress towards the social and community aspects of housing all Aucklanders in secure, healthy homes they can afford
5. Grow skills and a local workforce to support economic growth in Auckland

The work of the committee will:
- Deliver on the outcomes in the Auckland Plan
- Be focused on initiatives that have a high impact
- Meet the Council’s statutory obligations, including funding allocation decisions
- Increase the public’s trust and confidence in the organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic approach to Climate Change</strong></td>
<td>To demonstrate that Auckland is making progress with climate change adaptation and mitigation and taking action to reduce emissions.</td>
<td>Strategic direction will be provided in the coming months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A summary of activities to prepare for climate change was given in the presentation on 8/8/17 meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report was considered on 20/2/18, resolution ENV/2018/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 18 – approval for consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb – Mar 19 - targeted public engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr 19 – feedback presented to elected members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jun 19 – final strategy for adoption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q2 (Dec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low carbon living</strong></td>
<td>To deliver on Low Carbon Auckland Plan commitments by the design and implementation of awareness raising and incentives programmes to reduce household, community, business and schools carbon emissions by approximately 50% of current levels.</td>
<td>Strategic direction and endorse programmes as part of the Low Carbon Auckland Plan implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report was considered at 20/2/18 meeting. Res ENV/2018/11 report back in Dec18 for a decision. Independent Advisory Group (IAG) was approved. Chairs Planning and Env &amp; Community Cttees, an IMSB member and the Mayor’s office to decide on the membership of the IAG.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 (Feb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q4 (Sept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1 (Sept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q2 (Dec)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 8

**Low Carbon Auckland / Climate Change Mitigation**

Four-yearly review of strategic action plan due in 2018; increased engagement with and commitments via C40 Cities membership; development of proactive policy agenda to central government emerging.

**Climate Plan Workshop:**
- Risks and vulnerabilities (June)
  - Committee workshop on risks and vulnerabilities
  - Communication strategy for broader public engagement
  - Local Board workshops
  - Mana whenua engagement (integrated throughout)
  - Stakeholder workshops
- Prioritisation criteria and identified actions (Jul/Aug)
  - Cost benefit and total value analysis
  - Agree prioritisation criteria
  - Review all actions
  - Draft plan
  - Draft plan to committee (Dec 2018)
  - Consultation (linking to other plans, approach tbc)
  - Updates to action plan
  - Adoption of updated plan by council (Proposed December 2018)
  - Final Adoption of Climate Plan (Mar 09)

**Decision and endorsement of strategic direction**

**Progress to date:**
- Report was considered at 20/2/18 meeting. Res ENV/201811 report back in Dec 18 for a decision. Independent Advisory Group was approved.
- Workshops scheduled: 4/7/18 and 26/09/18. An update was on 12/06/18 meeting agenda.

### Urban Forest Strategy

Strategic approach to delivering on the wider social, economic and environmental benefits of a growing urban forest in the context of rapid population growth and intensification.

**Decision on strategic direction and endorsement of strategy.**

**Progress to date:**
- A workshop was held on 14/06/17. Report was considered on 12/09/17 ENV/2017/116 a full draft of the strategy was considered 20/02/18, res ENV/2018/12 with a report back on the results of the LiDAR and an implementation plan on costs and benefits in Aug 2018. An update was included in the 14 Aug agenda regarding several workstreams covered by the 18 high level implementation actions. A report on a full progress on implementing the strategy will be in August 2019.

### Allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund

Decision making over medium and large funds from the Waste Minimisation and Innovation fund in line with the fund’s adopted policy. Funds to contribute towards council’s aspirational goal of zero waste to landfill by 2040.

**Decision on the annual allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund for the 2018-2019 financial year.**

**Progress to date:**
- Decision: Approval of allocation of September 2016 funding round Resolution ENV/2016/19 Item C5. Approval of grants in Dec 17
## Auckland’s water strategy

The health of Auckland’s waters is a critical issue. Both freshwater and marine environments in Auckland are under pressure from historic under-investment, climate change and rapid growth. The draft Auckland Plan 2050 identifies the need to proactively adapt to a changing water future and develop long-term solutions.

**Decision and strategic direction and priorities as part of the Auckland Plan.**
Consider the development of an Auckland’s waters strategy to be adopted for consultation December 2018.

**Progress to date:**
A report was considered on 12/06/18 to approve the proposed scope, timeframe and budget for the development of the strategy. Res ENV/2018/78
Key milestones:
- June 2018 – develop a strategic summary of water related outcomes, identify integrated water outcomes,
- July-Oct 2018 – high level regional options are developed and assessed for the five draft themes – consultation with mana whenua

## Regional Pest Management Plan review

Statutory obligations under the Biosecurity Act to control weeds and animal pests.
To ensure that the plan is consistent with the national policy direction and up to date.

**Decision and strategic direction on weed and plants that will be subject to statutory controls.**
Consider submissions received on the draft plan in mid 2018 and adopt the final plan by December 2018.

**Progress to date:**
Decision: Agreed to the inconsistencies in ACT at the 14 Feb 2017 ENV/2017/7 Item 12
Workshops held on 4/04/17, 3/05/17 and 27/09/17
Draft plan was approved for consultation in Nov 2017
Funding for implementation of the proposed RPMP through LTP.
A memo was distributed and is attached to the July agenda.
Key milestones:
- workshops with local boards on public feedback – September - October 2018
- workshops with local boards on public feedback – September - October 2018
- engagement with mana whenua – September – October 2018
- workshop with Environment and Community Committee – October – November 2018
- formal feedback from local boards at business meetings – October – November 2018
- approval of final plan by Environment and Community Committee – March 2019
| Item 8 | Inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan | To ensure the plan is consistent with Auckland Council’s:  
- proposed Regional Pest Management Plan  
- current and future marine biosecurity programmes  
**Progress to date:** A memo was distributed on 31/05/18 advising the committee on the Auckland Council’s participation in the development of a discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan, through the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity partnership. | Q2 (Nov/Dec) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attachment C | Allocation of the Regional Natural Heritage Grant | Decision-making over regional environment fund as per the grants funding policy and fund guidelines | Decision on the annual allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund for the 2018-2019 financial year.  
**Progress to date:**  
Allocation of the Regional Environmental Natural Heritage Grant for the 2017-2018 financial year was made on 6 Dec 2016_ENV/2016/11 Item 15 | Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 (Dec) |
| National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management | The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management is being implemented, with periodic reporting to council committee on progress, and responding to ongoing central government refinement of the framework for achieving water outcomes.  
In December 2018 further decisions will be sought under the national policy statement, including:  
- approve final targets for swim-ability of major rivers in the Auckland region  
- approve the updated Progressive Implementation Plan for the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management | Decision submission was approved on Central Govt. Clean Water Consultation 2017 process: Minutes of 4 April ENV/2017/54 Item 12. Follow up is required for resolution b) – a workshop held on 14 June. A supplementary submission on the Clean Water Consultation package was made on 25 May 2017, Item 14 13/06/17  
**Decision ENV/2018/14 on engagement approach for consultation on the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management in Feb 2018.**  
A report was considered on 26/6/18 : Res ENV/2018/78  
- June 2018: develop strategy  
- July to Oct 2018 – High level regional options are developed and assessed for the five draft themes in consultation with mana whenua, local boards and key stakeholders.  
- Dec 2018- Draft Auckland's waters strategy presented to Environment and Community Committee for approval for release for public consultation  
- Feb to Apr 2019 - Targeted public engagement on the draft Auckland’s waters strategy in February to March 2019  
- Apr 2019 - Feedback analysed and presented to elected members in April 2019  
- Jun 2019 - Final strategy presented to Environment and Community Committee for adoption | Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 (Dec) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Food Policy Alliance</strong></th>
<th><strong>To consider food policy alliance</strong></th>
<th><strong>Decision on food policy alliance</strong></th>
<th><strong>Q3 (Mar)</strong></th>
<th><strong>TBC</strong></th>
<th><strong>Q2</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Auckland Growing Greener** | **Statutory obligations under the Resource Management Act, Biosecurity Act and Local Government Act. Consideration of items to give effect to the adopted commitment of Auckland Council to grow greener.** | **Strategic direction and oversight into council’s role to improve the natural environment, and to endorse proposed incentives. This may include endorsing:**  
  - a framework to ensure planning and growth decisions are underpinned by relevant environmental data  
  - proposed incentives for green growth  
  - recommendations arising from a current state statutory obligations review. | **Q3** | **Q4** | **Q1** |
| **Hunua Aerial 1080 Operation** | **Provide information on outcomes of the Hunua 1080 aerial pest control operation** | **To note outcomes of the Hunua 1080 aerial pest control operation.** | **Q3** | **Q4** | **Q1** |

**Parks, Sports and Recreation**

| **Sport and Rec Strategic Partnership Grant to Aktive Auck Sports Rec** | **Approval of $552,000 strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auck & Sport to deliver on agreed priority initiatives.** | **To approve the $552,000 strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auckland Sport & Recreation for 2017/2018** | **Progress to date:**  
  - Report was considered 5/12/17 Resolution ENV/2017/186 – report back against KPI every six months.  
  - A report was considered on 10 July 2018 to approve the strategic partnership grant of $552,000 per annum for a three-year term (2018-2021) Res ENV/2018/90  
  - A funding agreement will be prepared for Aktive that ensures clear accountability and KPIs for each of the four geographical areas (North, West, Central and Southern) for the investment. (TBA) | **Q3** | **Q4** | **Q1** |
| **Te Motu a Hiaroa (Puketutu Island)** | **Status update on the Te Motu a Hiaroa Governance Trust** | **To note further update on progress of the governance trust.** | **Q3** | **Q4** | **Q1** |
| **Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan** | **Status report on implementation plan** | **Direction on future options for sport and recreation.** | **Q3** | **Q4** | **Q1** |
| **Sports Investment Plan** | **Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in sports** | **Decision on issues papers**  
  - Draft Plan approval  
  - Finalise and adopt investment plan – approval of guidelines | **Progress to date:**  
  - Evaluation of current sports facilities investments and proposed changes was adopted on 14 March, resolution ENV/2017/39 Item 13 with the final draft investment plan to be adopted prior to consultation. | **Q3** | **Q4** | **Q1** | **Q2 (Nov)** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment C</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>Golf Investment Plan</td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in golf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An outcome measurement tool to support the Sports Facilities Investment Plan was considered and agreed at the 4 April 2017 meeting. Resolution ENV/2017/50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item 9 The findings of the pilot will be reported in mid-2019 seeking a decision on the roll-out model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indoor Courts</td>
<td>Strategic business case for indoor courts investment</td>
<td>Decision on investment approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Springs Community School Partnership</td>
<td>Improve Community Access to school facilities</td>
<td>Decision on Business and Investment in indoor court facility at Western Springs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date: A workshop was held on 12 Sept and information is available on OurAuckland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth Programme</td>
<td>Update on proposed growth funding allocation for 2018-2020</td>
<td>Decision on growth funding allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Sport and Recreation grants programme 2018/2020</td>
<td>Review of previous grants allocation and recommendation for next round</td>
<td>Decision on sport and recreation grants programme objectives and approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>(Sep)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012: TOR</td>
<td>The review will assess the efficacy of the guidelines in for the council to deliver the best possible outcomes for Auckland through community leases</td>
<td>Decision on the terms of reference for the review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2 (Nov)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date: The TOR was approved for the review to commence and will report back in May July 2018 subject to TLP. An update memo was circulated in August 2017 in response to feedback from the July 2017 meeting. Joint workshop with local board chairs held 20/6/18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>Attachment C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Recreation Investment and Visitor Experience</strong></td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcome, priorities and investment for active walking, cycling, waterways and visitor experience on open space, parks and regional parks</td>
<td>Decision on scope and phasing</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1 (Aug)</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Takaro – Investing in Play discussion document</strong></td>
<td>Development of a play investment plan</td>
<td>Decision on approval for public release</td>
<td>Q3 (Feb)</td>
<td>Q1 (Oct)</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Parks Management Plan 2010 – variation to incorporate land at Piha into the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park</strong></td>
<td>To approve variation to incorporate land purchased at Piha to be known as Taitomo Special Management Zone as part of the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park</td>
<td>Decision on approval to a variation</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1 (tbc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

| **The Southern Initiative (TSI)** | Provide an update on the TSI approach, priorities and achievements. | Strategic direction of the TSI approach to social and community innovation in south Auckland | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 |
| **Global Engagement Strategy** | Provide an update and direction of Auckland Council’s global engagement strategy and priorities. It has been three years since a new strategic direction was introduced, progress on this strategy will presented. Funded | Strategic direction of Auckland Council’s global engagement strategy and priorities | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 |
| **Options to expand revenue streams for sport facilities investment** | Provide strategic direction to expand revenue streams to fund future sports facilities investment in the draft Sports Facilities Investment Plan | strategic direction to expand revenue streams to fund future sports facilities investment in the draft Sports Facilities Investment Plan | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 |

**SOCIAL, COMMUNITY, CULTURAL INFRASTRUCTURE**

| **Community Facilities Network Plan** | Update on progress and report back on strategic business case for central west. | Decision on indicative business case for central west | Q3 (Mar) | Q4 | Q1 (July) | Q2 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment C</th>
<th>Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan</th>
<th>Homelessness</th>
<th>Facilities Partnerships Policy</th>
<th>Citizens Advice Bureaux Services</th>
<th>Social and Community Housing Strategy and initiatives</th>
<th>Affordable Housing Intervention</th>
<th>Te Kauroa – Library Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>Develop and endorse the Sports Facilities Investment Plan to enable Auckland Council to take a more co-ordinated approach to its sports facilities investment.</td>
<td>Implementing Regional Policy and Strategy resolution to progress work around Council’s strategic position on addressing homelessness (note this work will be informed by discussions at the Community Development and Safety Committee)</td>
<td>Identify the range of current council approaches to facility partnerships, issues, opportunities and agree next steps</td>
<td>Review of the Citizens Advice Bureaux Services RSP decision in April 2016</td>
<td>Strategic overview of social and community housing initiatives. Wider housing portfolio and spatial outcomes of council’s role in housing is led by the Planning Committee.</td>
<td>Understanding NZ and international interventions to address affordable housing</td>
<td>Libraries and Information is carrying out a change programme (Fit for the future) to accelerate the implementation of this 2013-2023 strategy (approved by the Governing Body)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Decision on the Auckland Sport Sector : Facility Priorities Plan.</td>
<td>Decision on sector’s investment priorities and investigate potential funding options.</td>
<td>Decision on role and direction addressing homelessness</td>
<td>Decision on review results</td>
<td>Decision on future Auckland Council approaches to affordable housing interventions</td>
<td>Decision relating to priorities and to receive update on strategic direction and implementation progress</td>
<td>Decision relating to priorities and to receive update on strategic direction and implementation progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date: The plan was endorsed on 12 Sept ENV/2017/118. Staff to report back on priorities and potential funding options.</td>
<td>Progress to date: Approved the scope policy 14 Feb Item 17 Auckland council’s position and role was considered at the August meeting report item 12. Staff to report back with an implementation plan. Resolution ENV/2017/118 of preferred position and role</td>
<td>Progress to date: Update was given at 14 February meeting on Phase 1. Approval was given on the proposed timelines for Phase 2: Minutes 14 February Item 14 preferred option A report seeking approval to engage on a draft facility partnerships policy on 12/06/18. Resolution ENV/2018/74</td>
<td>Progress to date: Report was considered at 20 Feb meeting. Decision: lies on the table. A supplementary report was considered on 10 April 2018, Res ENV/2018/48 and with changes for an updated funding model to be agreed by 1 April 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q1 (Sept)</td>
<td>Q2 (Aug)</td>
<td>Q1 (Dec)</td>
<td>Q3 (Feb)</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2 (Feb/Mar19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 (Aug)</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central library strategic review</td>
<td>A strategic review of the Central Library has been commissioned to understand how the current building can meet future need and demand for services, assess the Central Library’s current and potential future role in the region, and guide decision making about future investment and development opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Work around the integration with customer services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Cities Network</td>
<td>Consideration of a proposal to join the Intercultural Cities Network to support implementation and monitoring of progress on ‘Inclusive Auckland’ actions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in Aucklanders (Age Friendly City)</td>
<td>Identify issues and opportunities for an inclusive friendly city (Regional Policy and Strategy resolution REG/2016/92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Enterprise approaches for youth and long term unemployed</td>
<td>Improved understanding of social enterprise reach, impacts, costs and benefits</td>
<td>Strategic direction on councils approach to social enterprise.</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1 (Jul)</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth volunteer programmes</td>
<td>Intervention assessment of youth volunteer programmes on long term education and employment – understanding impacts, costs and benefits</td>
<td>Strategic direction on interventions approach</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1 (Jul)</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Policy</td>
<td>A review of what is working well and what isn’t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Policy Monitoring</td>
<td>Audit of the application of the Grants Policy</td>
<td>Decision on audit results</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toi Whitiki Strategy</td>
<td>Targeted analysis of social return on investment on specific art and culture investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art Policy</td>
<td>Review of the Public Arts Policy: what’s working what’s not</td>
<td>Decision on review results</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>Attachment C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Development Contribution revenue and expenditure – funding for open space purposes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investigation in North-west Community Provision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress to date: A report was considered on 14/08/178 on Open Space acquisition in 2017/18 financial year. Resolution ENV/2018/104 to report back on DC revenue and expenditure by funding area for open space purposes based on current based on the current DC policy.</td>
<td>Progress to date: A report was considered on 13/10/18 on the findings. Resolution ENV/2018/131. Staff will progress the key moves outlined in the report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to acquire land. Reports will come to committee as required. Next report will be in Feb 2018 seeking authority to carry out compulsory acquisition of land in the Henderson area for a flood prevention project.</td>
<td>Decision on the investigation findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGISLATION/CENTRAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Environmental Standards</strong></td>
<td><strong>LAND ACQUISITIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council response on the National Direction for aquaculture expected following scheduled release of consultation document in April 2017. The National Direction is likely to address matters relating to re-consenting, bay-wide management, innovation and research, and biosecurity.</td>
<td><strong>Strategic acquisition issues and opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction Committee agreement to a council submission on the National Direction for Aquaculture.</td>
<td>Understanding current acquisition issues and options.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land acquisition for stormwater purposes</strong></td>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated responsibility of the committee. To acquire land for stormwater management and development purposes, to either support a structure plan or ad-hoc development.</td>
<td><strong>Long-term Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to acquire land. Reports will come to committee as required. Next report will be in Feb 2018 seeking authority to carry out compulsory acquisition of land in the Henderson area for a flood prevention project.</td>
<td>Informing the development of the 2018-2028 Auckland Council Long-term Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 (Feb) Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reapplication for C40 Cities membership

File No.: CP2018/20945

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To endorse Auckland Council’s membership reapplication to the C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. Auckland was admitted into the C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group (C40) in December 2015, joining cities like Los Angeles, Melbourne, Guangzhou, New York and Seoul.

3. Auckland has derived positive value from its C40 membership. The benefits and opportunities that Auckland has secured includes tailored research and technical assistance in core issues for Auckland (like transport and waste), training and assistance to subject experts across council and CCOs, resourcing for a member of the Mayor/Committee Chair-appointed Climate Independent Advisory Group, significant assistance in identification of actions for Auckland’s Climate Action Plan (under development), a platform for Mayoral declarations and visibility of Auckland’s work and leadership on a national and global stage.

4. C40 membership requires commitments, including emissions reporting, participation in regional networks, attendance at biennial meetings and completion of case studies. Council’s C40 work already programmed and budgeted for the next 12-18 months and this will help ensure Auckland can continue to meet its membership requirements. There is no membership fee to join or rejoin C40.

5. Auckland is one of 96 global cities that are members of the city-led network. As a C40 ‘Innovator City’, Auckland is required to reapply every three years; that application is due 12 November 2018. Auckland’s application requires commitment to the aims of Deadline 2020, a C40 report which suggests that cities and nations must commit to bold and coordinated climate action in the next few years to limit temperature rise to 1.5 degrees Celsius (°C) of warming, as well as avert catastrophic climate change. This is a central component of Auckland’s C40 application, as all the other commitments will flow from this. All other C40 cities in the Asia-Pacific region have already signed up to Deadline 2020 commitment.

6. Under the Paris Agreement, New Zealand has committed to take actions to keep the global temperature rise this century well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels, and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5°C. Since signing the agreement central government has committed to the Zero Carbon Bill and stated that the target options being considered for this proposed legislation are consistent with the 1.5°C target. Council has signed a partnership agreement with central government in the development of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan. This is important given the need to ensure the pathway recognises roles and responsibilities at all levels of government in the delivery of the target. This is critical because Auckland Council, by itself, does not have all the levers to achieve the target.

7. Staff recommend that the Committee endorses Auckland’s reapplication for C40 membership.

8. Auckland’s relationship with C40 would continue to be led by the Chief Sustainability Office, with input from relevant teams across council and CCOs.
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) endorse Auckland Council's reapplication for membership to the C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group, including the requirement to develop a climate plan consistent with the Paris Agreement aspiration of 1.5°C maximum temperature rise.

Horopaki / Context

Original Membership

9. Auckland was admitted into the C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group (C40) in December 2015, joining cities like Los Angeles, Melbourne, Guangzhou, New York and Seoul. Auckland’s application was endorsed by the Auckland Development Committee in October 2015 (AUC/2015/197).

10. C40 is a group of over 90 megacities as well as a smaller selection of “Innovator Cities” like Auckland. C40 supports effective collaboration, knowledge sharing and meaningful action on climate change between its member cities.

Scientific Evidence

11. Current scientific evidence – including a recent report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) this month – suggests early and decisive action on climate change is necessary to avert severe environmental, social and economic consequences. While the Paris Agreement sets the ambition for a maximum temperature increase of 2°C and an aspiration for 1.5°C, the global conversation has shifted toward 1.5°C being a necessary target.

12. Such was the upshot of the recent IPCC report and the position of C40 through the expectation all cities sign a commitment to their Deadline 2020 report. The, commitments required for C40 reapplication are scientifically sound and there will be increased pressure and expectation that Auckland deliver on them, regardless of C40 membership. It is worth noting that all other C40 cities in the Asia-Pacific region have already signed up to Deadline 2020 commitment.

NZ Government’s Zero Carbon Bill

13. The New Zealand Government is progressing the Zero Carbon Bill to deliver on its Paris commitments and ensure a stable, efficient and just transition to our economy and society. Climate Change Minister James Shaw has stated that the target options being considered for the Zero Carbon Bill are consistent with the 1.5-degree target.

14. Auckland Council has endorsed the approach of the Bill and it is anticipated that Auckland will be expected to deliver its fair share to NZ’s overall commitment.

15. Over 2800 submissions (23% of the responses received by central government) on the bill were from Aucklanders. Approximately 93% of these responses (2604 submissions) supported a target in line with achieving 1.5°C.

Auckland’s Climate Action Plan

16. Auckland’s Climate Action Plan is under development through cross-sector collaboration involving Government, Mana Whenua, Local Boards, business and organisation leaders and a range of experts from all sectors. Work and modelling done for this plan will flesh out specific sector pathways toward a net zero, climate resilient Auckland. Action development has been significantly aided by C40 engagement. This plan will be reviewed periodically to monitor the progress against the target and consider the surrounding circumstances impacting the pathways.
17. The plan is the vehicle to deliver on the C40 membership requirement to a *Deadline 2020* compliant plan by 2020 – (likely by mid-2019). Auckland Council, Auckland Transport, Panuku and Watercare’s recent membership to the NZ Climate Leaders Coalition is added impetus, as this group (representing more than half of NZ’s emissions) has committed to action in line with the Paris Agreement. Council is drawing on this collective work to underpin development and delivery of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan.

18. This action plan will be compliant with the 1.5°C target under C40 requirements. It is worth noting, whether looking at 2 degrees or 1.5°C commitment, fundamental changes to the structure of the regional and wider New Zealand economy will be required. This includes transitioning how we move around the city to more public and active transport, increasing electrification of vehicles, retrofitting buildings and homes to be warmer and healthier, supporting innovation in new technologies and a shift to greater energy security through local and regional generation. In addition, Auckland will need to consider the carbon sequestration potential of the region. As stated in the IPCC report, 1.5°C will require action over a shorter timeline, but the transition required is substantial on either pathway.

**Value from C40 Membership**

19. The value Auckland has derived from its C40 membership has been significant. Among many other things, C40 has resourced tailored research and technical assistance specific to Auckland and our core issues (like transport, waste and emissions modelling). C40 has provided hours of training and assistance to subject experts across council and several CCOs. C40 has also resourced a member of the Mayor-appointed climate Independent Advisory Group, as well as connected and profiled Auckland’s work and elected/executive leadership on the global stage.

20. Engagement with C40 and C40 members has enable council to progress quickly in identifying actions in our emerging climate action plan with significant time and resource savings. Such value has flowed into work with Government and other NZ cities (as Auckland is the only NZ city that has is a C40 member).

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice**

21. Given the scientific evidence, central government direction and intention, our current plan development and the value derived from our last three years of C40 membership, staff recommend reapplication. A brief options analysis is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not submit reapplication for C40 membership</td>
<td>• No further action required</td>
<td>• Reputational risk of not continuing as a member, as a network leader and award winner, with signed Mayoral declarations and broad government/leader support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk in destabilising current alignment and collaboration with central government on climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Resourcing risks as direct benefits from data, ideas and staff resources will cease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk to momentum on climate action plan development and implementation of actions to reduce emissions and prepare for climate change, thereby potentially increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Do not submit reapplication for C40 membership now; reconsider after Auckland’s climate action plan complete and NZ Government’s Zero Carbon Bill in force | • Allows for more detailed consideration and approval of pathways to achieve emissions reductions  
• Allows for a clearer understanding of how the central government approach will function and interface with Auckland | • Risk to public and private infrastructure and assets due to lack of preparedness to climate change impacts  
• Many of the risks above still apply  
• Reapplication at a later date will almost assuredly be more competitive, as C40 has signalled a reduction in the number of “Innovator Cities” |
| Submit reapplication for C40 membership   | • Helps underpin the global call for local and national action on climate change as per the recent IPCC report  
• Draws together local and central government commitments and reflects majority sentiments in Auckland-based Zero Carbon Bill submissions  
• Resources the development and delivery of Auckland’s climate action plan  
• Helps Auckland Council achieve our own stated commitments as a member of the NZ Climate Leaders Coalition  
• Likely adds value to council and ratepayers from tailored research, technical assistance, training and communications  
• Avoids cross-sector reputational and relationship risks | • Requires commitment to Deadline 2020 and a 1.5-degree compliant plan – currently under development (however, all other Asia-Pacific C40 Cities except Auckland have done so)  
• Requires steady progress, new action and accelerated leadership on climate change |

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views**

22. Local Boards have not been specifically consulted on the potential reapplication for C40 membership. However, the Chief Sustainability Office has held individual and cluster workshops with all local boards on the development of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan. Given active local board engagement on plan development, it is likely that continued C40 membership would provide local opportunities and benefits.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

23. Climate change will affect areas over which Māori have kaitiakitanga; impacting ecosystems, shaping community vulnerability and resilience, and linking to economic outcomes. C40 membership will continue to provide resourcing and expertise to address climate impacts, some of which are specific to Māori. C40 has specifically noted the unique opportunity for other cities with indigenous peoples to learn from the role of Māori in Aotearoa.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
24. There is no membership fee to join or rejoin C40. Limited expenditure from existing budgets will cover participation and meeting our obligations no additional funding is required.
25. C40 membership requirements include emissions reporting, participation in regional networks, attendance at biennial meetings and completion of case studies. Work is already programmed, budgeted and will meet membership requirements. Resourcing and management of the relationship with C40 would continue to be led by the Chief Sustainability Office, with input from relevant teams across council and CCOs.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
26. Risks are identified in the options analysis above.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
27. With endorsement of reapplication to C40, the Chief Sustainability Office will work with the Mayor’s Office to finalise and transmit application materials, including a draft letter of intent from the Mayor to the C40 Chair (Paris Mayor), a commitment letter to Deadline 2020, and a C40 activity assessment report highlighting Auckland’s contributions to C40.
28. C40 Cities will review materials and make a recommendation to the C40 Steering Committee. Their decision will be informed by 1) Auckland’s compliance and scoring in C40 Participation Standards, 2) previous and planned contributions to C40, 3) commitment to leadership through declarations and meetings, and 4) a regional balance of Innovator cities.
29. The C40 Steering Committee will make a decision at their meeting on 30 November and Auckland will be informed in December. Unsuccessful cities will cease being C40 members by 1 April 2019. In discussions with C40 there are no anticipated concerns/issues with Auckland not meeting C40’s membership expectations.
30. Concurrently, the Chief Sustainability Office will continue to develop Auckland’s Climate Action Plan, including cross-sector engagement, technical modeling and refinement of actions and targets.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

| Authors | Parin Thompson - Principal Specialist Sustainability & Climate Mitigation  
John Mauro - Chief Sustainability Officer |
|---|---|
| Authorisers | Jacques Victor – General Manager Auckland Plan Strategy and Research  
Jim Quinn - Chief of Strategy  
Dean Kimpton - Chief Operating Officer |
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To present key findings from an evaluation of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 and to seek agreement to proposed improvements.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. To enable decision-making on the council’s sport investment and leasing policy, staff have undertaken an evaluation of sport and recreation leases developed under the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012, based on agreed terms of reference [CP2017/08531 refers].

3. The evaluation found that the guidelines are being applied as intended, but that it is difficult to show improved community outcomes from existing leases. A range of equity, consistency, transparency and financial sustainability issues were also identified.

4. Staff recommend:
   - strengthening decision-making and monitoring of community leases outcomes
   - reviewing the content of the guidelines
   - undertaking further policy work on rental charges and commercial activities
   - refining processes and practices, including introducing new tools to assist local boards.

5. These changes will enable the council to better respond to growth and changing community needs. They also reflect the underlying value of council assets that are leased to community organisations and the impact leases can have on minimum service levels.

6. There are high legal and regulatory compliance risks with the status quo.

7. There are low operational risks, including capacity issues arising from the proposed changes. These can be mitigated through phased implementation. There are low reputation risks from undertaking a review of rents, but this will be mitigated through public engagement.

8. Implementation will be staged and will take up to 18 months to complete. Staff will engage with local boards and the community on changes to the guidelines and other policy improvements.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the following improvements:
   i) introduce an outcome evaluation framework to support decision-making and monitoring of community leases
   ii) increasing transparency, consistency, financial sustainability and equity in the leasing process (including a refresh of the guidelines in consultation with the local boards).

b) request staff to report back on implementation within 18 months.
Horopaki / Context

The Community Occupancy Guidelines support a consistent approach to leases

9. The council has over 1400 community leases. The purpose of these leases is to enable use of council assets by community organisations to deliver benefits directly to Aucklanders.

10. The underlying value of these assets makes it one of the most significant forms of investment that council makes in local communities. It is, therefore, important to ensure that the desired outcomes are delivered and that minimum service levels are not compromised by leases.

11. The governing body has the responsibility to set regional policy and to ensure the delivery of community outcomes that align with the Auckland Plan and other strategic priorities.

12. The governing body also sets minimum service levels through the Open Space Provision Policy and Community Facilities Network Plan.

13. It approved the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 to inform decision-making and to provide a consistent approach.

14. Local boards have delegated authority to enter into individual community leases in response to community needs. Their decision-making needs to consider regional objectives, ensure the delivery of community benefits, as well as comply with relevant legislative requirements.

15. Local boards should also consider growing competition for open spaces and community facilities due to growth and density. The activities Aucklanders undertake are also changing and reflect the diversity of the population, therefore, lease terms should be carefully considered.

Figure 1: Various functions of governing body and local boards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governing body</th>
<th>Local boards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● sets a regional approach to community leases through the Community Occupancy Guidelines</td>
<td>● make final decisions on community leases within the local context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● ensures Aucklanders have access to a variety of opportunities at open spaces and community facilities</td>
<td>● have delegated responsibilities for the use and management of local parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● delivers the council’s strategic outcomes</td>
<td>● deliver outcomes in the local plan through community leases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● strategically invests and manages the council’s open space and community facilities regional network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An evaluation was undertaken to assess the impact of the guidelines

16. The Environment and Community Committee commissioned an evaluation of the Community Occupancy Guidelines [CP2017/08531 refers]. They agreed terms of reference, which included the following evaluation criteria: (1) relevance; (2) impact; (3) effectiveness; (4) efficiency; (5) equity; (6) financial sustainability; (7) consistency; and (8) transparency.

17. Attachment D provides a copy of the terms of reference.

18. The evaluation methodology entailed:
   - a desktop assessment of the processes and decisions for leases developed under the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012. A sample of 70 sport and recreation leases was selected to assist decision-making on sport investment. The analysis was supplemented with feedback from stakeholders, elected members, council staff and leaseholders
   - a literature review that compares Auckland Council’s guidelines with community lease policies and guidelines of two New Zealand, three Australian and three Canadian local authorities, with a particular focus on policies for indigenous peoples.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

19. The following section provides an overview of results of the evaluation. Summary reports of the desktop assessment and the literature review are provided in Attachments A and B.

20. Many of the evaluation findings can be generalised, but there could be issues that are specific to sport and recreation. This is a limitation of taking a sample of 1400 leases.

The evaluation found that the guidelines were being actively implemented

21. The evaluation found that the guidelines inform staff advice and local board decisions:
   - staff follow the processes set out in the guidelines and used them as a basis for their advice to local boards
   - local boards consider staff advice and, generally, make decisions that are consistent with the guidelines
   - the guidelines are similar to those of other local authorities.

The impact of community leases is unclear

22. The evaluation found a lack of assessments or information regarding:
   - the change to service levels and public access to open space and community facilities before and after leases were granted
   - the benefits delivered to local communities compared to the private benefits accrued by segments of the community arising from leases providing exclusive use of council assets
   - the strategic alignment of leases to Auckland Plan outcomes
   - the implications of leasing on the regional network of parks and open space and community facilities.

23. The evaluation also found equity, consistency, transparency and financial sustainability issues. These are outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Assessment against the evaluation criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
<td>Variance in access</td>
<td>Stakeholder feedback suggests some communities (for example, Māori and new immigrants) do not have enough information about community leases. Consequently, they have missed opportunities to apply and access open spaces and community facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistency and transparency</strong></td>
<td>Variance in staff advice and local board decisions</td>
<td>There are no standard processes or decision-making frameworks across local boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance in reporting and documentation of key local board decisions</td>
<td>Local boards often do not have enough information, for example the costs and benefits of a community lease, to support the decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance in the approach to commercial activities</td>
<td>There is no standard process to record key local board decisions such as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- whether to conduct an Expression of Interest (EOI) process to generate a pool of applicants for a new or vacant site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- why the final applicant was selected and what community outcomes are expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is variance around:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- how commercial activities are defined across the council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- how the different types of commercial activities by community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion | Issue | Description
--- | --- | ---
 |  | organisations should be treated - how to conduct assessments under the Reserves Act 1977 and/or Local Government Act 2002.

**Financial sustainability** Difficulty in meeting the administration costs

- Rents do not cover the administration costs of community leases (approximately $3710 each per annum). This cost is currently funded by rates.
- Auckland Council charges a low level of rent compared to other councils. For example, for a 200m² building on 500m² of land Auckland Council charges $1 compared to $575-$22,600 by Hamilton City Council $156-$1173 by Wellington City Council.

---

**Staff are seeking approval of two key improvement areas to enhance community leasing**

24. Staff recommend improvements in two areas.

25. Improvement 1 will enable the council to better respond to growth and changing community needs. The changes will help the council make decisions that reflect the underlying value of council assets that are leased to community organisations and the impact leases can have on minimum service levels.

*Improvement 1: Introduce an outcome evaluation framework to assist decision-making and monitoring*

*If we:*

Introduce an outcome evaluation framework throughout the leasing cycle

*Then by:*

Strengthening decision-making and monitoring of community leases

- Application
- Assessment
- Decision-making
- Monitoring

**Application**

Seek information from applicants on:
- site utilisation
- community outcomes
- benefits for Māori
- financial data
- asset management

**Assessment**

Staff assess information in the application form

Further analysis of:
- costs and benefits (CBAx)
- changes in service level
- public/private benefits
- strategic alignment
- asset network provision

**Decision-making**

Local boards make decisions based on staff analysis and assessment

Renewal decisions will be based on previous monitoring results

**Monitoring**

Annual monitoring and evaluation of:
- site utilisation
- financial data particularly revenue generated from the site
- community outcomes and Māori benefits delivered
- asset status
We will achieve:
- improved outcomes for Māori communities and those most in need
- greater impact in areas of highest need
- better understanding of the outcomes delivered through community leases
- applied learning from our current successes
- strategic management of the council’s open spaces and community facilities network.

26. Improvement 2 will ensure application of good practice in the leasing process, drawing on examples identified in the literature review. These changes will ensure that quality standards are met at each stage of the process.

**Improvement 2: Increase equity, consistency and transparency and financial sustainability**

*If we:*
Ensure the leasing process demonstrates good practice

*Then by:*
- refreshing the guidelines in consultation with local boards
- standardising internal forms and processes for community leases
- standardising the reporting templates and documentation of key local board decisions
- reviewing the council’s approach to commercial activities, particularly regarding compliance with the council’s internal strategies and policies for alcohol sales and gambling
- reviewing the mechanism for rental charge

*We will achieve:*
- practice: consistency, transparency, equity and financial sustainability
- increased public confidence in the council’s leasing process.

27. Attachment C provides a detailed outline of the current practice and the changes proposed.

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views**

Feedback from local board members was generally supportive, but there were a couple of key concerns

28. Staff have discussed the key findings and recommendations with local board chairs and the Environment and Community Committee in a workshop on 20 June 2018.

29. Staff also presented the findings to local boards between February and April as part of the engagement for developing the *Sports Facilities Investment Plan*.

30. Feedback from local board members was generally supportive of the main findings.

31. A number of local board members raised concerns about the impacts of a potential rental increase on sport organisations and whether the costs will be passed on to players.

---

32. Some local board members supported a subsidy scheme (as used by Hamilton and Wellington City Councils), but they suggested that it be funded regionally.

33. Most local board members believe commercial activities are a good way for community groups to raise additional revenue. They stressed the need for further consideration on:
   - the type of commercial activities allowed on council properties, particularly regarding the approach to smoking, alcohol use and gambling that are harmful to the local communities
   - the type of community organisations, with a particular view on not penalising fundraising activities run by small local clubs to pay for operational costs.

34. The issues relating to rental charges and commercial activities will be investigated further in the proposed policy work.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

35. The literature review looked at the approach of three Canadian local authorities to indigenous people (First Nations, Métis and Inuit). It found many similarities with council’s approach in terms of recognising the importance of indigenous people’s treaty rights and the requirement to consult on land use planning and development processes.

**Feedback from the Mana Whenua Forum**

36. Staff engaged with the Mana Whenua Forum twice during the evaluation. The first time was in December 2017 to introduce the objectives and scope of the evaluation. The second time was in April 2018 to share the key findings.

37. The forum raised three main issues relating to community leases:
   - inconsistency and lack of culture awareness when engaging with the Mana Whenua Forum, iwi and Māori organisations, particularly for community lease decisions that involve use or development of land
   - lack of exposure for mana whenua and Māori organisations to information about the application process and prospective leases
   - lack of consideration about how Māori outcomes could be achieved and measured.

38. The proposed outcomes evaluation framework will have a particular focus on benefits for Māori. It will assist consideration of Māori outcomes in the Community Outcomes Plans and monitoring of outcomes over time.

39. Improvements can be made through staff cultural awareness training and better processes to engage with iwi and Māori organisations.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications**

40. The proposed changes will lead to different ways of working and additional demands on existing staff. All costs can be met in the short-term within the current departmental budgets.

41. Over the medium-term council could expect efficiency gains.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

42. There are high legal and regulatory compliance risks with the status quo. The lack of evidence on public consultation and expressions of interest, as required under section 119 of the Reserves Act 1977 and/or section 138 of Local Government Act 2002 placed council at risk of judicial review. Other aspects of the lease process could also be open to challenge.

43. There are low operational risks, including capacity issues arising from the proposed changes. These can be mitigated through phased implementation. There are low reputation risks from undertaking a review of rents, and this will be mitigated through public engagement.
Table 4: Initial risk assessment and mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reputational risk:</strong></td>
<td>• explain the rationale behind changing the way rent is currently determined and include an analysis of possible incentives or reduced rent for the delivery of community outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organisations’ concerns about the proposed rent review</td>
<td>• any proposed changes on how rents are calculated will be subject to public engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ensure the processes are transparent and consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational risk:</strong></td>
<td>• simplify processes and ensure expectations are managed at the lease application stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns that changes to improve efficiency and outcomes monitoring will lead to extra processes and reporting requirements</td>
<td>• explain the reasons for having effective processes and reporting requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organizations might not have the capacity to meet the requirements</td>
<td>• any significant changes will be tested with key stakeholders before finalising the changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. A full risk assessment will be undertaken during policy development for proposed changes and will be discussed with local boards, stakeholders and relevant staff.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

45. Auckland Council has over 1400 community leases. Each year on average, the council responds to over 200 new leases and 100 renewal requests. In recognition of the current heavy workload of operations staff, the proposed changes will be phased in over the next 18 months. The first few changes will focus on improving efficiency and transparency of the current processes.

46. Staff will engage with local boards and the community on changes to the Community Occupancy Guidelines and other policy improvements.

Figure 2: Timeline

- **Dec 2018 – May 2019**
  - Adapting the following changes in Improvement 2 to increase process efficiency and transparency:
    - standardising internal forms and processes for community leases
    - standardising the reporting templates and documentation of key local board decisions.

- **Dec 2018 – Oct 2019**
  - Adapting the following change in Improvement 1 to assist decision-making and monitoring:
    - introducing an outcome evaluation framework throughout the leasing cycle.

- **June 2019 – March 2020**
  - Adapting the following changes in Improvement 2 to improve consistency, equity and financial sustainability:
    - reviewing the council’s approach to commercial activities, particularly regarding compliance with the council’s internal strategies and policies for alcohol sales and gambling
    - reviewing the mechanism for rental charge.

- **Jan – June 2020**
  - Review impacts of Improvements.
47. Staff will report back to the Committee on implementation, including the revised Community Occupancy Guidelines.
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Review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012

PART ONE: Evaluation of leases developed under the guidelines

August 2018
Executive summary

This report presents Part One of a two-part summary of findings from the review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 (the guidelines).

**PART ONE: How have the guidelines been applied?**
- Desktop assessment of 70 sport and recreation leases granted after 2012
- Workshops and targeted interviews

**PART TWO: How do the guidelines compare with others?**
- Literature review of community lease policies and guidelines of two New Zealand, three Australian and three Canadian local authorities

It provides a summary of findings focused on how well the guidelines have been applied against best practice principles. It covers desk-top analysis of key decisions and documents for 70 community leases granted since 2012, and qualitative information gathered from workshops and targeted interviews.

The key findings are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best practice principle</th>
<th>Assessment result</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relevance                | Aligned           | Overall, the guidelines have been applied across the region:  
- council staff have followed the processes set out in the guidelines and used the guidelines as a basis for their advice to local boards  
- the local boards have considered staff advice and made decisions that are generally consistent with the guidelines. |
| Impact                   | Not aligned       | There is very limited information regarding the outcomes from community leases such as:  
- the change to public access before and after leases were granted  
- the benefits delivered to local communities compared to private benefits exclusive to certain people or groups  
- the alignment with the council’s strategic priorities  
- the impacts on the council’s open space and community facilities assets  
- the implications to the council’s provision of open space and community facility network |
<p>| Equity                   | Not aligned       | Feedback from stakeholders suggests some communities (for example, Māori and new immigrants) do not have sufficient information about community leases. Consequently they missed out on opportunities to apply and access open spaces and community facilities |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best practice principle</th>
<th>Assessment result</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Consistency and transparency | Not aligned        | Variance in staff advice and local board decisions due to:  
- no standard decision-making framework or processes adopted across local boards  
- insufficient information provided to the local boards during the decision-making process such as the costs and benefits relating to each community lease and the underlying land value |
|                         |                    | Variance in reporting and documentation of key local board decisions such as:  
- whether to conduct an Expression of Interest (EOI) process to generate a pool of applicants for a new or vacant site  
- why the final applicant was selected and what community outcomes are expected |
|                         |                    | Variance in the approach to commercial activities around:  
- how commercial activities are defined across the council  
- how the different types of commercial activities by different types of community organisations should be treated  
- how to conduct assessments under the Reserves Act 1977 and/or Local Government Act 2002 |
| Financial sustainability | Not aligned        | The council is unable to fund the administration costs of community leases (approximately $3710 per annum) through the rent revenue.  
This cost is currently funded by rates  
Auckland Council charges a low level of rent compared to other council's 1 |
| Efficiency and effectiveness | More information needed | More outcome data is needed to determine whether community leases assist the council to deliver the best outcomes possible (effectiveness) and whether the outcomes delivered is proportional to the costs and resources spent (efficiency) |

**Suggestions for improvement**

Potential changes to community leases suggested by internal staff, leaseholders and the Mana Whenua Forum are provided in Section 4.3 of this report.

**Next steps**

The Part One summary of findings will be considered alongside Part Two summary of findings to form recommendations on the council’s future direction for community leases and any changes to the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012.

1See Part Two summary of findings for a detailed comparison of rental charges. For example, for a 200m² building and 500m² land, Auckland Council charges $1, compared to $575–$22,800 in Hamilton City Council and $156–$1173 in Wellington City Council. See par.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the review
Auckland Council currently has over 1400 community leases and licences with community organisations.

Community leases allow community organisations to operate on council properties. In return, lease and licence holders are expected to deliver community benefits that align with the Auckland Plan wider outcomes and priorities.

In 2012, Auckland Council introduced Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 (the guidelines) to assist decision-making and to provide an overview of the process and standard terms and conditions of new lease agreements.

On 17 July 2017, the Environment and Community Committee [CP2017/08531] approved a review of the guidelines to:

- assess the efficacy of the guidelines in helping the council deliver the best possible outcomes for Auckland through community leases
- improve the guidelines to ensure consistency in assessing, granting and managing leases.

The terms of reference for the review set out a list of evaluation principles to assist the evaluation of the guidelines: relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency, transparency and consistency, equity and financial sustainability.²

1.2 Part One of the review
Summary of findings from the review were divided into two parts. This report presents Part One summary of findings:

**PART ONE: How have the guidelines been applied?**
- Desktop assessment of 70 sport and recreation leases granted after 2012
- Workshop and targeted interviews

**PART TWO: How do the guidelines compare with others?**
- Literature review of community lease policies and guidelines of two New Zealand, four Australian and three Canadian local authorities

Part One focuses on how the guidelines have been applied since they were introduced in 2012. It has two key components:

² The evaluation principles were based on a list of OECD best practice principles - Guidelines for Project and Programme Evaluations OECD(2006) [https://www.oecd.org/development/evaluation/40523766.pdf]
- desktop analysis of key decisions and documents of community leases granted since 2012 (after the guidelines were introduced)
- qualitative feedback from targeted interviews and workshops with leaseholders, council staff and the Mana Whenua Forum.

Section 2 of this report presents the methodology for desktop analysis.

Section 3 provides the results from the desktop analysis.

Section 4 provides the results from the workshops and targeted interviews.
## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 Desktop analysis

Auckland Council currently has approximately 1400 community leases. Of these, around 150 leases (around 10 per cent) were granted after the guidelines were introduced in 2012.

Council staff undertook a desktop analysis of 70 of the 150 leases granted after 2012. These 70 leases cover parks, sport and recreation leases to inform the development of the council’s *Increasing Aucklanders’ participation in sport: Strategic Plan 2019-2039* (previously known as the *Sports Facilities Investment Plan*).

Council staff reviewed the key decisions and documents at each stage of the lease cycle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lease cycle stage</th>
<th>Key components</th>
<th>Key documents reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Expression of Interest (EOI)</td>
<td>Lease application form, club report/rules, constitution and financial information, new lease letter to council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Local board reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site visits</td>
<td>Site forms, aerial photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Criteria and process</td>
<td>Local board reports, general correspondence between internal staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td>Local board decision-making</td>
<td>Local board reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms and conditions</td>
<td>Lease agreement</td>
<td>Local board reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specific terms for permitted use, lease duration, rent, renewal conditions, insurance and other specific amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Utilisation</td>
<td>Financial reports, quarterly reports, local board reports, constitution, annual reports, quarterly reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial activities</td>
<td>Annual account information, constitution and financial statements, quarterly reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserves management</td>
<td>Reserve Management Plans (RMP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of each lease assessment were checked by the Lease Advisor responsible for the lease agreement, followed by discussion with relevant staff to gain a better understanding of the key issues.
Limitations

A key limitation is that the desktop analysis drew heavily on staff knowledge and data available in council’s internal database. Staff turnover and data entry errors could cause gaps in the analysis.

The sample

The 70 park, sport and recreation leases chosen for the desktop analysis cover a wide range of leases across different local boards, geographic areas, sports and type of land.

Figure 1: Number of leases by local board

- Albert-Eden: 3
- Devonport-Takapuna: 6
- Franklin: 6
- Henderson-Massey: 3
- Hibiscus & Bays: 3
- Howick: 2
- Kaipatiki: 1
- Mangere-Otahuhu: 7
- Manurewa: 5
- Maungakiekie-Tamaki: 3
- Oake: 3
- Otara-Papatoetoe: 4
- Papakura: 1
- Puketapapa: 2
- Rodney: 12
- Waitakere Ranges: 5
- Whau: 4

Figure 2: Number of leases by building ownership

- Club-owned: 58
- Council-owned: 12

Figure 3: Number of leases by land classification

- Both LGA 2002 and Recreation Reserve: 1
- LGA 2002: 11
- Local Purpose Reserve: 5
- Recreation Reserve: 48
- Unclassified: 5
2.2 Workshops and targeted interviews

A series of targeted interviews and workshops were undertaken to supplement the desktop analysis. They provide qualitative data on how the guidelines are applied in practice.

*Interviews with sport and recreation organisations*

Council staff conducted 13 targeted interviews with sport and recreation organisations. They were selected from the sample of 70 park, sport and recreation leases included the desktop analysis.

The 13 organisations were purposely chosen to cover a variety of leases:

- User diversity: the sample covers a wide range of participants in different age, gender, ethnicity and social-economic backgrounds.
- Governance structure: the sample includes a range of small local clubs and large social enterprise (18 members- 2400 members) with different operating revenue ranging between $2000 and $1,400,000.
- Geographic diversity: the sample spreads across the North, East, South and West areas of Auckland.
- Facility types: the sample includes both multi-functional and bespoke facilities for a range of sports such as rugby, tennis, gymnastics, water sports and boxing.
- Activity types: the sample has a range of activities including core sport and recreation events, commercial activities (including sub-leasing, alcohol sale, gambling) and small-scaled fundraising activities.

Each interview was scheduled for 20 to 30 minutes, conducted in the community, often at the clubs premises. The interviewees were asked about:

- their experience with the lease process, including their role in the process
- the application form
- the standard terms and conditions set out in the guidelines
- the monitoring and reporting processes.

*Interviews with council staff*

Five council staff with expertise in legal, land development and reserve management issues were also interviewed to gain insight on specific aspects of the lease process.

Council staff were asked about their involvement with the overall process, issues in their expert areas and any possible changes that could be implemented to improve the guidelines.

*Workshop with lease advisors*

A separate workshop was conducted with the Lease Advisors to gain their feedback on the current processes and any potential changes to improve the operation of the guidelines.
The Mana Whenua Forum workshop

Staff engaged with the Mana Whenua Forum separately to understand how well the guidelines are working from a Māori perspective and to gain feedback on any potential changes to improve the delivery of Māori outcomes.
3 Key Findings from the desktop analysis

3.1 Summary of findings
The desktop analysis focused on several key components at each stage of the lease cycle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lease cycle stage</th>
<th>Key components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Expression of Interest process to generate a suitable pool of candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation with key stakeholders (local community, Mana Whenua and iwi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site visits to ensure the sites are fit-for-purpose for the intended activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Criteria and process to select the best application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Local board decisions on who to grant leases and the terms and conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms and conditions</td>
<td>Lease agreement that sets out fees and charges, lease terms, utilisation of the site and accountability requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Process and data collected on impacts of community leases, particularly progress of the Community Outcomes Plans that set out outcomes of community leases and measures to track progress over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring of commercial activities undertaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance with the Reserves Act 1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that the guidelines have been applied across the region:

- council staff have followed the processes set out in the guidelines and used the guidelines as a basis for their advice to local boards
- the local boards have considered staff advice and made decisions that are consistent with the guidelines

However, there are a number of issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lease cycle stage</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Lack of transparency and consistency in why the council sometimes did not run an open Expression of Interest (EOI) process to seek suitable applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaps in consultation records, such as who has been consulted and what feedback was provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of consistency in how site visits are conducted and recorded in the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The quality of the Community Outcomes Plans included in the applications varies greatly. There is often no clear link to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease cycle stage</td>
<td>Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>council’s strategic priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of information around Māori outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No expectations set on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o site utilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o asset management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o financial performance of the community groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No consistent assessment framework has been adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The quality and coverage of the assessment vary greatly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There are often gaps in information provided in the application forms which make robust assessment difficult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local boards often do not have sufficient information when making decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is variance in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the length of lease terms granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the approach to commercial activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms and conditions</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Very limited information provided regarding how the site is going to be utilised and how the activities will be monitored over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rental charges are often set at a level that cannot cover the council’s cost of administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The majority of annual review reports were not available to track progress towards community outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quality of the Community Outcomes Plans varies greatly across leases. The majority fail to include meaningful targets that link to the intended community outcomes and local board priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The range of activities conducted and the utilisation of the sites are not monitored over time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the assessment are summarised in the following sections.
3.2 Findings at each stage of the lease cycle

3.2.1 Expression of Interest (EOI)

The Expression of interest process takes place at the beginning of the lease cycle.

According to the guidelines, when vacant buildings, space or land are identified as appropriate for development, the council can run an EOI process to seek applications through public advertisement or by direct notification to groups who have registered their interest with the council.

However, an EOI process is not mandatory. Groups that own their buildings have an automatic right to re-apply at the end of their occupancy terms without public notification.

Application of guidelines

Of the 70 leases reviewed:
- seven had undertaken an EOI process
- there are no records of EOI process for the remaining 63 leases in the internal system
- an EOI process is sometimes undertaken at the request of the relevant local board
- the majority of local boards have opted out of undertaking the EOI process
- the majority of the EOI were undertaken in the Southern region (Otara-Papatoetoe, Manurewa and Franklin).

The lack of EOI process has contributed to some transparency and consistency issues. Some community groups claimed they are often not aware of leasing opportunities.

Without the EOI process, the council also runs the risk of having a limited pool of applicants. This could mean an inability to select a suitable applicant and hence likelihood of under-delivery of community outcomes and inequity in the local area.

3.2.2 Public notification

Legal requirements

Under section Sections 54(2) and 119 of the Reserves Act:

- Before granting any lease or licence (relating to reserves)... the notification shall be published:
  (i) Once in a newspaper circulating in the area in which the reserve... is situated
  (ii) In such other newspapers (if any) as the administering body decides...

Application of guidelines

Of the 70 leases reviewed:
- there are gaps in the internal records, such as whether public notifications have taken place or what feedback was received.
3.2.3 Consultation

Legal requirements

Under section 138 of the Local Government Act 2002:

- A local authority proposing to sell or otherwise dispose of a park … including the granting of a lease for more than 6 months that has the effect of excluding or substantially interfering with the public’s access to the park … must consult on the proposal…

Auckland Council often consults with a range of groups during the application process, depending on the type of land the reserves are classified. The table below summarises the groups that are consulted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Consultation description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mana Whenua and/or iwi    | • If the lease is located on a reserve or crown land, consultation is required with the Mana Whenua Forum and/or individual iwi to understand any potential impacts to Māori  
• If the reserve has an up-to-date Reserve Management Plan (which will include feedback from the Mana Whenua) then consultations are not necessary |
| Public                    | • If there is significant public interest, an EOI process will be undertaken as part of the application process  
• Public notifications through the local newspaper follow the local board decision and lasts for one month. This process is required for land held under the Local Government Act 2002 and land held under the Reserve Act 1977 that is Crown owned, non-classified land or with no reserve management plan |
| Internal staff            | • Subject matter experts across the council (such as the Parks, Sport and Recreation advisors, Park and Recreation Policy team) before drafting local board reports |

Consultation ensures transparency in the process and expert and community views are considered before final decisions are made.

Application of guidelines

Of the 70 leases reviewed:

- the majority of local board reports noted that consultation was undertaken with no adverse impacts on the key stakeholders  
- there are gaps in consultation records in the internal system, such as who was consulted and the feedback provided.
3.2.4 Site visit

For both new and renewal leases, lease advisors are expected to conduct a site visit with the applicant.

Site visits help ensure that the site is fit-for-purpose (for new leases) or maintained as intended by the leaseholders (for renewals).

Application of guidelines

Of the 70 leases reviewed:

- 45 site visits were recorded in the internal database, the remaining leases did not have a record of a site visit
- there was inconsistency in the content of the site visit reports
- time constraints have limited the capacity of both council and community organisation staff (some are volunteers) to undertake site visits and draft comprehensive reports.

3.2.5 Assessment

The guidelines outline a range of eligibility criteria, assessment criteria and further considerations for open space and reserves.

Applications are assessed on a case-by-case basis by Lease Advisors, who then prepare advice and recommendations for relevant local board for consideration.

Application of guidelines

Of the 70 leases reviewed:

- the assessment process typically follows the guidelines
- the quality and coverage of analysis used in assessment vary greatly
- there are transparency and inconsistency issues around the reporting of assessment results across local boards.

There is currently no robust assessment framework in place (such as standard procedures, criteria and weightings).

There is some consistency within the sub-regions, but not across the region. The methods used to collate and store information related to the lease assessments are different across local boards.

3.2.6 Local board decision-making

Local boards are the decision-makers for community occupancy agreements.

They draw upon the guidelines and take into consideration staff recommendations as the basis for decision-making. They may, at their discretion, choose to vary from the guidelines and recommendations on a case-by-case basis.
Lease Advisors engage with the local board regularly throughout the application process, often through workshops to identify potential leaseholders.

Application of guidelines

Of the 70 leases reviewed:
- key decisions by local board are generally consistent with the guidelines
- local boards often do not have sufficient information during the decision-making process such as the costs and benefits relating to each community lease and the underlying land value
- examples of variance are lease terms (more information provided in section 3.2.6).

3.2.7 Terms and conditions

All community occupancy agreements should include a standard set of terms and conditions. The guidelines provide particular guidance on:
- rental fees, maintenance charges and additional charges for commercial activities
- length of lease
- utilisation of the site (such as requirements for shared use, subleasing and commercial activities)
- accountability requirements.

Application of guidelines

Of the 70 leases reviewed:
- standards terms and conditions were included in all community occupancy agreements
- four leases had terms longer term than the maximum suggested by the guidelines.
- there is limited information specified in the terms and conditions about how the site will be utilised and how the activities will be monitored over time (more information provided in Section 3.3)
- rental charges are often set at a level that cannot cover the council's cost of administration (round $3710 per lease per annum)
- all of the leases include accountability measures as required by the guidelines.
3.2.8 Monitoring and evaluation

Community leaseholders are required to submit an annual report which includes the accountability form based on the agreed Community Outcomes Plan (COP) as a condition of their lease agreement. The COP should include:

- benefits that the group will provide to the community
- measures used to review the group’s performance against the plan over time.

Accountability reports are discussed with local board at workshops before finalisation.

**Application of guidelines**

Of the 70 leases reviewed:

- the majority of annual review reports were not available to support the progress towards delivering community outcomes

- the quality of the Community Outcomes Plan vary greatly across leases, with the majority fail to include meaningful targets that link to the intended community outcomes and local board priorities

- the range of activities and utilisation of the sites are not monitored regularly.

Feedback from Lease Advisors indicates the issues with reporting on Community Outcomes Plans were mainly due to limited volunteer capacity of community organisations.

Lack of monitoring of the Community Outcomes Plans has led to gaps in performance data. This makes it difficult for council staff to evaluate outcomes of community leases, and unable to assess whether they have contributed to local board priorities and wider council strategic outcomes.

3.2.9 The approach to commercial activities

The guidelines do not exclude commercial activities on council properties, so long as they comply with the relevant legislation and land classification under the Reserves Act 1977 and align with the Reserve Management Plans.

Commercial activities on parks may:

---

1 In place of the annual review, Lease Advisors may invite the lessees to present a verbal update on how the club has operated over the past year.

2 Leases that are on parkland held under the Reserves Act 1977 are administered under the Local Government Act 2002. In cases where the land is classified as a recreation reserve, the area occupied by the club could be held under the Local Government Act 2002 and not the Reserves Act 1977.

3 Reserve Management Plans which set out objectives and policies for the management, protection and future development of a reserve, after consulting with relevant groups such as the Mana Whenua Forum and local iwi. If community leases are to deliver the best outcomes from the council property, the plans should reflect the current needs of the community or local board.
- enhance the park-user experience where the primary purpose of the park (such as recreation, organised sports or conservation) is not adversely affected
- provide an additional revenue stream for sports and recreation organisations to fund their activities. For some organisations the additional revenue might be critical in keeping the organisation financially viable.

The commercial activities permitted under S4(1)(d) of the Reserves Act 1977 include:

- admission fees to an outdoor sports event
- charging non-members for access to playing facilities
- fund-raising
- operating a pro-shop or equipment hire (e.g. tennis or cricket)
- selling refreshments such as coffee
- operating a café or gym
- operating a not-for-profit childcare centre
- partnering with corporate sponsor to provide funding to upgrade premises.

If the commercial activities do not comply with the relevant legislation then the lease should not be granted until the land is reclassified.

The guidelines stipulate that if the community group generates significant revenue, the relevant local board may charge a percentage of the rent at the rent review phase.\(^6\)

**Sub-leasing**

Sub-leasing particularly for commercial activities is generally not permitted under the guidelines. Local board approval is sought if the activity is deemed appropriate.

Sub-leases need to be publically advertised. This can be a commercial provider but would need to comply with the Reserves Act 1977.

**Liquor licences**

There is a separate process for granting liquor licences.

The liquor licence needs to comply with the Reserves Act 1977 classification.\(^7\)

New and renewed licences are required to go through the alcohol licencing process, which includes public notification to give members of the public an opportunity to object to the licence.

**Gambling**

The guidelines do not specifically address gambling activities on council land or premises

The Department of Internal Affairs (DIA) issues certificates of approval for casino employees and non-casino gambling licences.\(^8\)

Non-casino gaming machines in bars and clubs must be operated by an incorporate society and intended to raise money for community groups and non-commercial purposes.

**Cafés and restaurants**

---

\(^6\) No policy exists on fee schedules for commercial activities. As a rough guide, clubs can earn up to $100,000 before the local board may choose to charge a percentage rental. That percentage charge is on the amount over and above $100,000. The percentage is set anywhere between 4 and 7%.

\(^7\) The Alcohol and Licensing team do not enquire into the Reserves Act 1977.

\(^8\) The New Zealand gambling laws are regulated, audited and investigated by the Department of Internal Affairs.
Café or restaurants that are not operated by the club require a formal sub-lease agreement. The sub-lease document between the two parties requires approval from the council. This would not tend to be permitted under most classifications of the Reserves Act 1977.

Application of guidelines

Of the 70 leases reviewed:
- 40 have liquor licences
- three have gambling licences
- there is very limited information on the level of revenue generated from commercial activities and whether the revenue has been reinvested to deliver community outcomes
- there is incomplete information to determine how many leases have shared use agreements. Leases with shared use agreements also failed to specify the days and hours that the site is used by external organisations and describe the intended purpose.

Reserve management

Of the 70 leases reviewed:
- 48 have reserve land status under the Reserves Act 1977
- five leases are located on land declared as local purpose reserves. Eleven cover land under the Local Government Act 2002
- one lease is located on both reserve land under the Reserves Act 1977 and Local Government Act 2002 land
- five leases are unclassified but administered as recreation reserves
- the majority of reserves were accompanied by Reserve Management Plans and the majority of leases demonstrated activities that align with the Reserve Management Plans
- the majority of the Reserve Management Plans are outdated.

The desktop analysis revealed a number of issues relating to the approach to commercial activities:
- **lack of clarity** across council in terms of what are considered commercial activities compared to fundraising events
- **lack of data** about the type of commercial activities undertaken and how much revenue is generated from those activities
- **difficult to monitor** whether the commercial activities comply with the relevant legislation

---

9 Under the Community Grants Policy 2014, Auckland Council welcomes grant applications from social enterprises delivering outcomes for our communities. Social enterprises are hybrid organisations that trade goods and services in order to achieve their social, environmental, economic or cultural goals. There are a variety of legal structures which social enterprises can adopt, including Charitable Trusts and Incorporated Societies.
- **lack of flexibility** to amend standard lease terms and conditions to allow:
  - alternative income sources to be generated to fund maintenance or upgrades
  - shared use between multiple sports or with compatible community groups and the general public

- **lack of clarity** around the approach to social enterprise (community groups that run an effective business model and generate significant profits from council properties) compared to local clubs run by volunteers and operating on less than $10,000 of revenue per annum

- difficult to **maintain a balance between financial sustainability of the business and public accessibility**—many sport and recreation organisations undertake commercial activities to pay for costs and the revenue is often not re-invested to deliver community benefits.

---

10 Many reserves currently do not have the right classification under the Reserves Act 1977 or have an outdated Reserve Management Plan
4 Key findings from the targeted interviews and workshops

4.1 Summary of findings

Overall, feedback received during the Mana Whenua Forum, workshops and targeted interviews suggest that the guidelines have been working adequately.

Feedback from different groups tends to be consistent, with the exception being the level of rent charged. Sport and recreation organisations tend to think the current level of rent is fair whereas other groups support a higher rent to cover operational and maintenance costs.

A number of operational issues have been highlighted:

- efficiency issues – the lease process is long and time-consuming, even for renewals which normally lead to little or no change
- transparency and consistency issues regarding the Expression of Interest (EOI) process and local board decision-making
- lack of clarity around the approach to commercial activities – what is defined as commercial activities? How should they be monitored and whether a percentage of the profit should be charged as part of the rent (but consideration needs be had on sport organisations’ financial sustainability)?
- lack of reporting and monitoring – most clubs were unaware of the need to report annually on the community outcomes plan to the council
- lack of consideration about achieving the optimal use of the assets (such as shared-use)
- lack of consideration and monitoring of asset management in the lease agreements.

A list of suggestions made by the Mana Whenua Forum, sport and recreation organisations and council staff is provided in section 4.3.

More detailed feedback summary and verbatim quotes are presented in section 4.2.
4.2 Findings at each stage of the lease cycle

4.2.1 Application process

“More contact with the Lease Advisor is required.”
— sports and recreation organisation

“There needs to be more transparency around the application process.”
— council staff

Key feedback from sports and recreation organisations:

- the application process is very slow
- the application form is not user-friendly and requires clubs to provide the same information multiple times. This made preparing the application more time-consuming than necessary
- there are communication issues with some of the Lease Advisors caused by staff turnover and changes to the lease advisors’ lease portfolio.

Key feedback from council staff:

- there is lack of transparency about why sometimes an expression of interest process was not undertaken
- not all reserves are classified under the Reserves Act 1977 before the community lease is granted. Waiting for classification adds extra time to the application process.

4.2.2 Assessment & decision-making

“We should be paying more attention to the quality of the evidence/information that is attached to the applications.” — council staff

Key feedback from sports and recreation organisations:

- inconsistent decisions are made by local boards across the region around lease lengths

Key feedback from council staff included:

- there is lack of consideration of the quality of evidence contained in the applications.
- there is variation in:
  - the process adopted across local boards to make decisions
  - the criteria and weightings used to assess applications
  - the way the decisions are reported.
4.2.3 Terms and conditions

“We are satisfied with the peppercorn rent as this keeps the cost(s) down for the club so that they can focus on meeting their service needs.” – Sports and recreation organisation

“Nominal rent undercuts social outcomes when social enterprises operate on council land.”

“Staff should be given more direction around commercial activities for fundraising purposes.” – Council staff

Key feedback from sports and recreation organisations:

- rent and maintenance charges were fair as they allow clubs to focus on providing their activities
- there is a lack of flexibility in granting a longer-term lease to provide financial security and assurance for club
- there is a lack of consideration of:
  - optimal or shared use for facilities, particularly for multi-sport facilities.
  - alternative financial pathways (transfer hours of facility use to other user-groups to generate revenue, more events)
- sport and recreation organisation need more options to be able to financially sustainable, such as the ability to conduct more commercial activities.

Key feedback from council staff included:

- current level of rent is too low. However, sport and recreation organisations might cut back on building maintenance or come to council for grants if rent is increased
- market rate should be charged if significant revenue is generated or a significant portion of activity is designated as commercial use. Otherwise, revenue from commercial activities should be re-invested to support wider community outcomes
- there needs to be more consideration of the type and status of assets when setting maintenance fees. Currently, maintenance costs are charged per square metre based on the guidelines, without consideration of the actual costs of maintaining the building
- there needs to be a clearer distinction between community and commercial activities, especially around clubs‘ alternative revenue streams such as fundraising events.

4.2.4 Monitoring and reporting

“We need a clear message from council about the importance of tracking club activities.”

– Sports club

“Clubs need to be more transparent with their alternative revenue streams.”

– Council staff
Key feedback from sport and recreation organisations

- most clubs were unaware of the need to report annually on the community outcomes plan to council

Key feedback from council staff included:

- commercial activities in general are hard to monitor
  - there have been cases of organisations monopolising land or not utilising it for what it was originally granted (for example, bars, restaurants), resulting from a breakdown of the monitoring system in place
- there have been cases of organisations privatising their space and facilities to be utilised by club members only
- there is a lack of monitoring around sub-letting
- there is minimal monitoring of sport and recreation organisation's maintenance of their club-owned buildings. In some occasions club buildings reverted to council when the club could no longer operate, the lack of maintenance could bring a considerable financial burden to the council.

4.2.5 The Mana Whenua Forum workshop feedback

“The Mana Whenua Forum and Lease Advisor relationship should be more proactive on Lease Advisors part in learning about mana whenua’s cultural values.” – mana whenua

“It’s difficult for the Mana Whenua Forum to access and seek information on the application process and upcoming lease opportunities.” – mana whenua

Council staff engaged with the Mana Whenua Forum to gain specific feedback from a Māori perspective. Feedback received can be categorised into three main themes:

- **Application** – Māori groups find it hard to access leases. The public notification process is not considered to be widely publicised. There is often a lack of resources for marae groups which means these groups are unable to know what facilities are available and where and how to apply.

- **Decision making** – The Mana Whenua Forum wants to be engaged earlier in the leasing process and only feel they are engaged at the end when the decision has already been made. It was highlighted that there needs to form a stronger relationship between the forum and Lease Advisors.

- **Outcomes for Māori** – It is not clear whether leases are delivering positive outcomes for Māori.
### 4.3 List of suggestions

A list of potential changes from council staff, sport organisations and Mana Whenua are summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Inconsistency in the current processes** | • Standardise forms and processes for:  
- Expression of interest  
- site visits and building assessments  
- lease assessments  
- internal and external consultation and engagement  
- engagement with local boards  
- engagement with the Mana Whenua Forum  
- annual reporting and review  

- Standardise review and approval process to ensure quality and consistency across local boards  
- Provide training and mentoring programmes for new operations staff |
| **Lack of documentation and reporting of key decisions** | • Provide training and standardise templates and processes for documentation and reporting of key local board decisions such as:  
- the process to generate a pool of potential candidates  
- the assessment criteria for selecting the final candidate including consideration on the underlying land value, public/private benefits expected from the candidate  
- the terms and conditions of the lease agreement and whether they deviate from the guidelines  
- compliance with the Local Government Act  

- Standardise review and approval processes to ensure consistency across local boards |
| **Lack of clarity around the treatment of commercial activities** | • Further work to determine the definition and approach to commercial activities (with consideration of the Reserves Act 1977)  
• Updated the guidelines to provide more clarity for staff and sport organisations around what commercial activities are permitted |
| **Reporting and monitoring issues** | • Introduce a service agreement in community leases that encompasses:  
- the **Community Outcomes Plan**  
- an **asset management plan** for land and buildings owned by council and leaseholders, which details roles and responsibilities for maintenance and upgrades  
- **financial data** of the community group including profits generated from the site  
- **utilisation data**: either for sport and recreation activities (by members, public or through the shared use with other compatible codes) or other uses (e.g. sub-leasing, hirage and commercial activities such as café, restaurants and gambling machines)  

- Introduce mandatory annual reporting and reviewing processes to monitor the service agreement |
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Executive Summary

This report presents Part Two of a two-part summary of findings from the review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 (the guidelines).

**PART ONE: How have the guidelines been applied?**
- Desktop assessment of 70 sport and recreation leases granted after 2012
- Targeted interviews with council staff and sport and recreation organisations

**PART TWO: How do the guidelines compare with others?**
- Literature review of community lease policies and guidelines of two New Zealand, three Australian and three Canadian local authorities

**Part Two** covers findings from a literature review to assess how Auckland Council’s guidelines compare with community lease policies and guidelines of other local authorities in New Zealand, Australia and Canada.

**Key findings**

Overall, the results show that Auckland Council’s guidelines are similar to the policies and guidelines of the other local authorities studied.

The greatest difference highlighted is the level of rent. Auckland Council charges a lower level of rent compared to the other local authorities. Some local authorities in New Zealand charge a much higher rent, but provide a subsidy if the site is open for public access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rent determination scheme</th>
<th>Charge for $200m² building on 500m² land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>$1 for land, no charge for buildings</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton City Council</td>
<td>Charge per square metre for land and buildings, with a subsidy of 87.5% or more if provide public access</td>
<td>Up to $2,595 for land and $20,000 for building (without subsidy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington City Council</td>
<td>Charge per square metre for land and buildings, with a subsidy of 86.67% or more if provide public access</td>
<td>Up to $700 for land and $320 for building (without subsidy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below summarises the similarities and differences and the approach undertaken by other local authorities.
### Evaluation of Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012: Findings and recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Summary of findings</th>
<th>Approach undertaken by others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application process</td>
<td>Most use a similar application process as Auckland Council</td>
<td>• A detailed application process map describing each stage of the process <em>(The City of Calgary, Canada)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Assessment              | Most use similar assessment criteria as Auckland Council Some include additional criteria, with additional information to explain what the criteria mean | • Other criteria include:  
  - strategic alignment with respective sport codes or other umbrella organisation strategic directions *(Wellington City Council)*  
  - optimal use of land/building *(Wellington City Council)* such as a ‘Sportsville’ or amalgamation model *(Hamilton City Council)*  
  • A set of questions provided for each criterion to step the lease advisors through the key components of each criterion *(Wellington City Council)* |
| Terms and conditions    | **Lease length** – a range of lengths offered. Many do not give a right of renewal  | • Maximum lease term range between 4-15 years  
  • No right of renewal *(Hamilton, Wellington, Toronto, Logan City, City of Stornington, Brisbane and Calgary)*                                                                                                               |
|                         | **Rent** – most charge a higher level of rent compared to Auckland Council         | • Standard rent of $10 per year *(Toronto, Calgary and Vancouver)*  
  • Standard rent of $10 plus $1000 for community groups with a liquor licence *(Logan City)*  
  • Different charges apply per square metre with a subsidy *(Hamilton and Wellington)*  
  • Rent subsidy grants *(Brisbane)*                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                         | **Sub-leasing** – generally permitted subject to the council approval             | • Subleasing not permitted *(Brisbane, Hamilton and Wellington)*                                                                                                                                                            |
|                         | **Commercial activities (including alcohol and gambling)** – generally not permitted | • Commercial activities permitted *(Logan City, Toronto, Brisbane)*                                                                                                                                                       |
| Monitoring and reporting| Reporting requirements – most request more information from community groups compared to Auckland Council | Additional information required includes:  
  • Utilisation data regarding membership numbers, one-off hireage, sub-leasing and shared-use with public and with other compatible community groups *(Logan City, Hamilton and Wellington)*  
  • Financial reports of the past and coming year *(Vancouver, Hamilton and Wellington)*  
  • Progress report of facility’s lifecycle study *(Calgary)*                                                                                                                                                           |
|                         | **Termination clause** – some allow termination with written notice              | • Termination with written notice *(Calgary and Vancouver)*  
  • Termination clause in favour of council *(Toronto)*                                                                                                                                                                   |
Indigenous framework

Canadian local authorities were selected because of their approach to considering the rights of indigenous people. The results show many similarities with the Auckland Council approach in terms of:

- recognising the importance of indigenous peoples’ treaty rights
- maintaining government-indigenous relationships
- the requirement to consult indigenous groups during the leasing process, particularly relating to land use planning and development processes.

Next steps

The Part Two summary of findings will be considered alongside Part One summary of findings to form recommendations on the council’s future direction for community leases and any changes to the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the literature review
The literature review aims to provide insights to national and international good practice for community leases.

In particular, it aims to:

- increase Auckland Council’s understanding of how its guidelines compare with other local government authorities, both nationally and internationally
- identify the common lease components that define the community lease process and the rationale for the components selected
- provide an evidence base of good practice examples and implications for further policy work.

The findings of the literature review provide a range of suggestions to improve the guidelines and the current process for managing community leases. These should be considered alongside Part One summary of findings.

The literature review forms part of the analysis for the review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012. Further information about the guidelines and the scope of the review is provided in section 1 of the Part One summary of findings.

Section 2 of this report presents the methodology used for the literature review.

Section 3 of this report presents details from the local authorities in New Zealand, Australia and Canada.
2. Methodology

The literature reviews involves a desktop analysis of community lease policies and guidelines of other local authorities. Information provided in the policies and guidelines for each stage of the lease cycle was compared to information provided in Auckland Council’s Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012.

Selection of countries
Nine local government authorities were chosen for the literature review.

- New Zealand
  - Hamilton City Council
  - Wellington City Council

- Australia
  - Brisbane City Council
  - City of Stonnington
  - Logan City Council

- Canada
  - City of Calgary (Alberta)
  - Toronto City Council (Ontario)
  - City of Vancouver (British Columbia)

New Zealand local authorities
Wellington City Council and Hamilton City Council were chosen as they are considered most similar to Auckland Council. Christchurch City Council was not included due to lack of information available online.

The two city councils face similar urban issues as Auckland Council such as land supply constraints and lack of open space.

However, Auckland Council may face more complicated challenges. In particular:

- Auckland has a much larger number of leases (over 14,000), compared to around 100 leases in Hamilton.
- decision-making in Auckland is delegated to 21 local boards, which means maintaining consistency and transparency is more difficult compared to other New Zealand local authorities, where decisions are made by one governing body
- there is inconsistency amongst leases in Auckland due to different legacy council approaches.

Australian local authorities
Three urban Australian councils were chosen as they are considered to be similar to Auckland Council, compared to small local councils in outback communities. Similarities to Auckland Council include the rate of multicultural diversity, council consolidations, issues of urbanisation and intensification, and an emphasis on providing services to communities using local amenities.
Canadian local authorities
Three urban Canadian councils were chosen to study how their policies respond to the
needs of indigenous people.¹

The Canadian municipalities have built a comprehensive system of leasing community
spaces. The consistent aim of municipal lease policy is to establish guidelines for
community leases that deliver services and programmes in alignment with municipality
services and programmes.

Limitations
The literature review heavily relied on publicly available information on the internet.
Where possible, council staff have engaged with staff from other local authorities via email,
skype conversations or questionnaires to gain qualitative information on the effectiveness of
their policies and guidelines.

¹ The Canadian local council authorities are specifically focused on examples of community association and
social recreation lease policies.
3. Key findings

3.1 Policies versus guidelines

3.1.1 New Zealand local authorities

Decision-making

Decisions for community leases are guided by different documents in the New Zealand local authorities included in the case studies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local authorities</th>
<th>Decisions are guided by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington City Council</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton City Council</td>
<td>Both policy and guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key difference between policy and guidelines is the decision-maker is obligated to make decisions consistent with policy, but have discretion to deviate from their guidelines.

In Auckland Council, guidelines are used by the 21 local boards due their delegated responsibilities for local parks and reserves. Local boards have discretion to deviate from the guidelines and consider applications on a case-by-case basis.

Content

The content of the Wellington and Hamilton City Council policies are similar to Auckland Council’s guidelines but include a set of principles to guide decisions.

The common themes for the principles in the Wellington and Hamilton City Councils include:

- best practice principles such as equity, fairness, transparency and consistency
- alignment with council’s strategic goals
- delivery of community outcomes
- compliance with legislation and terms and conditions in the lease agreements
- promotion of shared use to ensure the council assets are effectively utilised.

Notable differences are:

- Wellington City Council requires:
  - community benefits to be maximised
  - collaborative relationship between council and lease, flexible approach to respond to changes and demand, and land and building to be responsibly managed.
3.1.2 International local authorities studied

Decision-making

Decisions for community leases are mainly guided by policies in the six international councils, with the exception of Brisbane City Council.

Decision-making delegation differs across the case studies:

- Logan City Council - decisions on new leases and renewals are made by the Community Services Manager, with recommendations from a lease advisory group
- Calgary and Vancouver - decisions are made by the councils.
- Toronto - decisions on new leases are made by the council but renewals decisions are delegated to the Chief Corporate Officer in consultation with other internal staff.

Content

The content covered in the policies and guidelines in the international councils are similar to Auckland Council guidelines. Most of them include principles similar to Auckland’s such strategic alignment, outcome delivery, best practice and promotion of shared use.

3.2 Application process

3.2.1 New Zealand local authorities

Process

The application process is similar across the three New Zealand councils.

1. Community groups submit an applications to the council
2. Council staff meet with the community group to discuss the application
3. Council staff assess the applications based on the principles and assessment criteria outlined within the policies or guidelines (more information on the criteria is provided in section 3.3)
4. Council staff provide advice and recommendations to the relevant decision-making bodies (local boards or councillors)
5. The decision-making body makes decisions at a formal business meeting.

A notable difference is the Hamilton City lease policy requires the community group to make initial contact with a Council Property Officer.

Sometimes the process might involve extra steps depending on the land classifications of the reserves included in the leases. Additional time is required if:

- the land is not classified or the classification needs to change
- the reserve has no Reserve Management Plan
- if planned activity is not anticipated in the Reserve Management Plan or sits outside of the Council’s delegations under the Reserves Act 1977.
Expression of interest (EOI)

Sometimes an application process starts with an EOI to generate a pool of interested applicants for a new or recently vacant site. The EOI process is similar across the three New Zealand councils studied:

- community groups wishing to apply for a community lease may register their interest by contacting the council
- when there is a new or vacant site identified, organisations on the council’s interest register will be contacted directly. Other means of contacting potential applicants include online media, local papers and public advertisement
- councils have discretion to work with one community group if there is an obviously suitable applicant for the site
- existing leaseholders, especially those who own the building, can apply for a new lease without a public expression of interest (EOI)
- an EOI process is not always required unless there is significant public interest or it is requested by the local board. Councils often have discretion to work with one organisation without running an EOI process if that organisation is identified as a suitable candidate.

3.2.2 International local authorities studied

Process
The application process in the international councils is similar to the Auckland Council process. One notable difference is the Canadian examples provide specific process maps.

Expression of interest (EOI)
All international councils include EOI as part of the application process.

The Australian councils conduct a closed EOI process involving community organisations on council’s interest registry.

The Canadian examples seek application through public advertisement and an open EOI process. It is unclear whether they also use an interest registry.

3.3 Assessment

3.3.1 New Zealand local authorities
The criteria for assessing lease applicant cover themes such as:

- meeting council objectives and delivering community outcomes
- utilisation of the land/building, including membership/user numbers
- good financial position and track records with council
- if on reserves, compliance with reserve classifications and reserve management plans
- suitability of the site, in terms of location, physical characteristics, accessibility, and potential impact on adjoining land and other users, statutory requirements, costs required to alter site to accommodate the group.

Notable differences are:

- Hamilton City Council also requires the services and activities to align with strategic directions of respective sport codes or umbrella organisations

- both Wellington City Council and Hamilton City Council stress optimal use of land and or buildings. Wellington City Council particularly encourages a ‘Sportsville’ or amalgamation model

- each of the Wellington City Council criterion is followed by a set of questions to step lease advisors through key components of the criteria, this helps provide additional clarity and transparency.

The table below summarises the type of criteria used by New Zealand councils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Auckland</th>
<th>Hamilton City</th>
<th>Wellington City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council's strategic objectives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of community benefits</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic alignment with sport codes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting the needs of local community</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open membership</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared use</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial viability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with the Reserve Act</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated good track records</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability of the site</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.2 International local authorities studied

The criteria used to assess the six international councils covers themes similar to the three New Zealand councils studied.

Other criteria include: the ability to meet performance requirements, appropriate organisational structure, compliance with legislation, promotion of equal access, community collaboration and partnerships.²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Logan City</th>
<th>City of Stonnington</th>
<th>Brisbane City</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council’s strategic objectives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of community benefits</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of equal access</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting the needs of local community</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet performance requirements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration of good track records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial viability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate organisation structure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community collaboration and partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Terms and conditions

3.4.1 New Zealand local authorities

There are a number of differences between the three New Zealand councils in the terms and conditions of lease agreements. Notable differences are the length of lease terms and rental charges.

² Information for criteria used in Toronto and Calgary is not available online.
Length of lease terms

The three New Zealand councils offer different lengths of term. The key difference is Hamilton City Council does not offer a right of renewal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Auckland</th>
<th>Hamilton City</th>
<th>Wellington City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Lease Term</strong></td>
<td>Five years plus a further five years of right of renewal for council owned land and building</td>
<td>Maximum occupancy five to 15 years</td>
<td>10 years plus 10 years of right of renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ten years plus a further 10 years of right of renewal for council land with community group-owned building</td>
<td>No right of renewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shorter term for newly established community groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rent and maintenance fee

All three local authorities charge rental and maintenance fees. Auckland Council charges a lower level of rent compared to the other two New Zealand local authorities.

The methods used to determine the level of rent also differs. Auckland Council charges a standard $1 dollar regardless of the size and condition of the land and building. In contrast, Hamilton City Council and Wellington City Council use a sliding scale method\(^3\) to charge rental per square metre, with a subsidy if public access is provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Auckland</th>
<th>Hamilton City</th>
<th>Wellington City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard rent for land and building</strong></td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>Charges per square metre, different rates apply for different categories of building (categories 1-6)</td>
<td>Charges per square metre Rent is subject to annual reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rent is subject to annual reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rent Formula</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sliding Scale</td>
<td>Sliding Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rent Subsidy</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>87.5% (more if the facility is open to the public)</td>
<td>87.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance fee</strong></td>
<td>Charges apply per square metre for council building only. Different charges apply to exclusive and non-exclusive use</td>
<td>Maintenance fees are calculated on a proportional basis</td>
<td>Fees apply per square metre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another notable difference is Hamilton City Council applies different rental charges depending on the quality of the building. For a category 1 building (high amenity, good location, high market value, good quality, good tenant demand) the charge per square metre is higher.

\(^3\) For example, the rental for 500m\(^2\) of land would be calculated at $1.60 for the first 250m\(^2\) and $1.20 for the remaining 250m\(^2\). This equates to a rental of $700 per annum plus GST or $1.40 per square metre overall.
Hamilton City Council charges a higher rate per square metre compared to Wellington City Council. The table below compares the rental charge for a leasing a 200m² council building on 500m² council land.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Council</strong></td>
<td>$1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hamilton City Council</strong></td>
<td>$575  ~  $22,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wellington City Council</strong></td>
<td>$156  ~  $1,173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other uses of sites

The approaches taken for other uses are similar across the three New Zealand councils. Subleasing and commercial activities (including gambling and alcohol sales) are generally permitted, but need prior approval. They must also be subject to compliance with the reserve classifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Auckland</th>
<th>Hamilton City</th>
<th>Wellington City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-leasing</strong></td>
<td>Not permitted, needs approval</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not permitted, needs approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casual hires permissible, so long as they comply with Auckland Council’s hireage policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial activities</strong></td>
<td>Not permitted, need approval and need to comply with Reserves Act 1997</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not permitted, needs approval and compliance with Reserves Act 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gambling and alcohol</strong></td>
<td>Needs approval, only on certain land classifications, mostly applied to sport clubs for members and visitors Special events need council’s consent</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Needs approval, a special licence and council’s consent required for variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casual hire</strong></td>
<td>Permitted, but requires prior written approval of the council and the Sport, Leisure, and Facilities Manager</td>
<td>Permitted for approved purposes, subject to council approval.</td>
<td>Permitted hire of all halls on any day Commercial hire applies to all halls and meeting room bookings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.2 International local authorities studied

The Australian and Canadian councils studied share similar lease agreement terms and conditions with the Auckland Council guidelines, except rent determination methods and length of term are different.
Length of lease term

The international councils show differences in the maximum length of term allowed and whether a right of renewal is provided.

Australian examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Logan City</th>
<th>City of Stonnington</th>
<th>Brisbane City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Lease Term</strong></td>
<td>A preferred term of five years</td>
<td>Standard term of five years, which is negotiable by considering particular circumstances of the facility and the tenant.</td>
<td>Maximum term four years, which is seldom negotiable Standard licence term is one year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canadian examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Toronto</th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Lease Term</strong></td>
<td>Lease term varies (two years or five years) depending on the tenancy type (there are three types)</td>
<td>Maximum term of 15 years</td>
<td>Maximum term of five years, renewable for two further five-year terms Council approval is required for a lease with a term that exceeds ten years including renewals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rent and maintenance fee

The levels of fees and charges vary across international councils studied. Most charge a low level of rent. A notable difference is Logan City Council, which charges $1000 for organisations with a full liquor licence.

The methods used to determine fees and charges are different too. Some set a standard rent while others apply charges per square metre with subsidy. A notable difference is Vancouver Council which provides rent subsidy grants for non-profit agencies.

Australian examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Logan City</th>
<th>City of Stonnington</th>
<th>Brisbane City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard rent for land</strong></td>
<td>$1 for community organisations $1000 increased by inflation on renewal of the lease term for organisations with a full liquor licence Special rate for organisations to which council has made significant capital contributions</td>
<td>Market rent</td>
<td>Eight different levels of fees and charges schedule Rent is determined on the basis of the facility type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation of Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012: Findings and recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 10</th>
<th>Logan City</th>
<th>City of Stonnington</th>
<th>Brisbane City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rent formula</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rent subsidy</strong></td>
<td>Rent subsidy applies (but not publicly available)</td>
<td>Subsidy available (peppercorn or discounted market rent) Level of subsidy depends on performance against criteria such as strategic alignment, public access, use of volunteers and external funding</td>
<td>Generally no rent subsidy but evidence of hardship may build the case for a rent subsidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance fee</strong></td>
<td>Audited every three years and determined by the Council</td>
<td>Council generally assumes some responsibility for facility maintenance costs but reserves the right to negotiate structural and other maintenance responsibilities and costs</td>
<td>Tenant responsibilities include repairs and maintenance of the facility Additional charges may also be applicable under each particular lease or tenure arrangement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Canadian examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Toronto</th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>$10 payable in advance of the commencement date</td>
<td>$10 payable in advance of the commencement date</td>
<td>$10 payable in advance of the commencement date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Formula</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Subsidy</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Rent subsidy grants available for non-profit agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance fee</td>
<td>Tenant agrees to make repairs and/or replacements to the premises arising from or caused by the operations of the lease</td>
<td>A lifecycle study for facility which specifies the repair and maintenance requirements</td>
<td>Fees apply per square metre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other uses of the site

The international examples generally permit subleasing and commercial activities, subject to prior approval.

Notable differences are:

- Logan City Council charges $1000 in rent per year for a full alcohol licence or $230 per gaming machine
- City of Stonnington strictly prohibits gambling
- Brisbane City Council requires community groups to demonstrate the community benefits of commercial activities (for example, personal training, sports and fitness, and classes that could improve the life skills, health and well-being of participants).

### Australian examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Logan City</th>
<th>City of Stonnington</th>
<th>Brisbane City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-leasing</strong></td>
<td>Permitted if approved by the council’s lease advisory group</td>
<td>Permitted for approved purposes, subject to council approval</td>
<td>Lessees may not transfer, sublet, or dispose of their interest in a lease without prior written approval from the council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial activities</strong></td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Permitted subject to council approval and demonstration of community benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gambling and alcohol</strong></td>
<td>Permitted but needs to pay $1000 in rent per year for a full alcohol licence or $230 per gaming machine, whichever is higher</td>
<td>Gaming not permitted. Liquor licence applications require council approval and must only be applied after prior council consent.</td>
<td>Permitted, with terms and conditions which stipulate alignment with outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casual hire</strong></td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Permitted for approved purposes, subject to council approval</td>
<td>Permitted hire of all halls on any day Commercial hire applies to all hall and meeting room bookings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Canadian examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Toronto</th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-leasing</strong></td>
<td>Permitted but subject to prior approval from the council Notices of lease and sublease required</td>
<td>Permitted but subject to the Public Use Policy such as facilities must be accessible to the public without discrimination and at a reasonable fee</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial activities</strong></td>
<td>Permitted subject prior approval from the Division Head</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>No mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gambling and alcohol</strong></td>
<td>Permitted but needs approval from the council</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Needs approval from the council, special licence and landowner consent required for variation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Monitoring and reporting

3.4.1. New Zealand local authorities

All three New Zealand councils require annual reporting or reviews, but the requirements vary:

- Both Auckland Council and Hamilton City Council require a community outcomes plan to monitor the delivery of community outcomes.
- Auckland Council requires organisations’ annual reports with no specific requirements on the content whereas:
  - Hamilton City Council asks for forecast budget and reports on usage rates
  - Wellington City Council asks specific questions to ensure community groups continue to meet the criteria throughout tenure, such as detailed information about membership and usage, community events, hireage, financial information and work as scheduled in the maintenance plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Auckland</th>
<th>Hamilton City</th>
<th>Wellington City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Reporting</td>
<td>Annual report plus Community Outcomes Plan, subject to annual performance reviews to ensure the community benefits identified in the Community Outcomes Plan are being realised</td>
<td>Annual accounts, next year budget, Community Outcomes Plan, report on usage rates</td>
<td>Annual reporting to ensure meeting criteria throughout tenure such as membership and usage, community events, hireage, financial information and work as scheduled in the maintenance plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Termination clause          | Council reserves the right to investigate and terminate an occupancy agreement on notice if the land is required for another purpose or when a community organisation is found to:
  - be in significant breach of agreement and relevant legislation
  - consistently fail to achieve the outcomes outlined in the agreed Community Outcomes Plan
  - have poor governance
  - undertake illegal activities | Not mentioned                                                             | Shorter tenure if decline in activity, council anticipating alternative use, building life expectancy, new contracts, management plan |

Common issue for monitoring and reporting

Discussion with staff at Wellington City Council and Hamilton City Council highlighted outcome measurement as a key challenge.

Hamilton City Council, which has a similar monitoring and reporting process as Auckland Council noted difficulty in drafting the community outcomes plan. Without clear guidance on how it should be written, staff and sport clubs often do not have the knowledge and capability to write a structured plan. Monitoring progress of the plans could then become a pure compliance exercise.
There is a general issue of limited staff capacity for carry out monitoring and reporting as agreed in the agreements. In the case of Hamilton City Council, a lease advisor is expected to oversee around 100 leases.

3.4.2. International local authorities studied

All international councils require annual reporting and reviews. Common elements in the annual reports are similar to the three New Zealand councils including:

- financial statements (previous and coming years)
- a summary of past and planned activities on the premise
- business plan
- evidence of facility maintenance.

Notable differences are:

- the Australian and Canadian examples include clauses that allow leases to be terminated with written notice (30-day notice for Calgary Council)
- evidence of activating spaces and engaging with local communities is required for Logan City Council
- financial statements are audited by Calgary Council. An Annual review is undertaken on the lifecycle study submitted by the tenant for maintaining and upgrading land and facilities
- annual reporting is done online in Brisbane City Council.

Australian examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Logan City</th>
<th>City of Stonnington</th>
<th>Brisbane City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual reporting</strong></td>
<td>Annual reports detailing compliance with key performance indicators, legislation, evidence of activating spaces and engaging with local communities, financial statements and evidence of maintenance</td>
<td>Annual reports against the eligibility criteria</td>
<td>Completion of the Community Facilities Annual Evaluation and Committee Update online form, maintenance inspections and annual financial reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Termination clause</strong></td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Lease may be terminated at Council's request if unauthorised subletting by the tenant is found</td>
<td>Lease may be terminated at Council's request if unauthorised subletting by the tenant is found</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canadian examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Toronto</th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual reporting</strong></td>
<td>Annual report in a format determined by the council</td>
<td>Business plan, progress against lifecycle study and status of the repairs.</td>
<td>Financial statements for previous and coming years, summary of past and planned activities for the coming year, evidence of a functioning governing board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Termination clause</strong></td>
<td>May be terminated at the discretion of the council upon 60 day written notice</td>
<td>May be terminated at the discretion of the council upon 30 day written notice</td>
<td>Agreement may be terminated with written notice (varies with type of lease arrangement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Indigenous framework

Particular focus was placed on the Canadian councils for their approach to indigenous people. The results show many similarities with the Auckland Council approach in terms of:

- recognising the importance of indigenous people’s treaty rights
- maintaining government- indigenous relationships
- the requirement to consult indigenous groups particularly relating to land use planning and development process.

Indigenous Policy Frameworks exist across the three Canadian examples as a guide to establish procedures to:

- guide council on how best to listen to, learn from, and act on ways forward together with indigenous communities in planning, advising and decision-making
- strengthen council’s understanding, relationships, and opportunities with Treaty 7 First Nations on matters of historical, traditional, and cultural significance due to their traditional territory
- strengthen council’s understanding, relationships, and opportunities with indigenous communities on matters of contemporary significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Toronto</th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Indigenous engagement** | Recognition of aboriginal peoples’ a unique legal and constitutional position in Canada  
Affirmation of this unique position in the city’s vision statement on access, equity and diversity | Indigenous Policy Framework Engagement clause: sustained dialogue with Treaty 7 First Nations and urban indigenous communities, leadership and organisations should assist in determining the nature of the matter of significance requiring engagement | City staff play an important role in helping indigenous communities gain access to services, overcome barriers, and have a voice in civic government |

4 Toronto City Council (2015) Statement of Commitment to the Aboriginal Communities of Toronto  
Calgary City Council (2017) Indigenous Policy Framework for The City of Calgary  
### Attachment C: Detailed proposed changes

**Improvement 1: Introduce an outcome evaluation framework to assist decision-making and monitoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Current practice</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>What will be different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Applicants are required to complete a Community Outcomes Plan that outlines the benefits expected from the lease and key performance measures. As part of the application, applicants are also asked to provide current membership data.</td>
<td>The quality of the Community Outcomes Plans varies greatly. There is often no clear link to the council's strategic priorities. Lack of clarity around how Māori outcomes could be considered and measured. No expectations set on:  - site utilisation  - asset management  - financial performance of the community groups.</td>
<td>Add additional questions in the application form on:  - site utilisation  - community outcomes (and alignment with the council's strategic priorities)  - benefits for Māori  - financial data  - asset management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Council staff conduct assessment based on consultation feedback and information provided in the application form. Some staff use an assessment matrix (a set of weighted criteria).</td>
<td>No standard assessment framework adopted. The quality and coverage of the assessment vary greatly. There are often gaps in information provided in the application forms which make robust assessment difficult.</td>
<td>Adopt an standard assessment framework across Auckland which includes:  - an agreed set of assessment criteria  - further analysis of:    - costs and benefits (CBAx)    - changes in service level    - public/private benefits    - strategic alignment    - asset network provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td>Local boards make final decisions based on staff advice.</td>
<td>Local boards often do not have sufficient information when making decisions.</td>
<td>Improvements in the assessment stage will improve the quality of staff advice and inform local board decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Staff are expected to conduct annual reviews of the Community Outcomes Plan.</td>
<td>Annual reviews are not always conducted. The Community Outcomes Plans do not always set the right expectations or include meaningful performance measures that link to council’s strategic priorities.</td>
<td>Set the right expectations from the application stage and continue to monitor:  - site utilisation  - financial data particularly revenue generated from the site  - community outcomes and Māori benefits delivered  - asset status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Improvement 2: Increase transparency, consistency, financial sustainability and equity of the leasing process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Current practice</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>What will be different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Not all new leases have an expression of interest (EOI) process</td>
<td>Feedback from stakeholders suggest some communities do not have sufficient information about community leases and hence, have missed out on opportunities to apply and access open spaces and community facilities</td>
<td>Clarify the process and requirements for consultation in the guidelines in consultation with local boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consistency and transparency      | There is currently no standard decision-making framework or processes. Local boards often do not have sufficient information during the decision-making process, such as the costs and benefits relating to each community lease and the underlying land value | Variance in staff advice Variance in local board decision-making | Ensure consistency of staff advice by standardising internal forms and processes for:  
  - Expressions of Interest (EOI)  
  - site visits and building assessments  
  - internal and external consultation and engagement  
  - lease assessments  
  - annual reporting and reviews  
  Introduce a standard outcome evaluation framework to assist decision-making (as presented in improvement 1) |
|                                  |                                                                                 | Variance in reporting and documentation of key local board decisions | Standardise the reporting templates and documentation of key local board decisions |
|                                  |                                                                                 | Variance in the approach to commercial activities | Review the council’s approach to commercial activities, particularly regarding the sale of alcohol and gambling  
  Clarify the approach to commercial activities in the |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Current practice</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>What will be different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>different types of community organisations should be treated</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review guidelines in consultation with local boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• how to conduct assessments under the Reserves Act 1977 and/or Local Government Act 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review compliance with council’s strategies and policies on alcohol use and gambling¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial sustainability</td>
<td>Auckland Council charges peppercorn rental (often at $1) for community leases</td>
<td>The council is unable to fund the administration costs of community leases (approximately $3710 per annum) through the rent revenue This cost is currently funded by rates</td>
<td>Review the mechanism for rental charge based on feedback from local boards, stakeholders and communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012

Terms of Reference

1.0 Background

Auckland Council has over 1,400 community leases with community organisations that:

- serve a wide range of purposes (sport, recreation, art, culture, community etc.)
- are on different types of land (parks, reserves, camping/recreation ground etc.)
- have different ownership structures (for example: council-owned land with buildings owned by a sport club).

Leases allow community organisations to operate on council properties, mostly with peppercorn rent. In return, leaseholders are expected to deliver community benefits that align with the council’s wider outcomes and priorities.

Auckland Council introduced the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 to assist decision-making and to provide an overview of the process and the standard terms and conditions of new lease agreements.

Around 90 per cent of current community leases were granted by legacy councils before 2012. They continue to be subject to the terms and conditions of the original lease agreements until they expire.

The terms of reference set out the objectives, scope, methodology and timelines for a review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012.

2.0 Project objectives

The objectives of the review are to:

- assess the efficacy of the guidelines in helping the council deliver the best possible outcomes for Auckland through community leases
- improve the guidelines to ensure consistency in assessing, granting and managing leases.

3.0 Scope

The review will aim to gain a good understanding of the current state of council’s investment through community leases with a special focus on:

- the types of public and private benefits delivered through community leases and the alignment with council’s strategic goals
- the regional and inter-generational implications of long-term leases
- the range of operating and business models adopted by sport organisations
2.1 Out-of-scope

Commercial leases are out-of-scope as they are not aimed at delivering community benefits and are subject to different operating practices and processes.

2.2 Project dependencies

The project team will ensure the results and recommendations of the review are linked with the current work to improve the SAP system (where lease data is stored) and the development of an outcome measurement tool for council’s sport investment.

3.0 Methodology

The review will be conducted in two stages.

3.1 Stage One – review of leases granted under the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012

Staff will review all leases granted since 2012. The review will consider the application of the guidelines at each stage of the lease cycle.

There are around 150 leases that fall within the scope.

Table 1 below provides the indicative questions to consider during the review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lease cycle</th>
<th>Indicative questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Percentage of applications that follow the application processes specified in the guidelines? Where processes vary, in what ways do they vary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentages of applications that provided sufficient information as required by the guidelines? In particular:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the activities, services or programmes the applicant provides that align with strategic outcomes and local board plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• how the needs of community identified in the local board area will be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evidence of applicant’s viability to deliver its services or activities through voluntary contributions, and/or financial commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>What assessment criteria were considered when granting the leases and whether they are consistent with the criteria specified in the guidelines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of decisions made by the local board that deviate from the advice provided by staff, and the reasons why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease agreement</td>
<td>Decisions made by the local board on the terms and conditions of the leases and whether they are different to the advice provided by staff? If so, why and how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the final lease agreement comply with the guidelines?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lease cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of lease agreements that include a Community Outcomes Plan as required by the guidelines? What the plans contain?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of leaseholders that have submitted annual reports as part of the requirement of Community Outcomes Plan? How adequately these provide monitoring information?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of leases that had annual review? What those reviews identified and how leases were amended?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of annual reports that have been audited and monitored over time? What were the results? Did the results inform future renewal decisions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the termination clauses been exercised? If so, what were the circumstances?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the expectations (for example, community benefits) set in the last lease agreement been met? In what ways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the terms and conditions for renewal?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 Stage Two – evaluation of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012

Stage Two will build on the findings from Stage One to evaluate the current guidelines.

A literature review will be undertaken on international good practice. It will compare the process and outcomes in each stage of the council lease cycle against international case studies.

The project team will also build on the findings from the Facility Partnerships Project about leaseholders’ perspective on the benefits and disadvantages that they might face in regards to leases. This will be supplemented by targeted interviews with a range of existing leaseholders and elected members to gain more qualitative feedback.

The following list of evaluation principles will be used to assist the evaluation. They are based on the best practice principles developed by Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) for projects and programmes evaluation.1

### Table 2: Evaluation principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>The practice and process should be consistent with council’s current policy, operating and financial practice and meet the requirements of leaseholders and the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Principle** | **Description**  
--- | ---  
**Impact** | Community leases should contribute to local community well-being, local board plans and wider council strategic goals and priorities. Clear reporting and monitoring requirements to measure progress against the desired outcomes.  
**Effectiveness** | Community leases should assist council deliver the best outcomes possible (for example, social, economic and environmental) from the council properties. This includes consideration of alternative use of the council assets.  
**Efficiency** | The outcomes delivered should be considered against the cost and resources spent.  
**Transparency & consistency** | Decisions on leases should be consistent across local boards, with full disclosure of the assessment criteria, processes, results and outcomes.  
**Equity** | Community leases should support equity of outcomes for all people.  
**Financial sustainability** | There needs to be consideration of how ongoing operating costs, renewals and other capital expenses for the council properties are addressed in the leases, while also ensuring public accessibility and affordability.  

### 4.0 Timeline and deliverables

The key deliverables for this project and the target dates for delivery are set out in Table 3 below.

#### Table 3: Timelines and deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable / milestones</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report to the Environment and Community Committee seeking approval of the Terms of Reference</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Stage One</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable: Summary report of Stage One review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Stage Two</td>
<td>February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable: A findings report that consist of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• summary of the literature scan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• summary results of the evaluation of current guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• any proposed changes to improve the guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with key stakeholders and local boards for their views on the findings report</td>
<td>March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings report to the Environment and Community Committee seeking approval of any proposed changes to the guidelines for approval</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To provide the Environment and Community Committee with the 2017/18 Annual Report for the Regional Parkland at Port Fitzroy, Aotea (Glenfern Sanctuary) and give an update on the feasibility assessment for the establishment of a Great Barrier Island education/research centre proposed to be located on the park.

2. Members of the Glenfern Sanctuary Trust Management Trust will be speaking during the public input section of the agenda regarding the 2017/18 Annual Report for the Regional Parkland at Port Fitzroy, Aotea (Glenfern Sanctuary).

3. To provide a public record of memos, workshop or briefing papers that have been distributed for the Committee’s information since 16 October 2018.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

4. This is regular information-only report which aims to provide public visibility of information circulated to committee members via memo or other means, where no decisions are required.

5. The following papers/memos were circulated to members:
   - 20181012_Memo re: Central government led at-risk catchment project (Central government May 2018 report)
   - 20181018_Update on the NZ Defence Force Whenuapai PFAS investigation
   - 20181019_Memo_re: new swimming season 2018/19
   - 20181029_Update on Central government led Essential Freshwater work programme.

   Note that staff will not be present to answer questions about the items referred to in this summary. Committee members should direct any questions to the authors.

6. This document can be found on the Auckland Council website, at the following link: http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/
   - at the top of the page, select meeting “Environment and Community Committee” from the drop-down tab and click ‘View’;
   - under ‘Attachments’, select either the HTML or PDF version of the document entitled ‘Extra Attachments’.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the summary of the Environment and Community Committee information report – 13 November 2018.
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Memorandum

To: Environment and Community Committee

Subject: Glenfern Sanctuary – 2017/18 Annual Report and Research and Environmental Centre Update

From: Scott De Silva, Northern Principal Ranger

Purpose

1. To provide the Environment and Community Committee with the 2017/18 Annual Report for the Regional Parkland at Port Fitzroy, Aotea (Glenfern Sanctuary) and give an update on the feasibility assessment for the establishment of a Great Barrier Island education/research center proposed to be located on the park.

Summary

- In 2016 Glenfern Sanctuary was purchased as a regional park by Auckland Council with support from funding partners.
- The Glenfern Sanctuary Management Trust was established in 1 April 2017 and is responsible for the day to day management and administration of the Glenfern Sanctuary. The Trust operate under a license agreement requiring biannual reporting to Council against agreed Key Performance Indicators.
- Council has received the first biannual report highlighting achievements to date.
- At the time Glenfern Sanctuary was acquired, the Parks, Recreation and Sport Committee supported the commencement of an expression of interest process for the establishment of an environmental education camp on the park.
- Following subsequent discussions between the Glenfern Sanctuary Management Trust and Great Barrier Local Board, the Local Board funded a feasibility study for an island-based education/research centre to ensure any investment in such a facility would maximise opportunities to increase the visitation and growth of Great Barrier Island while creating a unique education opportunity for tertiary and school aged children.
- This feasibility study has identified Glenfern Sanctuary as the most suitable location for such a centre.
- The Glenfern Sanctuary Management Trust is now planning to develop an in-depth business case to confirm the centre design, funding models and local benefits.
- Staff will report back to the Environment and Community Committee once this business plan has been completed.

Context/Background

2. Glenfern Sanctuary is located at Port Fitzroy, Great Barrier Island. It contains 83 hectares of significant ecological value including coastal forests, and threatened fauna such as pateke, kaka, kereru, black and cook petrels and chevron skink.
3. The Glenfern Sanctuary is part of the wider Kotuku Peninsular that incorporates several private land owners and Department of Conservation administered land.
4. In 2008, a predator-proof fence was installed around the peninsular, and an aerial pest eradication completed to create the Kotuku Peninsular Sanctuary. The success of the Kotuku Peninsular Sanctuary is dependent on Glenfern Sanctuary, which provides the operational base for pest control, monitoring and habitat restoration.

5. Glenfern was acquired as a regional park in 2016 by Auckland Council with the support of funding partners: the Great Barrier Island Local Board, the Government’s Nature Heritage Fund, and Foundation North.

6. The Glenfern Sanctuary Management Trust (the Trust) was established on 31 March 2017. A license agreement dated 1 April 2017 was developed to enable the Trust to manage the park on behalf of council.

7. The Trust operate under a license agreement, commencing 1 April 2017 for an initial 10-year term with a 10 year right of renewal.

10. The Council and the Trust have agreed that the Trust will take on management of the sanctuary on the terms and conditions set out in the licence agreement.

11. The Council support the Trust through the regional parks team who provide specific operational advice and assistance including H&S audits, building maintenance, kauri dieback signage and associated hygiene supplies and pest control monitoring. Council staff are also working with the Trust on a planned capital upgrade of the jetty and ford to ensure secure access to the property.

Discussion

2017/18 Glenfern Sanctuary Management Trust Annual KPI Report

12. One of the requirements of the licence agreement is that the Trust provide Council with a biannual report summarizing its performance against agreed Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s).

The KPI’s for the Trust are focused on:
- Environmental Quality and Species Protection
- Advocacy and Outreach (public access and participation)
- Property and Infrastructure
- Administration and reporting
- Collaboration (with other relevant organizations).

13. The first of the Trust’s biannual reports has been received and is appended as Attachment A. Particular achievements noted in the report include:

- Promotion of the accommodation provision including the development of a website and link to the council’s holiday places online content. This has resulted in increased occupancy of the accommodation facilities by 60%
- Implementing annual pest plant and animal control in accordance with operational plans
- Establishment of, and appointment to, a Sanctuary Manager role
- Development of a program to increase volunteer assistance within the park for maintenance and animal and plant pest control activities
- Re-establishment of an onsite nursery and undertaking seed collection and propagation
- Installation of kauri dieback signage and improved hygiene stations
- Implemented visitor number monitoring.

Forward Work Program

14. The Trust and Council staff have identified the following work program over the next year that will contribute to the development of the park. This includes project such as:

- The upgrade of tracks to reduce the risk and spread of Kauri Die Back
- Upgrade of the jetty to enable guests arriving by water to access the park
- Replacement of the ford to improve vehicle access and stream protection
- Continue to develop and promote the accommodation opportunities at Glenfern through appropriate media and advertising avenues
- Continuing to expand the volunteer base to assist the Trust in meeting its objectives and KPI’s.

**Great Barrier Education and Research Centre Feasibility Study**

16. For some time there has been interest from schools and the local community for the establishment of an environmental education camp on Great Barrier Island. This was recognised at the time Glenfern Sanctuary was acquired by Auckland Council as a regional park. At its 21 September meeting, the Parks, Recreation and Sport Committee through resolution PAR/2018/80 supported the commencement of an expression of interest process for the establishment of an environmental education camp at Glenfern.

10. Following subsequent discussions between the Glenfern Sanctuary Management Trust and Great Barrier Local Board (Local Board) it was agreed that a broader feasibility assessment be undertaken for an island-based education/research centre to ensure any investment in such a facility would maximise opportunities to increase the visitation and growth of Great Barrier Island while creating a unique education opportunity for tertiary and school aged children.

11. The Local Board subsequently funded a feasibility study, which was undertaken by Envirospar Consulting Ltd (Attachment B). The first stage of the feasibility study was to identify potential users’ groups and suitable locations that could accommodate the size and scale of such a facility.

12. After considering several locations, following this first stage, Glenfern Sanctuary has been identified as the preferred location.

13. It is now the intention of the Trust to complete a business case for the education and research centre based on the recommendations set out in the feasibility study. The business case will provide an in-depth investigation of the centre design and curriculum elements, funding models, benefits to the local community and significant restraints and risks.

**Next steps/implementation**

14. Staff will continue to support the Trust with delivering a park for all Aucklanders, with a focus on pest management, developing the park infrastructure and track maintenance.

15. Staff will report back to the Environment and Community Committee on the outcome of the business case for the education/research center once this has been completed.

**Attachments**

– Glenfern Sanctuary Trust KPI Report 2017-18
– Aotea Great Barrier Island Education/ Research Centre Feasibility Study
KPI Report 2017-end April 2018

Glenfern Sanctuary Trust

Summary

Glenfern Sanctuary has progressed considerably since our initial Trust meeting in January 2017. A summary of our KPIs to date is provided in Table 1 and supportive evidence of our activities is available in files within https://drive.google.com/open?id=1jF4dOqb4suP6TmTXS6ECcej0FlxOVjyq.

The support we have received from the Northern Parks Regional team under the leadership of Scott DeSilva has been exceptional, with appropriate people allocated to help with many aspects of sustaining and growing the Sanctuary. Auckland Council have followed through with providing infrastructure that is fit-for-purpose, with some of these projects completed and others in progress.

In November 2017 the Trust contracted Sarah Matthew and Chris Giblin as our single FTE Sanctuary Managers. They have adopted the Sanctuary in record time and bought new energy and eyes to our Sanctuary and a passion and vitality that was very much needed. They have been instrumental in rapidly facilitating all aspects of Sanctuary Operations and have grown relationships with DOC and Auckland Council. An off-site accommodation manager supports bookings to assist with revenue raising for the Sanctuary.

The Trust continue to grow financial support of the Sanctuary with the accommodation a successful grant application from QEI and other grant applications applied for to support restoration projects.

A strategic meeting of the Trust in April 2018 reaffirmed several exciting proposals for the wider community hosted by Glenfern Sanctuary and which would progress the concept of Glenfern becoming the hub of conservation on Great Barrier Island. These are being carefully considered with respect to sustainably managing our existing operations.

We would like to take the opportunity to thank Auckland Council for their support of Glenfern Sanctuary.

Sincerely,

Emma Cronin (Glenfern Sanctuary Trust Chair)
### Attachment A

#### Item 11

**Table 1: KPI summary to end of April 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status 30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Quality and Species Protection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Plan</td>
<td>Revise and update KPS environmental plan</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Bi-monthly report on environmental achievements</td>
<td>Complete. Monthly reports provided by SOM (<a href="https://drive.google.com/open?id=12nuUBDhmyMaBdjOMt0MsvYyGDiJ1x0hef">https://drive.google.com/open?id=12nuUBDhmyMaBdjOMt0MsvYyGDiJ1x0hef</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biosecurity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosecurity Plan</td>
<td>Revision and recommendations of biosecurity plan</td>
<td>Complete. EC and Scott Sambell met with Matt Maitland and reviewed Kotuku Peninsula biosecurity systems - information relayed to Trust and to SOM to act on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodent tracking index of 5% is achieved during November monitoring period, and sustained below 20% at all other times.</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
<td>Adaptive management changed to peninsular wide tracking tunnel runs (4 per year) followed by targeted baiting and trapping to minimise poison use. See monthly reports link as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cat sign is responded to immediately until the cat is terminated and or/no further evidence is observed.</td>
<td>Biosecurity at fence ends/buffers (weekly)</td>
<td>Completed to plan, plus 6 cat traps inside Sanctuary owing to increased cat sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit control is continued to prevent over-abundance within the Glenfern Sanctuary.</td>
<td>Adaptive management incursions and residual populations within peninsula (ongoing)</td>
<td>Completed to plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Community Committee Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment A</strong></td>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 11</th>
<th>Monitoring and reporting progress (RTIs 5x per year)</th>
<th>Completed to plan. Jan (8.5% inside vs 5% outside), Apr (16.6 inside, 45% outside)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surveillance and management other mammalian pest species (cats, rabbits etc.)</td>
<td>Completed to plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation dog sweep (annually)</td>
<td>Planned for June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track maintenance</td>
<td>Track clearing (annually)</td>
<td>Completed to plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest proof fence and surveillance system</td>
<td>Relabelling of track network to comply with DOC system (summer 2017/8)</td>
<td>Completed to plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest plant management</td>
<td>Overseeing system is operational (ongoing) and fence clear of vegetation (twice per year)</td>
<td>System has had some glitches, but upgrade to new Econode system ($2200) being considered by KPCT and GST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete annual pest plant control wrt environmental plan</td>
<td>Pest species being GPSed and plan for management evolving - no further progress to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pest plant species in bush</td>
<td>as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pest plant species in gardens/around houses</td>
<td>Plan for removal of exotics and replacement with natives evolving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaori dieback/cleaning station</td>
<td>Installed at main gate, and at wharf</td>
<td>Thank you to AC for providing resources. Two stations installed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native species monitoring shows improvements in abundance and/or diversity over a three year period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome monitoring</td>
<td>Annual bird counts (December)</td>
<td>Not achieved in Dec owing to workload and beginning of contract for SOM. In workplan for 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petrel monitoring (Dec, Feb?)</td>
<td>Monitoring done in Dec - Mar. Initially 9 burrows located (7 Black and 2 Cooks), but only 1 Black petrel burrow occupied in Jan and no Black petrel burrows occupied in Feb. Unknown why our 'usual' burrows are vacant this year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Existing restoration programmes are maintained or enhanced. | Re-vegetation program | Nursery propagation of ecosourced seeds and seedlings (ongoing). Specific area restoration and maintenance (eg. Pateke wetland restoration (summit to sea), fencing and planting riparian stream btwn pateke restoration paddocks). | Seed collection and propagation implemented. Nursery re-instated in March 2018.
Two school groups facilitated doing weed control/maintenance of existing restoration projects in March. Two grant applications applied for (WWF HPF (unsuccessful) and GB Local Board grant (successful 2K)). |
|---|---|---|---|
| Community engagement (Environmental Plan) | Facilitate guided walks | Guide opportunistic and scheduled guided walks Facilitate Hillary Outdoors and other organisations Sanctuary experiences | 12 commercial tours in Jan to Mar. Approx. 15 people per tour, so 280 people in 3 months
Two school groups facilitated doing weed control/maintenance of existing restoration projects in March.
200-400 visitors per month estimated. |
| Overall number of visitors to Glenfern Sanctuary is increased. Education programmes at Glenfern Sanctuary are maintained or increased. | Sanctuary advocacy | Provide point of contact for public interaction | |
| Volunteer support for Glenfern Sanctuary is diversified, and total support is maintained or increased. | Volunteer programme | With AC, develop volunteer programme and protocol for implementation in 2018. Coordinate and facilitate volunteer programme wrt environmental plan | DOC and AC have provided employees for several working bees. AC (biosecurity and biodiversity teams), and local DOC staff. Programme for volunteers being developed with Sue Hill. Trust are working with Sue Hill from AC to develop this in association with Marketing Plan. SOM have developed associations with Toi Oho mai to do volunteer week in July. |
| Marketing | Develop marketing plan for Sanctuary with AC | Strategy for marketing Sanctuary and accommodation developed with AC | Considerable progress in marketing with probono deal with Mt DeLuxe to develop new marketing material.
Meetings with Sue Hill to progress advertising and align with AC Regional Parks websites. |
| (Marketing plan) | Open day event | Organise and deliver an open day event | Planned for Oct/Nov 2018 |
### Overall number of visitors to Glenfern Sanctuary is increased.
Total number of donors (all sources) is maintained or increases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>AC website, Bookabach and GS website aligned</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation rack cards</td>
<td>Revised and printed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website updated and maintained</td>
<td>Give-a-little Links to AC website and vice-versa Newsletters/Blogs/Facebook posts</td>
<td>Completed Completed Completed - monthly Shoutouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>Social media posts and updating website Providing advertising material to I-site etc.</td>
<td>Ongoing. Facebook likes have increased to approx. 400 per month. Monthly Shoutouts. Rack cards provided to I-site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Property and Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property and Infrastructure</th>
<th>Property and Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guest accommodation</strong></td>
<td>Visitor information guides upgraded Review and print visitor guides Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of the accommodation offering at Glenfern Sanctuary is maintained or improved.</td>
<td>Houses and gardens maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers Accommodation</td>
<td>House and gardens maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General maintenance</td>
<td>Houses, outbuildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment A

#### Item 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Maintenance Manual)</th>
<th>Grounds (lawns, paths, gardens etc.)</th>
<th>Maintenance of grounds (driveway, front entrance, culverts etc.)</th>
<th>Maintained.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems and vehicle checks</td>
<td>Monthly checks (generators, batteries etc.), registration requirements etc.</td>
<td>On track.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitor assets</strong></td>
<td>Annual fire compliance</td>
<td>Fire compliance outsourced</td>
<td>Completed 20th March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall number of visitors to Glenfern Sanctuary is increased.</td>
<td>Glenfern trail upgraded</td>
<td>Sunset rock track, steps gravelled on GW descent, vehicle track improved</td>
<td>Completed to plan. Gravel pathway and balustrade improved to Sunset rock. Steps along Glenfern walk need further maintenance as some rotting boards. Quadtrack and farm track needs grading. All scheduled to occur before end of '18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signage installed</td>
<td>AC signage installed and reassessed for what is still required before summer</td>
<td>Completed. Additional decals added to improve existing signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kauri access</td>
<td>Kauri structures assessed and plan for maintenance implemented</td>
<td>Kauri tree currently closed pending alterations to design to improve safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Childrens treasure map</td>
<td>Revised and printed</td>
<td>Re-design underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information centre maintained</td>
<td>Opened daily, information restocked, introduce merchandise?</td>
<td>Opened daily. Much improved. No merchandise at this stage as too time consuming and info centre is largely unmanned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Administration and reporting

<p>| Glenfern Sanctuary is managed as a financially viable operation. | Budget management, adminstrivia Health and Safety management | Monthly reviews in Trust meetings. With input from Joanne O'Reilly and AC this has been improved and is working well. |
| QEII Stephenson Fund | Successful (assists with SOM contractor income). | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration with other relevant organisations</th>
<th>Research opportunities</th>
<th>Commercial Operators</th>
<th>DOC</th>
<th>Iwi</th>
<th>Local community</th>
<th>KPCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liaison with Auckland University and Auckland Council, Polytechs and Universities to develop research opportunities for students</td>
<td>Formalise agreements with commercial operators (Go Great Barrier Island etc.)</td>
<td>Formalise DOC commitment and provide annual work plan.</td>
<td>Invite and encourage Ngati Rehua - Ngatiwai ki Aoteas input to planning</td>
<td>Engage local community to input ideas and recommendations to Glenferns future reporting to Trustees.</td>
<td>Clarification of respective roles wrt pest control. Participation at management meetings and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships are established and/or maintained with other relevant stakeholders.</td>
<td>Auckland University completed annual 3rd year day trip to GS in April. Toi-Ohomai students planning to visit as volunteers in July to assist with Peninsula tracking tunnel operations and line clearing.</td>
<td>Concessions policy for Glenfern being written to formalise commercial or otherwise use of Glenfern.</td>
<td>Completed. On-going.</td>
<td>Email contact made to Nicola MacDonald. No replies. SOM and some Trustees have talked with Local iwi to progress relationships with Glenfern. Plan to meet to progress commercial tour opportunities.</td>
<td>Easter egg hunt event held to advocate for Takotekai and improve profile of Glenfern. Very successful. SOM have attended community Hui and visited Okiwi school.</td>
<td>KPCT operations meeting (Feb). Trust meeting (May). Need to increase our partnership with KPCT to improve/align objectives and funding opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive Summary

This study into the feasibility of an education / research centre at Glenfern Sanctuary, Aotea Great Barrier Island was commissioned by Auckland Council on behalf of the Great Barrier Local Board. In addition to the contribution of the Local Board, other stakeholders that were integral to the feasibility study were the Glenfern Sanctuary Trust, the Park Services Group of Auckland Council, and Hillary Outdoors.

This feasibility study focuses on Local Board aspirations and builds upon considerable previous work on the concept of a centre at Aotea undertaken by the Glenfern Sanctuary Trust, Hillary Outdoors, and Kristin School. Each organisation has its particular goals, scope and language; however the overlap and alignment between them is significant. Although this study refers to a “centre”, it would comprise a number of buildings including residential facilities, a separate accommodation block for Glenfern volunteers and Hillary Outdoors staff, and a visitor centre / research centre available to the local community.

Aspirations

The main aspirations identified by the Local Board for a potential centre were:

- To promote the unique elements Aotea Great Barrier Island, including endemic species, the predator free status of Glenfern Sanctuary, and Dark Sky Sanctuary status of the area.
- A ki uta ki tai 'Ridge to Reef' focus on education, promoting a holistic set of life-long learnings that encompasses astronomy, terrestrial and aquatic ecology, the natural environment and 'off-grid' living.
- A 'citizen science' element where users are given the opportunity to observe, participate in and contribute to science in action.
- A laboratory facility suitable for university students/researchers, should demand exist for such a facility.

Recommendations

The study has determined that a centre is feasible, although it will require several parties to work constructively in a manner that aligns their collective aspirations for future development of Glenfern Sanctuary. A high quality laboratory facility is not feasible due to a lack of demand, although a basic wet lab would provide some benefits. The operating model for an education / research centre at Glenfern would need to incorporate a range of organisations, each with different roles and responsibilities. The diagram below provides an overview of a suggested operating model based on our analysis of the likely role and contribution of different stakeholders.
Next Steps

Provided the Local Board is willing to progress the development of the centre concept, we recommend the next practical steps should include:

1. The ‘consolidation of the coalition’ of different organisations with key roles to play.
2. Develop a detailed business case.
3. Provisional commitment.
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Introduction

Purpose

This report assesses the feasibility of establishing an education / research centre in the northern end of Aotea Great Barrier Island. The purpose of the report is to:

1. Clarify the likely scope, components and operating model of such a centre.
2. Provide information on the strategic and operational feasibility of such a centre.
3. Support discussions among important stakeholders on whether to co-operate further on the idea.
4. Provide the necessary background information for any further work to progress the centre idea.

The primary audience for this report is the Great Barrier Local Board. Other intended audiences are the Glenfern Sanctuary Trust and Auckland Council (Customer & Community, Park Services, Community Facilities). Other recommended audiences for this report are Hillary Outdoors, local Iwi (Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea) and Kristin School.

Background

This study into the feasibility of an environmental education / research centre was commissioned by Auckland Council on behalf of the Great Barrier Local Board. In addition to the contribution of the Local Board, other stakeholders that were integral to the feasibility study were the Glenfern Sanctuary Trust, the Park Services Group of Auckland Council, and Hillary Outdoors.

It is important to acknowledge that this feasibility study was built upon considerable previous work on the concept of a centre at Aotea undertaken by the Glenfern Sanctuary Trust, Hillary Outdoors, and Kristin School (in alignment with Auckland Council). Each organisation has its particular goals, scope and language; however the overlap and alignment between them is significant.

Although this study refers to a “centre”, it would comprise a number of buildings. Probable component buildings include school residential facilities (i.e. bunkrooms, kitchen, bathrooms), a separate accommodation block for Glenfern volunteers and Hillary Outdoors staff, and a visitor centre / research centre available to the local community. Each of these is described and expanded upon further within this report.

Approach

At a high-level, this feasibility study involved four stages; kick-off, research and consultation, feasibility analysis, and reporting.

The kick-off stage centred upon confirming the expectations of critical stakeholders such as the Local Board, Auckland Council and Glenfern Sanctuary Trust. Early meetings were held to discuss the centre concept including the expected scope of operations, success criteria and location. The results from this phase along with a more detailed approach were summarised into an Expectations document that guided the rest of the feasibility study.

The research and consultation stage comprised parallel work streams of research into other centres with similar characteristics, and consultation with different stakeholder groups. The other centres researched include 4 main categories: public access research facilities; public education facilities; school owned camps; and independently owned camps.

The main stakeholder types consulted were: potential centre owners; potential centre operators; and, potential centre users (paying customers). We met with representatives from Glenfern Trust, Hillary Outdoors, Auckland Council Park Services, Kristin School, St Peters School, Trident School, and Auckland University.

Attempts were made to engage with local Iwi (under guidance from Auckland Council) but this was not possible within our project timeframes. Local businesses and potential (capital) funders were not approached directly as the core scope and concept were not sufficiently developed and agreed upon to begin wider engagement. It is expected that these groups would be consulted as part of any subsequent phase.
The **feasibility analysis stage** brought together the results of centre comparisons and stakeholder engagement. The core concept, scope and operating model for a centre were defined more clearly based upon what had succeeded elsewhere, and what stakeholders believed would be successful from their perspective at Aotea Great Barrier Island. Initial findings were presented to the Great Barrier Local Board and Glenfern Trust for feedback.

**Feasibility Study Approach**

- **Kick-off**
  - Initial engagement with Local Board and Council staff
  - Summarise expectations and approach
  
- **Research & Consultation**
  - Shortlist similar centres and conduct initial research
  - Consult with main stakeholder groups
  - Summarise best option(s) for feasibility analysis
  - Follow-up consultation on option(s) with key stakeholders

- **Feasibility Analysis**
  - Analyse the consultation and research findings
  - Assess the concept against feasibility categories

- **Report & Present**
  - Write-up the feasibility assessment, including risks, high-level costs, assumptions, next steps
  - Present findings
Centre Concept

Local Board Aspirations

The main aspirations identified by the Local Board for a potential centre were:

- To promote the unique elements of Aotea Great Barrier Island including endemic species, the predator free status of Glenfern Sanctuary, and the Dark Sky Sanctuary status of the area.
- A ki uta ki tai ‘Ridge to Reef’ focus on education, promoting a holistic set of life-long learnings that encompasses astronomy, terrestrial and aquatic ecology, the natural environment and ‘off-grid’ living.
- A ‘citizen science’ aspect where users are given the opportunity to observe, participate in and contribute to science in action.
- To provide a laboratory facility suitable for university students / researchers, should demand exist for such a facility.

Success Criteria

The Great Barrier Local Board identified success criteria that would be used to measure the success of the centre if established:

- To grow the profile of the Island and its unique environment – promoting sustainability and ecology learnings.
- Contribute to a better-informed community, including visitors, getting people to “get it” about why we protect things and limit our impact on the environment.
- To be utilised consistently; available to less affluent users as well as those who could afford it.
- To achieve financial self-sufficiency with a user pays system.
- To grow the ‘astronomy economy’ for the Island.

Core Stakeholders

There are a number of stakeholders that are crucial to the concept of an education / research centre in the northern half of Aotea Great Barrier Island. The interest of each in a centre is described below.

Local Board

The Great Barrier Local Board is democratically elected to advance the interests and aspirations of the local community. The concept of an education / research centre is listed within the Local Board’s strategic plan, and they are an important advocate and driving force for the concept.

Glenfern Trust is responsible for coordinating the protection and promotion of the Glenfern Sanctuary located at Fitzroy, on the the western coast of Aotea Great Barrier Island. The Trust has developed a site plan for development of the sanctuary that includes a visitor / research centre able to be accessed by the community and Glenfern visitors, accommodation for volunteers, and accommodation for students.

Auckland Council Park Services is part of Auckland Council, the landowner of Glenfern Sanctuary as part of its the Auckland regional parks network. The concept of an education centre located at Glenfern is consistent with the long term strategic intent of the Park Services Group, and it supported previous work on the idea put forward by Kristin School.

Hillary Outdoors provides youth learning through adventure and currently operates programmes at its Tongariro Centre, and from the Orana Christian Camp on Aotea Great Barrier. Hillary Outdoors is seeking new centres due to significant growth in demand in recent years to support adventure learning and, increasingly environmental learning. It has previously identified Glenfern Sanctuary as providing the best location for expansion upon Aotea Great Barrier Island and worked closely with Kristin School in developing a previous concept.
Mana Whenua

Ngāti Rehua-Ngātiwai ki Aotea were identified as an important stakeholder in this feasibility study. Both Auckland Council and Envirostrat have attempted to engage with Ngāti Rehua through appropriate channels, without success. Hillary Outdoors already works with both marae at the northern end of the Island and Otaki school, providing economic benefit to the local community and cultural benefit to visitors.

Kristin School has previously (2016 / 2017) undertaken considerable feasibility work on an education centre at Glenfern. They see considerable benefit for year 10 students participating in 4-5 week stays that provide environmental and outdoor education based learning through immersion in a natural setting.

Analysis & Findings

Comparison with other facilities

A comparative analysis of other facilities that shared characteristics of the proposed centre was carried out in order to identify traits of other facilities that could provide lessons for this study. Four types of facility were identified:

Table. 1. Types of facilities that shared characteristics with the proposed sustainability education centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Accommodation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Laboratory</td>
<td>Goat Island Marine Laboratory, Portabello Marine Laboratory</td>
<td>University grants, student fees.</td>
<td>Yes. Host University groups and full-time researchers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council / Charitable Trust- owned Facilities</td>
<td>MERC facility at Long Bay, Island Bay Marine Education Centre</td>
<td>Charitable trust funding, publicly funded through Council.</td>
<td>Sometimes. Depends on the facility – those that operate like camps accommodate visitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-owned Camps</td>
<td>Private schools: Kahanui Camp for girls (St Cuthbert’s), Tihoi Venture Camp (St Paul’s Collegiate).</td>
<td>Funded by private schools through annual fees.</td>
<td>Yes. Host groups of students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the four types above, school owned / independent camps (in some cases with external providers such as Hillary Outdoors) were the best models for comparisons due to the overlap with Local Board criteria.

Funding

There was no strong underlying theme in how each of the centre types were funded, however, they could broadly be categorised into those that were paid for by the ratepayers / Council (publicly-owned; e.g. MERC), and those that were paid for by institutions (privately-owned; e.g. Goat Island Marine Laboratory).

A user-pays system was a common factor between all of the case studies, relying on either students, tourists, the general public, or a mixture of the three. By establishing a continual revenue stream through paying users the facilities are able to cover some of the operating costs associated with running programmes or maintaining the buildings. However, many of the facilities also relied heavily on external funding grants or sponsorship in order to continue providing their services. Public / Council owned enterprises (e.g. MERC) receive annual funding allocations subsidised by ratepayers, allowing them to cover operating costs and offer assistance to under-privileged users.
Research laboratories have fewer characteristics in common with the proposed centre than the other types of facility examined. In terms of establishment costs, the research laboratories stand out for being significantly more expensive due to the high-tech equipment costs, making them largely unattainable for organisations outside of a University.

Demand

The majority of comparative examples catered to students largely from within their own institutions (e.g. University of Auckland students attending Goat Island Marine Laboratory). Those that didn’t have students enrolled at their institution for the most part acted as third party providers of outdoor / adventure style activities to schools in their community (e.g. MERC). None of the facilities were characterised by ‘walk-ins’ or casual visitors. Local user-bases were not a key indicator of whether or not a facility was heavily utilised, and many were attended by non-locals only.

Lessons for a Centre at Aotea Great Barrier Island

Based on the models reviewed, the proposed centre at Aotea Great Barrier Island should:

- Not rely on walk-in customers; should target schools as the primary market.
- Contract a single long-term user (a private school willing to commit for an extended period for a significant portion of the year) to de-risk the proposition.
- Have a structured programme provided by a third party provider.
- Design the governance structure to ensure eligibility to access philanthropic, charitable or public funding.
- Provide suitable accommodation to host groups of students.
- Establish clear ownership of assets and management responsibilities.

Location

Glenfern Sanctuary was identified as the preferred location during the kick-off phase by the Local Board, and was confirmed to be the only feasible location during the research and consultation phase. The reasons why Glenfern Sanctuary was identified as the only feasible site for a centre are:

- It is located in the north of Aotea Great Barrier as preferred by the Local Board to bring additional economic value to the area.
- It is public land maintained by the Glenfern Trust so there is no need to purchase additional land, plus the Council has previously supported the idea of a schools accommodation element of a new centre on the site.
- It is large enough (83ha) to support several new buildings without detracting from the natural aesthetic value of the land.
- There is significant natural value at the Glenfern Sanctuary (walkways, flora and fauna) that support sustainability and environmental learning, including the predator control programme.
- Glenfern is the strong preference of Hillary Outdoors (if it is to be the lead provider) due to its proximity to the equipment and storage that Hillary Outdoors already have at the Orana Christian Camp.
- It is close to the commercial wharf and facilities at Port Fitzroy plus Glenfern also has its own smaller jetty on-site, all within a very sheltered location.
Image 1. Aerial photograph of Glenfern Sanctuary showing the existing structures.

Retrieved from Auckland Council GeoMaps.

**Kristin School**

The Great Barrier Local Board is not the first organisation to consider establishing a centre of this nature. Significant previous work was led by Kristin School (with architectural design produced by the University of South Australia) in 2016.

This previous work included the design of a pre-fabricated sustainable off-grid (energy, water, waste efficient) student accommodation block at Glenfern Sanctuary, for the purpose of a long stay (~5 week) camp for all year 10 students, in groups of 35-40 at a time. The centre would have been used on a non-exclusive basis i.e. other schools could have used it when Kristin was not. This work was discontinued in 2017 but could potentially be revived and result in significant cost savings on design and construction. The Kristin feasibility work did not include the additional buildings (staff / volunteer accommodation or the visitor / community centre) envisaged by the Local Board / Glenfern Trust, but is otherwise consistent.

**Figure 1. Birds-eye view architectural drawing of potential schools accommodation facility.**

Supplied by Kristin School. Design produced by the University of South Australia on behalf of Kristin School.

Figure 1 shows bunk-bed units, an attached teacher accommodation block and a bathroom facility on each side separated by a communal living / education space with a commercial kitchen and dining hall.
Image 2 and 3. Photographs of ‘Kauri Paddock’; the proposed location for the accommodation block as part of the Kristin School plans.

Glenfern Trust

In early 2018 Glenfern Trust developed a strategic plan to meet future Sanctuary needs. This included a “schools residential” area (which despite a different name is the same concept as the centre that is the basis of this feasibility study). The proposed location for the schools residential area (Image 2 and 3) were the same as that identified by Kristin School and approved in principle by Auckland Council, Parks Services. Image 4 takes into account:

- The need to ensure privacy of the existing rental accommodation.
- Separating schools accommodation from other public accessed areas.
- A stand alone visitor / learning facility for community and visitor access.
- The need for volunteer accommodation.

Although Image 4 identifies sites in 3 stages (with the schools residential being stage 3) this has now been changed by Glenfern Trust and includes all new buildings as a single stage.
Image 4. Aerial photograph of Glenfern Sanctuary with existing and proposed buildings included. Produced by Glenfern Sanctuary Trust as part of their preliminary Master Plan.

Following discussions with Kristin School, Hillary Outdoors and Glenfern Trustees it is apparent the different organisations support the concepts being tested in this feasibility study although further discussion is required to ensure alignment of expectation. The previous efforts of Kristin School and current work of Glenfern Sanctuary Trust are a strong indicator that key stakeholders (including Hillary Outdoors) are aligned in their thinking. Going forward, we recommend that any further business case development is co-ordinated between relevant groups.

Proposed Scope of Operations

Student & Visitor Education

Early engagement with the Great Barrier Local Board indicated a strong preference for the centre to provide visitors with an immersive (i.e. multi-week) educational experience, incorporating ‘ki uta ki tai’ (ridge to reef) learning with sustainability at the core. The main suggested user type (schools) were supportive of this alongside other ‘educational themes’ such as environmental science, outdoor adventure, team building, and citizen science.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>The education centre should incorporate eco-friendly, off-grid ideas into its design and functionality. This aligns well with the vision of the Local Board and the Island culture of sustainable living; lending strength to the concept of an off the grid facility where energy conservation and waste mitigation practices are integrated into the learning outcomes. Kristin School identified long term scientific research projects and sustainability learnings as the key focus for their students, wanting to provide experiences that they would seldom have in the classroom, and to encourage innovative thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology &amp; Environment</td>
<td>Ecological and environmental themes received strong support from potential users who believed it had great potential to be integrated with ecological aspects that already exist at Glenfern. It was suggested that a collaborative effort between users, Glenfern Trust and the Department of Conservation could provide an approach for tackling some ecological issues in the area (e.g. pest control), plus it would enable students to interact directly with the people leading these initiatives. Glenfern Sanctuary is uniquely positioned to provide ecology programmes that contribute to the improvement / maintenance of the reserve and its biodiversity goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Education</td>
<td>Outdoor education would be a core element of the school / cadetship user experience for visiting schools with physical activities on land and water. All schools interviewed expressed an expectation that although teachers may attend and participate, they would want staff employed by Hillary Outdoors to manage the day-to-day operations of the Centre and to deliver this part of the curriculum. This recognises both the specialist skills and the health and safety compliance obligations required to deliver such a programme. Hillary Outdoors are also explicitly expanding their curriculum into sustainability so could deliver this learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>A prevalent idea was that the centre could be uniquely positioned as an ‘applied science camp’ for students visiting for up 4-5 weeks at a time. “Separate them from their devices and embed them in the natural environment”. There was strong support from schools interviewed for learning to have a ‘ki uta ki tai’ focus, providing for a range of subjects such as astronomy, terrestrial ecology and aquatic science.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The opportunity to collaborate with Hillary Outdoors should be emphasised; the level of integration with potential users differentiates them from other providers. Hillary Outdoors prioritises and welcomes a learning model that is co-developed with teachers and tailor-made to suit each school. This approach is particularly effective when considering sustainability or ecological education themes which are increasingly desirable additions to Hillary Outdoors operating model.

**Tourism**

Glenfern Sanctuary already receives tourists that come to walk the trails and enjoy the tranquillity of the location. In addition, Glenfern Trust rents out two buildings to visitors and uses this money to contribute to the upkeep of the Sanctuary. The centre would significantly grow the number of visitors to Glenfern through visiting students, particularly during traditional low season periods. It would also provide additional reasons for ‘drop-in’ tourists such as visiting boaters to visit Glenfern with an improved visitor centre experience, and significantly expanded accommodation facilities when these are not being used by schools.

The main potential tourist periods for renting out the camp-style accommodation are:

1. The December / January period when inbound tourism demand is high, and accommodation options at the northern end of the Island are low. The centre would not be in use by schools over this period.
2. The mid-winter period for inbound Dark Sky Sanctuary tourists. This would need to be managed with school demand but could perhaps focus on the July school holiday period.

**Cultural Exchange Working with Local Iwi & Schools**

The existing 3-4 week camps run by Hillary Outdoors at Orana provide a working reference model for how cultural exchanges could be run between visiting students and the local community. Both of the local marae and Okiwi schools are involved in these exchanges. These provide an opportunity for both visitors and locals to learn about each other’s way of life and culture, and also provide economic benefit to the local community.

Although local iwi were unavailable for discussions about how ongoing interaction might occur with a centre based at Glenfern, all of the schools spoken to as well as Hillary Outdoors were keen to include bicultural
learning as part of their overall curriculum. This would be an important topic to test with local iwi as part of any future consultation.

**Citizen Science**

The Local Board expressed a desire for citizen science initiatives to be incorporated within the centre, and there was support for this from schools. Citizen science is defined as “the collection and analysis of data relating to the natural world by members of the general public, usually as part of a collaborative project with professional scientists”\(^1\). The rapid development of technology has fuelled growth in the citizen science sector, with enhanced communicative abilities people from all over the country can participate in nationally-run programmes. Glenfern Sanctuary offers a plethora of options to establish a citizen science programme.

High schools are increasingly wanting to provide applied science opportunities to their students. These programmes have a good reputation due to their ability to fit within the school curriculum, and because they give students authentic experiences that allow them to contribute in practical ways. Existing programmes in New Zealand run through science institutions such as Landcare Research\(^2\) and SeaWeek cover a range of subjects including bird counts, pest weed tracking, insect diversity monitoring, intertidal monitoring. The Local Board has also recently funded the training of a WaiCare coordinator on the Island who can assist with water quality monitoring and reporting.

**Curious Minds**

The schools programme could align with the MBIE funded Curious Minds programme which encourages and enables science and technology engagement for all New Zealanders. Since 2015, 175 projects have been funded; ranging from social-science through to field survey scientific studies. The Curious Minds Participatory Science Platform supports collaborative, community projects that bring together locals and scientists or technologists on research investigating locally-important questions or problems\(^3\). This platform builds upon the concept of citizen science by promoting ongoing relationships where the participants can contribute in meaningful ways to the progression of the study. Funding for this programme is for amounts up to $20,000; although this fund is in a pilot phase in South Auckland, Taranaki, and Otago, Great Barrier may qualify for this fund through a structured application and well-conceived study design.

**Unlocking Curious Minds** is another contestable fund that supports initiatives to facilitate the engagement of young New Zealanders who have limited opportunities to experience and connect with science and technology. Up to $2M is available with two levels of grants: up to $30,000 for local projects and up to $150,000 for regional or national projects. This funding platform has a broad set of criteria consistent with the centre being considered in this study, including:

- to support education and community outreach initiatives that focus on science and technology;
- to broaden participants’ ability to engage with science and technology;
- to promote the relevance of science and technology in their lives; and
- to encourage engagement in societal debate about science and technology issues facing the country.

There are third party organisations who may be able to deliver a citizen science programme at Great Barrier; partnering with these groups would help ensure quality control on study design, add another educational aspect to the facility on Aotea Great Barrier Island, and may open up new funding opportunities. Discussions with Experiencing Marine Reserves (EMR) – a programme of the Mountains To Sea Conservation Charitable Trust – suggest that this could be one logical partner. EMR is a national programme of experiential learning about marine conservation, aiming to increase awareness and encourage action and support for marine conservation. EMR is also affiliated with the Marine Metre Squared citizen science programme, collaborating with schools in Northland to undertake surveys of marine life around the coastline to contribute to a national database.

---

1. [https://scistarter.com/citizenscience.html](https://scistarter.com/citizenscience.html)
2. [https://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/information-for/citizen-science/mothnet](https://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/information-for/citizen-science/mothnet)
3. [https://www.curiousminds.nz/funding/participatory-science-platform/](https://www.curiousminds.nz/funding/participatory-science-platform/)
Figure 2. Examples of Citizen Science initiatives operating in New Zealand.
User Types & Demand

Schools

The unmet demand for fully-immersive sustainability / environmental centres aligned with a successful existing outdoor education programme run by Hillary Outdoors is significant based on the interviews conducted with schools and Hillary Outdoors, and research undertaken for this feasibility study. According to Hillary Outdoors there is strong demand from schools for a third party provider to accept liability for health and safety reasons. Existing facilities at Otara are reportedly at or near capacity and are unlikely to have space to accommodate additional users in large numbers. Hillary Outdoors is in discussion with a number of schools that are interested in participating in a camp of this nature, beyond those that are already using Otara.

The proposed centre (using the indicative design provided by Kristin School and ratified in discussion with Hillary Outdoors) would host up to 40 students at a time for a period of up to 5 weeks.

The Local Board, Glenfern Trustees and Auckland Council Park Services are clear that this facility would be made available to public schools in addition to private schools and that no single school be allowed sole access to the centre. It is important however that a ‘cornerstone tenant’ school is willing to commit to a significant portion of available time per year for a number of years. This would significantly derisk the capital requirements of building the centre as it would provide ongoing, reliable cashflow.

Private Schools

Demand exists from private schools to secure a long-term arrangement with Hillary Outdoors to run immersive 4 - 5 week long school camps for all students in a year group (probably year 10). Off grid, sustainability-themed immersive camps are a highly effective way to introduce lifelong learnings to students, providing an opportunity for kids to challenge themselves, develop strong friendships and leadership skills, experience the outdoors, and learn about the environment. The success of programmes run by Hillary Outdoors at Tongariro and Otara, as well as private school ventures such as Tihoi (St Pauls Collegiate), Kahunui (St Cuthbert’s College) and King’s College Adventure Challenge have created a positive reputation for these type of experiences, driving the demand for similar programmes to be provided to both private and public schools across New Zealand. One private school principal we interviewed noted that “not having a long term camp is almost becoming a differentiator for private schools in the modern era”.

Public Schools

Public school students in the same age bracket also make up this user group, however funding constraints likely make it more difficult for them to establish themselves as a reliable long-term tenant (i.e. an entire year group as opposed to groups of 40 students as a cohort of a year group). Public schools also expressed strong demand for this type of experience for their students, however, cost is a significant limitation. Cost limitations are able to be addressed in a number of ways including:

- Reduce the length of the camp in order to reduce costs to the students.
- Providing camps to a more limited number of students (as opposed to an entire year group).
- Third party providers (i.e. Hillary Outdoors) or the school itself sponsor individual students or offer reduced pricing for the entire cohort through grant funding opportunities.
- Philanthropic foundations provide grants to offset costs.

Hillary Outdoors already receives grant funding from foundations and commercial sponsors; this funding is used to offset operational costs and to subsidise course fees for some users. Hillary Outdoors does not cover all of the costs associated with the course and the accommodation, instead promoting fundraising campaigns by the students and schools to meet the remaining balance.

University Students

One of the Local Board aspirations for the centre was that it would offer researchers and students a high-tech laboratory facility with the capacity for extensive fieldwork operations. Based on our interviews with potential users there is little to no demand for these facilities. A major constraint facing post-graduate students is their ability to fund research, so thinking of them as a potential source of revenue to fund the ongoing costs of a
laboratory is unlikely, not to mention the cost of travel to Great Barrier vs mainland sites. The current trend is that post graduate students doing field work are more frequently being embedded in other organisations that are already established in remote areas (e.g. Department of Conservation) for health and safety reasons. Although a high-tech laboratory facility is unlikely to receive funding from tertiary institutions, we believe that a case could be made for a low-tech wet laboratory suitable for citizen science programmes – which have been identified by key user groups as a desirable inclusion.

We have however identified potential demand for facilities that are able to host 1 to 2 week long tertiary field courses for small groups of university students; ideally at locations with close proximity to areas of environmental significance. The feasibility study also identified short-stay tertiary students as a potential user group. This group consists of small numbers (typically, < 20 at a time, once per year, per class) of under-graduate / post-graduate university students on academic field courses. These users already participate in similar programmes elsewhere, for example; the University of Auckland sends students on annual residential field trips to Manaia Baptist Camp, Whangarei Heads for a 5 day intensive marine ecology project – something that could easily be replicated on Great Barrier Island. Transport costs are however a deterrent from staying at island destinations compared with the mainland. Provided that the transport to and from Great Barrier Island and the cost of staying onsite remains competitive, this user type could be another reliable long-term tenant that brings a unique scientific quality to the experience. University users would internalise all of the educational aspects and simply require the use of the facilities; this type of demand is unlikely to catalyse the creation of more jobs on Great Barrier.

Cadetship Programme

Another possible user type identified through this process is a newly formed ‘cadetship’ programme. This, whilst formative, intends to provide 17-20 year olds with a three year cadetship programme exposing school age / school leavers who would not be going to university or doing a trade apprenticeship exposure to different elements of the corporate workforce. A key element of this, currently being co-designed with Hillary Outdoors would be an ongoing block of time at a centre; 12 days in year one, five days in year two, and five days in year three. The cadetship programme will comprise of 200 individuals each year, which offers a significant potential demand for a centre.

Dark Sky / Summer Tourists

Since the primary users are limited by the school year, there would be a ‘low season’ at a centre coinciding with the summer holiday period. This could enable tourists to become users on a pay-per-night basis, but would not be part of a structured education programme per se. The demand for dark sky tourism facilities could also potentially result in a centre being available for rent during the middle of winter; perhaps coinciding with the July school holidays.

Competition

We do not anticipate that the proposed centre will directly compete with existing operations on Aotea Great Barrier Island. Since there is demand for more accommodation and due to the fact that existing facilities are operating at/close to maximum capacity, we do not believe that the construction of a new centre will negatively affect current businesses.

Orama Christian Camp is the only facility in close proximity that offers a similar experience to the proposed education centre. Currently, Hillary Outdoors bases its operations on Great Barrier at Orama and has invested considerably into equipment, storage facilities, a boat shed and constructing a rope course to deliver their programme.

The only relevant competitors elsewhere (of size and scale) are in-house providers of outdoor education (i.e. King’s College, St Cuthbert’s School); however these are exclusive programmes and are unlikely to encroach upon this market. Health and safety regulations make it unattractive for many schools to develop the capacity to run these programmes in-house, decreasing the likelihood of competition.

A new facility at Glenfern would provide Hillary Outdoors with an opportunity to continue existing programmes at Orama whilst leveraging the close proximity of Glenfern to utilise the assets held at Orama. The proposed centre should be considered as additional demand, rather than a cause for competitive concern.
Wider Community Benefits

The feasibility study suggests that a centre would have positive impacts to the local economy, including (but not limited to):

- Providing economic growth during low and shoulder season at the northern end of the Island.
  - In excess of 11,000 extra bed nights generating income.
  - 7-9 additional full-time employees living and working in the northern end of the Island.
  - Boost to transport links (ferry and bus service).
  - Increased interaction with local schools, mainland schools and iwi.
  - Opportunity for Dark Skies provider to be included in the curriculum.

- No impact from school users on Christmas / high season period, but potential to use facilities for tourists and boathies seeking accommodation.

- Provide the local community access to the visitor / learning Centre facilities.

- Separate accommodation block shared between facility staff and sanctuary volunteers – more room for volunteers to be involved at Glenfern.

Risks

There are several risks to the viability of the proposed Centre and associated activities, including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key partners fail to form a coalition.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Significant effort to go into working with each potential partner to seek alignment, followed by joint working sessions to agree core proposition acceptable to all parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lack of alignment between funders, the Local Board or key users.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Early engagement with potential sources of funding, immediately following agreement of coalition partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder season / dark skies tourism is not viable due to a lack of demand.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Effort into marketing accommodation options, ensure price competitiveness for similar offerings elsewhere. Work with dark sky tourism operators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor tenant is unwilling to commit.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Early engagement so all key parties understand expectations of anchor tenant. Ensure centre is fit for purpose and aligned with school expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of demand means revenue targets are not achieved.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Work with Hillary Outdoors to generate school / other demand as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support is not given by Auckland Council.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Local Board and key Council staff to ensure senior management / councillors understand and support the concept, and any expectations are understood early in the next stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CapEx costs of the Centre become too high to attract funding for all elements.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Careful design, willingness to consider alternative options such as staging, debt funding, or temporary buildings if costs are too high to attract funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost and Revenue Estimates

Capital Expenditure & Funding

Estimated Build Costs

It is not possible at this early stage to accurately determine the capital costs of building a centre at Glenfern Sanctuary. This is because the different parties that we believe need to be involved have not yet agreed a final design and submitted this for construction estimates. However, it is possible to provide a broad estimate based on the preliminary design work of some of the parties involved.

The following design assumptions underpin the capital cost estimates that follow:

1. There will be three new buildings constructed: a student accommodation block; a volunteer and Hillary Outdoors staff accommodation building; and, a visitor centre / community learning centre with basic wet lab.

2. All buildings will be a sustainable ‘off-grid’ design with solar power, rainwater storage, and on-site waste water treatment.

3. The student accommodation will have capacity to accommodate up to 40 students and 6 adults (teachers) per night. It will include washing, cooking and dining facilities. Architectural drawings produced for Kristin School by the University of South Australia architecture school provided an indicative cost for this facility (albeit from 2016) of between $2.4 million and $3.4 million for construction. The significant cost range is due to the option of using University of South Australia architecture school students to build the facility versus using a commercial building company.

4. The volunteer and staff accommodation will have capacity to accommodate approximately 10 adults at a time with washing, cooking and dining facilities. The building is shown in Glenfern Trust’s strategic site plan, but no architectural drawings have been produced yet so no indicative costs are available. This building is a priority for the Glenfern Trust which wants to accommodate volunteers, but it is not crucial for the school visitor operation as operational staff could rent private accommodation off site.

5. The visitor / community centre and basic lab does not yet have agreed parameters for size or facilities, but is likely to contain an open space for displays / lectures, a smaller room for basic lab facilities, and bathrooms for visitors to use. The building is shown in Glenfern Trust’s strategic site plan, but no architectural drawings have been produced yet so no indicative costs are available. This building is a priority for the Glenfern Trust but is not crucial for the school visitor operation. In addition to providing information for tourists (e.g. boaties in the summer peak season), it could be used by visiting scientists and the local community. This study was not able to quantify the level of tourist or local community demand for this building.

Broad estimates based on the above assumptions suggest that it may be possible to build the three buildings for between $4.5m and $6.5m. This is based on:

- Student accommodation block costing between $2.8m – $3.9m. This is a higher figure than provided in the Kristin architecture design ($2.4-3.4M) as it assumes a 10% increase in building costs since 2016, and a 5% transport premium for building in a remote location.

- Volunteer and Hillary Outdoors staff accommodation costing between $1m – 1.5m. This is a placeholder figure until an initial design and construction estimate is available.

- Visitor centre and basic lab costing between $0.7m – 1.1m. This is a placeholder figure until an initial design and construction estimate is available.

Raising the capital to build all three buildings at the same time may prove challenging. This is because some funding sources require a co-funding element, or expect to see an ongoing operating surplus with some return
on their investment in addition to the social impact of the centre (e.g. impact investors). Some alternate construction phasing options include:

A. The student accommodation block could be built first as it does not require the other two buildings. An important advantage of this is that it provides a regular revenue stream that would help facilitate partial debt funding if needed of the other buildings.

B. The volunteer/staff accommodation block could be built at the same time as the student accommodation block as there is confirmed demand for both. A temporary visitor centre could be ‘dropped in’, or a permanent facility built later when demand has been confirmed and separate funding secured.

Sources of CapEx Funding

No single obvious CapEx funding option has been identified yet. The primary users (schools) are unlikely to contribute to the upfront capital required to construct the facilities. Due to the nature of the proposed centre and the type of activities that will be hosted there, we anticipate that capital funding for this project is likely to come from either (or a mix of) grants from philanthropic organisations, government (local and central), or impact investors.

Philanthropic organisations provide funding to organisations and communities for capacity building, employment, environmental care and community development.

Impact investment is becoming increasingly more common in New Zealand as philanthropists, trusts and investors look to affect positive change beyond simply obtaining a financial return. Impact investments refers to investments “made into companies, organisations, and funds with the intention to generate a measurable, beneficial social or environmental impact alongside a financial return.” This type of investment has become attractive to philanthropic institutions who have recognised that by achieving a return on an investment, they can reinvest the money back into the respective programmes (rather than simply providing grant funding).

In the public sector, the largest single source of potential funding comes from the newly formed Provincial Growth Fund. It is seeking to allocate $1 billion per annum over three years to invest in provincial New Zealand. The priorities of this funding are to:

- Enhance economic development opportunities;
- Create sustainable jobs;
- Enable Māori to reach their full potential;
- Boost social inclusion and participation;
- Build resilient communities; and
- Help meet New Zealand’s climate change targets.

The proposed centre meet many of these funding criteria although it is essential that the project demonstrates genuine alignment across a range of stakeholders, as well as some co-funding element. Great Barrier Island comes under Auckland Council’s jurisdiction, but the separation from Auckland City, along with relatively few new employment opportunities, may enable this project to qualify for this funding option.

Another option is retained earnings or debt funding for some of the required Capex funding. The revenue received from the operation of the student programmes in its early years could be used to pay for the construction costs of the other buildings out of retained earnings, or to help secure debt funding to do this. Early discussions with the Glenfern Sanctuary Trust on this subject suggest that this is not a preferred option due to the time delays it could introduce for the other buildings.

---

Operating Revenue and Expenses

Revenue

Provisional revenue estimates from renting out the student accommodation block to different user types are set out in the table that follows. It is important to note that these reflect the steady state revenue of a mature operation so, in reality, it may take 12 months or more to achieve this level of revenue. However, this risk is greatly reduce by way of a school ‘anchor tenant’, and from the demand pipeline that Hillary Outdoors can supply.

Specific assumptions are noted within the table, while general assumptions for the revenue estimates are:

- During the summer (or mid winter dark skies) tourism period, all student accommodation is available at commercial rates to tourists.
- Assume beds available during school year and for cadetship programmes is limited to 40.
- The $20 / night rental fee for schools / cadets is an estimate based on our understanding of fees paid at other organisations. The $50 a night for tourists is also an estimate, but in times of high demand and limited availability we believe it would be a competitive price for a high quality facility.

Operational expenses

Most operational expenses will come from running school based programmes out of the student accommodation block. The suggested operating model for school programmes uses an outsourced programme provider (Hillary Outdoors) that is responsible for all associated operating costs, and pays a site rental fee to the building owner (via a governance committee – discussed in the next section). This keeps things very simple from the perspective of the governance committee and building owner (Glenfern Trust) which receives a regular income, without dealing with the complexity of running (and paying for) operations.

Any Hillary Outdoors staff staying in the additional accommodation facility would pay a rental, which is consistent with the model it uses at other facilities. This is expected to largely cover operating costs.

Assuming the facilities are constructed to be self-sufficient for energy, water and waste, then the bulk of operating expenses for the programme provider will be in the form of staff. Hillary Outdoors has estimated that it would need five instructors, a centre manager and two support staff. These would be paid from school programme fees after deducting a site rental charge per student. Details of these costs have not been included here as they would be the responsibility of Hillary Outdoors.

During the December - January summer tourism (and potentially the Dark Skies July tourism period), there would be some operating costs associated with cleaning and maintaining the student accommodation block as part of renting it to tourists. The simplest way to handle these costs would be for the governance committee to pay a set portion of the cost of regular cleaning and maintenance staff to Hillary Outdoors. This would come out of the extra revenue received from tourists renting the student accommodation.
Table 2. Estimates of potential revenue generated by the proposed centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Type</th>
<th>Total Estimated Usage Nights / year</th>
<th>Number of beds available (for revenue purposes)</th>
<th>Total bed nights potentially available</th>
<th>Estimated $ rental per night to Glenfern</th>
<th>Total Potential Revenue</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools - anchor tenant</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>1 anchor school; 5 week programme, 4 intakes of 40 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools - other</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>Assume 5 week programme, 3 schools, 40 students each intake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadetship programme (year one)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$19,200</td>
<td>80 attendees in 2 intakes of 40 beds each intake @12 nights for first year of cadetship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadetship programme (years 2 and 3)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>80 attendees in 4 intakes of 40 beds each intake @5 nights. 4 intakes represents both year 2 and 3 of cadetship programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>Assume facilities available for hire Dec and Jan at higher rate than schools / cadets would pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$411,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations and Next Steps

Operating Model

The operating model for an education/research centre at Glenfern would need to incorporate a range of organisations, each with different roles and responsibilities. The diagram below provides an overview of a suggested operating model based on our analysis of the likely role and contribution of different stakeholders.

We recommend that representatives of the organisations formalise the operating model, respective roles and responsibilities and ongoing commitment through a joint governance committee or similar structure. This would be underpinned by a charter that commits organisations and a funding model that provides revenue from paying users to support new and expanded roles. Our indicative view of the respective roles includes:

Land Owner (Auckland Council)
- Have ultimate authority over use of the land including granting concessions for use and any resource consents required.
- Determine strategic priorities for the use of regional parks.
Centre Owner (Glenfern Sanctuary Trust)

- Own any new buildings for the centre within the constraints of any lease or concession.
- Responsible for maintenance of the visitor centre / community learning facility and volunteer accommodation.
- Continue current site management including organising volunteer activities, maintenance of existing buildings, and undertaking ecological management and pest control.
- Maintain a close working relationship with land owner and centre education operator.
- Responsible for Glenfern Sanctuary operations staff (e.g. caretaker, park rangers) but not Hillary Outdoors staff.

Education Centre Operator (Hillary Outdoors)

- Outsourced provider of education programme and and curriculum including responsibility for the health and safety of all education users.
- Responsible for generating and maintaining demand from schools / cadetship etc.
- Responsible for operational costs of the accommodation facility including employing staff (except during the summer shoulder season when the facilities are vacated for tourist rental).
- Responsible for maintaining the schools accommodation facility.

School User ‘Anchor tenant’ (Kristin school or similar)

- Commitment to significant usage of approximately 20 weeks per year of full capacity for extended period (e.g. five year minimum).
- Provide long-term guaranteed revenue thereby reduce risk of capital investment.

Centre Governance

- Operate in accordance with a centre charter that sets out goals and responsibilities.
- Likely to comprise all the main stakeholder groups: land owner; centre owner; education centre operator; anchor tenant; and Local Board.
- Oversight of centre operations including significant decision on centre use and development, but not extending into broader Glenfern Sanctuary Operations (retained by the Glenfern Sanctuary Trust).
- Oversee capital investment and distribution of operating surplus with the majority expected to be returned to the Glenfern Sanctuary Trust.

Next Steps

Provided the Local Board is willing to progress the development of the centre concept, we recommend the next practical steps should include:

1. The ‘consolidation of the coalition’

In order for this project to progress further it is critical that the key parties involved are brought together to determine commitment to proceed and ensure alignment. We recommend:

- Circulation of the final report among stakeholders that would likely form a coalition.
- If all agree, confirm the coalition, decide on membership of a governance committee, determine the core spatial design, and to confirm the core operational design (users, providers, volunteers, accommodation etc).
- Form a project subcommittee to oversee the business case development.
- Reach agreement on design; including the consideration that the Kristin facility if adopted would provide significant cost reductions.
• Confirm the business case assumptions and scope.

2. Develop a detailed business case

An in-depth investigation to confirm the centre design and curriculum elements, further develop financial model and benefits to the local community, users, and providers, and identify any significant constraints / risks.

3. Provisional commitment

Ensuring that the key ‘tenant’ is committed - pending Capex funding – plus the written support of ‘gatekeepers’ will lend strength to the progression of the project, and provide assurances to investors / funders that the viability of the centre is not in question. We recommend actions in the following order:

• Consultation with local community and Iwi. Auckland Council may want to do this prior to the development of the business case.
• Provide charter document confirming commitments, then approach funders.

4. Approach funders

Although we have indicated where CapEx funding might come from in this report, further investigations into grant schemes and discussions with investment partners is required so that we may approach funders with confidence. We recommend:

• Develop an understanding of the funding landscape and shortlist targets based on likely alignment.
• Develop commercial proposition.
• Engage with potential funders.
### Appendix: Summary of comparative centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>User Group</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Laboratory</strong></td>
<td>The Goat Island Marine Discovery Centre educates people about the marine environment and the research activities at the Institute of Marine Science at the University of Auckland's Leigh campus. Staff are also current students at the lab and provide visitors with a personalised learning experience about their research. Modern building (2008) adjacent to the marine laboratory at Goat Island.</td>
<td>Up to 24 people can be hosted at a time. Shower/bathroom facilities (approx 8 showers, 8 toilets).</td>
<td>3 main types of user: walk ins, field course groups, event hire patrons. Walk ins are generally visitors to the marine reserve and either: 1) don't want to enter the water and want to do something, 2) make a planned trip to include the centre, 3) foreigners.</td>
<td>$4.5 million dollar donation from Edith Blackwell Foundation as part of a $10 million dollar upgrade to the lab facilities including the new bunkrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public / Charity-owned Facility</strong></td>
<td>The Island Bay Marine Education Centre is a not-for-profit, education facility operated by the Wellington Marine Conservation Trust (1996). The main purpose is to inspire people, especially children, to learn about Wellington’s and all New Zealand’s marine environments.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>3 main types of user: walk ins, field course groups, event hire patrons. Approx 25,000 students per annum.</td>
<td>Funded by Wellington Marine Conservation Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School-owned Camp</strong></td>
<td>Kahunui is a 117ha remote campus, in the Bay of Plenty. Students spend 28 days here in Year 10, tramping, kayaking, fishing and learn basic survival skills, culminating in going “solo”. Students also protect and preserve Kahunui for future students by contributing to many sustainability projects.</td>
<td>Hosts entire year 10 student group (approx 30 each visit), 4 week long stay in groups of 8.</td>
<td>Year 10 school girls at St Cuthberts. 30 students in each group.</td>
<td>School owns the land and facilities - retired and outfitted timber mill, since 1979.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Camp</strong></td>
<td>Hillary Outdoors is a charitable trust that provides outdoor education primarily to young people. Hillary Outdoors opened its first centre in 1972 beside the Tongariro National Park. In 2006 a second centre opened on Great Barrier Island with a marine focus. The organisation also runs a very successful series of nationwide adventure-based events throughout the year. Hillary Outdoors is a not-for-profit organisation run by a charitable trust.</td>
<td>Drama Oasis: &lt;120 guests. Hillary Outdoors Tongariro: &lt;150 guests.</td>
<td>Wide variety of user: Corporate team building groups, School groups (range of ages, mainly high school) Duke of Edinburgh Hillary Award Groups, International student groups, Home school groups, Tertiary Institution groups. Approx 7000 students per annum.</td>
<td>Hillary Outdoors is a charitable trust that relies on funding partners, sponsors and donors. Hillary Outdoors charges fees for its courses and these are heavily subsidised by the trust.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Environment and Community Committee
a) exclude the public from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

C1 Acquisition of land for open space - Hobsonville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7. | s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.  
s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).  
In particular, the report identifies land the council seeks to acquire for open space purposes. | s48(1)(a)  
The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7. |