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Ellerslie Sports Club

Stage 3 Michaels Avenue Reserve Redevelopment
**Background**

- OLB approved M. Ave Reserve Concept Plan South Section in Aug. 2016
- Delays in progressing Stage 3 – Conscious decision
- With completion of Stage 2, time appropriate to restart Stage 3
- Club has had 8 meetings with Council officers since Oct 2017 to align interests and get momentum
Current Status:

- Architectural Plans/Perspectives prepared with further refinement pending
- Geotech, survey and preliminary engineering completed to establish accurate baseline
- Preliminary QS estimate completed to ensure project is still fiscally on track
- Council advice received indicating preference for Club to own 100% of completed facility
- Application made for Land Owner Consent to grant lease of land parcel at M. Ave
- Resource Consent application in draft form, subject to further public consultation

Costs Incurred to Date:

- Club has spent circa $40,000 in direct costs associated with formulating a RC application
  with a further $30,000 anticipated to complete submission
Architectural Floor Plans and Perspectives
Level 0 Floor Plan
Exterior View 3
Anticipated Timeline:

- Consultation with Orakei Local Board: Today
- Consultation with ERA/FOMAR: 20 Nov 2018
- Lodge for RC: 30 Nov 2018
- Budget Confirmation: 20 Dec 2018
- Finance Applications: Nov 2018-March 2019
- Finance confirmation to Council: 28 June 2019
- Detailed Design documentation: April 2019-June 2019
- BC Processing: June 2019-Aug 2019
- Construction Start: Sept 2019
- Practical Completion: June 2020
Current Project budget set at $4,990,000 (includes 10% contingency)

Council advises that to date the following funds have been secured:
- Facilities Partnership Funding $840,000
- Council Community Facilities Funding $2,400,000

Funds still required $1,750,000

One of 5 confirmed priority projects under the Facilities Priorities Plan in order to give guidance to third party funding sources

Ultimately, Club can cut its cloth to suit funds available by concentrating on the delivery of the amenities block, and either deferring clubrooms component entirely, or building clubrooms shell only if funds not available.
What are we seeking from the Orakei Local Board?

- Firstly, Club wishes to thank the Board for its support to date.

We now respectfully request the following from this Board:

- Written reconfirmation of support for funding lines already secured from Council ie Facilities Partnership Funding/Council Community Facilities Funding

- Written support for further funding applications pending to 3rd parties

- Written support, where appropriate, for the RC application currently being finalised

- Favourably consider the Land Owner Consent application for a lease over the proposed new land parcel at M. Ave

- Support the Club’s contention that there is a need for 8 x changing rooms in new facility (vs Council policy of max. 4 x changing rooms) to meet demand.

Thank you to the Chair and members of this Board for the opportunity to update you on progress.
Thank you
Presentation to the Orakei Local Board

15 November 2018.

First of all I would like to thank the Board for the opportunity to make this presentation, and to thank the Chair, Kit Parkinson for his constant availability and support for our group.

I would also like to highlight the frustration that the group and our community have encountered in this process. 12 months ago I had the pleasure of presenting our concept plan to the OLB, and in March of this year we submitted a detailed plan covering the development of the community centre, assessments of alternative sites in Stonefields, utilization by various community groups, support from the Stonefields School. We also included operational budgets based on the experience of other community centres within the OLB area, including budgets for ongoing maintenance.

Since this presentation, we have in fact, achieved nothing in terms of gaining support, or answers to our questions form Council. In one document forwarded to us by the Chairman, from the Parks and Places team there is an assessment of a range of sites around Stonefields, using pocket parks around the community, each of which was deemed unsuitable. The Parks and Places team agreed that the site at 130 Barbarich Drive (the Pump house site) meets many of the objectives as a potential site, but then raises a number of objectives, which somewhat surprisingly, are identical to those raised by the developer, Todd Property. We intend to cover these objections as part of this presentation.

On 19 October the Chair wrote to an unidentified (to us) council officer and asked the question if technically the Pump house site could be used for a community centre and a lease offered.

The answer “My understanding from the memo is that technically it could happen.”

The Writer then states that Suzanne (Weld) would be better to advise as has far more knowledge than he.

In the last day or so we have after numerous requests, Suzanne has provided an opinion; however, as I said in an earlier email, while the location of a building on the reserve is not recommended by staff, it is ultimately the Board’s decision.

We have not been made aware of previous emails. We do not know why the staff does not support our project; we assume that they have accepted Todd Property’s arguments about the site. Todd’s have told us in meetings that they don’t want us to use this site as they have sold the adjoining property to Fletcher Residential on the basis that a number of the dwellings on the adjoin site will have uninterrupted views of the water and wetlands, and that our building would block such views. Because of the retaining wall, those buildings will be well above the community centre, and the view would not be disrupted, not that a view is ‘saleable’. They also indicated that our scruffy old relocatable building is not appropriate to fit within Stonefields, however they were happy for it to be positioned in Tauoma Crescent. This in our view negates this argument. We have also through the generosity of James Hardie Ltd been given new cladding material so that the build can look just the same as other buildings in Stonefields, many of which have used this cladding system. This also gives the group an opportunity to fully insulate the build with sound and heat insulation product.
Councillors other comments on the suitability of the Pump house site:

There has been a statement about utility and multi-functionality of council public spaces. The particular site has, until one week ago, been fenced off with security fencing, by the developer preventing any public access to the community space. This fencing has been in place for 18 months, and it was not until our request that Parks and Spaces personnel had noticed this illegal fencing, and had it removed, and the long grass mown.

Our community centre will provide much increased amenity of an unusual site, which already has an adjacent Council building, the Pump house.

Parking

Officers state that there is little space to develop additional parking.

The premise of having a small community centre within our community is that people will walk to this facility. There are excellent walking access ways that have good lighting to the site. There is sufficient existing hard stand area for a number of parks, without affecting access to the pump house, and there is space for more to be added to ensure that there is adequate disability parking, and short term service parking for the facility. One of our committee has expertise in parking layout. We are confident that the wider catchment of potential users will not contribute significantly to the existing issue of parking within Stonefields. Parking issues in Stonefields are resultant on the initial planning which reduced road width minimising on road parking. If we are given approval for a lease over the site, we will develop a functional compliant parking plan for the centre.

Access to the Pump House

Current access to the pump house is through a locked gate. Regularly on weekends, cars currently park across the gateway for seven hours at a time. There has never been an issue because of this preventing access to the pump house in emergencies. The addition of the community centre and our parking plan, will in fact improve the access, as there will not be the random cars creating a potential issue. We can ensure that a clear access way is maintained at all times to this council owned building. On the rare occasion that someone blocks access in error, they will be in the community centre and can be directed to move the offending vehicle.

Underground Services on the site.

Todd Property provided us with a map of services crossing the site, indicating that these were not shown on council’s site information system. Todd’s advised us that these were important Watercare Services Ltd assets. I contacted the CEO of Watercare, and met with him to discuss this issue,

His response was simple;

1. These are not part of the Watercare network, but are council assets belonging to the healthy waters group.
2. They are unused connections relating to the alternative water supply (purple pipelines) which originally were to be used for non-potable services, but will never be used because of the risk of contaminating the potable water supply. Watercare believe they have been blanked off. A second line connected to the sewer main is a filter flushing line associated with the 'purple' supply line filters, so that when those filters were back-washed, the backwash went into the waste water line for treatment. As the total 'purple' network is not connected, the filters are not used, and the pipeline is redundant.

3. We are aware, and this was also mentioned by the CEO of Watercare, that pipelines are regularly built over in all cities and particularly in Auckland. A building raised on piles as we are suggesting for the community centre can easily be engineered to meet all requirements.

**Placemaking.**

We have an existing building which will be repurposed for our community centre, using community volunteers to bring the building, and its new toilet, storage and kitchen facilities up to the highest standard. As mentioned earlier James Hardie Ltd have donated materials to make the building look like and feel like the existing residential buildings in the community. Positioned beside the Pump House building, which is in contrast in its design and look as part of the community, our community facility will be painted in a colour scheme to ensure it fits with other buildings and we are happy to accept recommendations from Council experts on the colour palette we should use, plus advice on post construction planting to ensure that the building meets the requirements and can be maintained by the community. Our vision is of a community facility which is truly owned by the community.

**The upgrade of the Meadowbank Community Centre.**

This is an important OLB project which is overdue and will be of significant benefit to the Meadowbank community. The existing facility has very high utilisation according to its management, and they do have to turn away bookings. They have offered to refer local bookings to our facility when we are ready. We do not see the large Meadowbank facility as an alternative to our facility, which is targeted at small groups of probably less than 50 people at one time, supplementing the Stonefields School hall, which also has an over-book situation on numerous occasions. The school believes that a smaller facility within walking distance will improve utilisation of the school hall. The upgrading of Meadowbank Community Centre will limited impact on the proposed Stonefields Community Centre.

**In summary, we have a good project which can be delivered without a call on Auckland Council for funding for completion of the project and for ongoing maintenance. We have a commitment from the Mount Wellington licensing Trust for initial funding of the project and our conservative budget shows that short term and long term operating costs are readily covered. We know that we meet all of the criteria for such a project and have even covered the eventuality that the community cannot sustain the centre, where a building removal company will remove the building at no cost to council and the land can be remediated.**
We are concerned that Council Offices may have engaged in discussion with the developer about this project, which we challenge as appropriate behaviour, particularly when we experience tremendous difficulty in engaging with council staff to gain information.

Todd Property have no interest in this project; their interest is only as an adjoining land owner, until the sale and purchase of the adjoining property to Fletcher Residential is completed and titles change hands. There is opportunity for interested parties to object during the consenting process rather than at this point of the project, when all that is being sought is approval to use the land for a community purpose and additional amenity.

We ask that the Orakei Local Board make the following declarations.

We request that the Orakei Local Board signify their support for this community initiative.

We request that the Orakei Local Board request council officers make the requisite changes in designation of the reserve area Lot 903 DP450854 in order to facilitate this land a community building.

We request the Orakei Local Board request that Auckland Council officers prepare an appropriate community lease agreement for signature.

We ask that the Council Officers be required to expedite these actions with some haste as we have been unable on this project, awaiting information and decisions for 12 months.
Auckland Council Facility Partnership Policy

In recently received minutes from the Orakei local Board, an attachment outlined Council policy relating to a new model of Facility Partnerships which covers a multitude of community facilities, including community centres.

This policy clearly states the benefits that will accrue to communities through a partnership with local communities and businesses and council in order to increase amenity for communities while reducing or controlling expenditure for Council.

It is very clear that our project fits the policy criteria well;

_We seek facility partnerships because they enable us to........_

Leverage

_Partnerhips leverage external investment, infrastructure and effort to deliver better community facilities and spread their costs between more stakeholders._

_Our Community centre meets this objective._

_The council and sector organisations, iwi, businesses, government and agencies and other funders each bring unique and complimentary knowledge, skills and strengths to the table._

_Our Community Centre group most certainly does this._

Empower and Enable

_Partnerships are a way for the council to empower and enable communities and build their mana, prosperity resilience skills and capacity._

_Our community based project certainly will achieve all of the desired outcomes as stated in the policy document._

Optimise

_Partnerships can optimise space and maximise investment by bringing together multiple groups to share one facility or breathing new life into assets instead of building new ones._

_Our project by repurposing an existing building and placing it in a new location in our community where there is a proven lack of community space for groups to meet, is an excellent fit to this policy._

_Our project falls within councils desire under the Thriving Communities Strategic Action Plan, the Community Facilities Network Plan and this new Facilities Partnership Policy._

_It is our belief that the Stonefields Community Centre proposal is the perfect fit for approval within this new policy framework._
We have engaged with local iwi and through this consultation have initial support for this project, and an assurance that all iwi with an interest in the area have an opportunity to understand our project, and the opportunity to have a say in the outcome.

We request the following from the Orakei Local Board:

1. **We would like to be supported by the Orakei Local Board as the initial model for this Partnership Policy and request that the Orakei Local Board vote to support our group in achieving this.**

2. **We would request that the Orakei Local Board assign a Council Officer to act as a liaison, and conduit for obtaining the necessary documentation and access to people and resources so that this model project is expedited in a timely and compliant manner.**

3. **We request that the Orakei Local Board undertake to make land available within the Stonefields Community in order that the community can progress making the facility available under the Auckland Council Facility Partnership Policy.**
## Proposed topics to be included in the Auckland Water Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Te mauri o te wai – the life supporting capacity of water is protected and enhanced.</td>
<td>• Is this the right vision for Auckland?</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To protect and enhance Te Mauri o Te Wai, we will need to apply a Māori world view throughout our approach to water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Support in principle, noting:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>Healthy water systems nourish the natural environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ecology</strong></td>
<td>Support the investigation of how to better manage mangroves and re-introduce native reeds to assist in improving water health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water use</td>
<td>We can meet our everyday water needs, safely, reliably and efficiently</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Water use</strong></td>
<td>Support the use of water quality monitoring to inform the basis of the Water Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and amenity</td>
<td>We enjoy being in, on and near the water</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recreation and amenity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Water contributes to our identity and beliefs, as individuals and as part of communities</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Culture</strong></td>
<td>Support Auckland Council finding alternative water sources such as recycled wastewater/greywater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Our water systems are resilient to changing conditions, and we are resilient to water hazards</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Resilience</strong></td>
<td>Support consideration of including rain water catchments, including rain collecting gardens/rock gardens, in all new housing and development consents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do these five values cover the aspects of water that are important to you?</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Do these five values cover the aspects of water that are important to you?</strong></td>
<td>Support improved enforcement and education to manage animals on beaches to assist with improving water quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposed topics to be included in the Auckland Water Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support the reseeding of mussels to improve the overall water health of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Hauraki Gulf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Culture</strong> -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support a clearer definition of 'Cultural Health'. The 'Mauri' of our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>waterways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Resilience</strong> -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support conversations starting now on the development of a strategy for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>priority areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support stronger planning controls for development in flood prone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The things we need to work on: The workshops identified a large number of challenges for water in Auckland. We have summarised and grouped them into two main areas: issues we need to work on and processes we need to work on.

### Issues we need to work on
These are the aspects of water in the physical environment summarised into four categories

- Cleaning up waterways
  - Addressing issues like sediment, overflows, litter and other pollution
- Meeting future water needs
  - Our future water sources and managing our demand
- Growth in the right places
  - Managing growth to minimise impacts on water and to improve it where it is already degraded
- Adapting to a changing water future
  - Getting prepared for climate extremes such as floods, slips and drought

### Processes we need to work on
These are aspects of the way we are managing water

- Creating our water future together
  - Improving water will need effort from everyone, not just the Council organisations
- Do these broad categories capture the issues that concern you?
- Do these broad categories capture the processes you are concerned with?

Concerned that the number of topics with unique outcomes will make the strategy hard to design and later implement.
Concerned that the strategy lacks clearly defined outcomes and objectives that are necessary in its development.
Support a clear outcome and stricter enforcement to better manage sediment and contaminant run-off.

Support in principle noting – the need for further clarity on the core role Watercare must play in the development of the Water Strategy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed topics to be included in the Auckland Water Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summaised into four categories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | • Setting priorities for investment  
Delivering the outcomes at an affordable price and good value for customers | | Note the need for other CCO’s such as Auckland Transport to align their environment and sustainability objectives to Council Plans. |
| | • Achieving net benefits for catchments  
Taking a whole-of-watershed perspective in decision-making | | |
| | • Applying a Māori world view  
Underpinning a holistic approach to water and te mauri o te wai | | |
| **Principles** | **Proposal** | **Questions** | **Feedback** |
| These suggested principles are to help guide decisions and behaviours as we work on the issues and processes | • Recognise that water is a taonga  
• Work with natural ecosystems  
• Deliver catchment scale thinking and action  
• Focus on achieving right-sized solutions with multiple benefits  
• Work together to plan and deliver better water outcomes  
• Look to the future | • Do you agree with these principles? | Support, noting the need for all CCO’s to align with the overarching principles of the Water Strategy. |