

## Analysis of land asset transfer options

	Option 1: Status quo	Options 2 and 3: Partial transfers	Option 4: Full transfer
<b>Overview</b>	Panuku retains ownership of the properties, and the council continues to operate as it does currently.	Panuku transfers the ownership of the completed only or completed and future waterfront property developments to direct the Council Entity ownership, while leaving either the working waterfront assets or working waterfront and future developments in Panuku ownership.	Panuku transfers the ownership of completed and future waterfront development property and the working waterfront property to the Council Entity.
<b>Advantages</b>	<p>No transaction costs in the immediate future.</p> <p>Panuku's day to day operations in their waterfront activities would not be changed.</p>	<p>Would be a marginally simpler transaction to implement than full transfer, although would require mostly the same legal procedures.</p> <p>Would mitigate some of the potential future liabilities to the council.</p> <p>Would consolidate some of the strategic land ownership and decision making in the Council Entity.</p> <p>Would reduce some duplication in governance for approvals.</p> <p>May provide Panuku greater freedom and flexibility to implement its strategic plans for the working waterfront.</p>	<p>Facilitates an orderly transition from development to ongoing maintenance activities without the need for a transfer in the future.</p> <p>Is consistent with the way Panuku operates in other development locations.</p> <p>Will reduce duplication in governance for approvals.</p>
<b>Disadvantages</b>	<p>If future transformed assets remain with Panuku indefinitely, then developed waterfront assets will have a different ownership arrangement to properties relating to the other development activities undertaken by Panuku (e.g. Manukau, Avondale, Onehunga, etc).</p> <p>Once development of the waterfront is complete, Panuku would be left with ownership of public assets such as parks which are used for activities that are outside of their core business.</p> <p>May have possible tax implications that would significantly impact the council's rates and debt.</p>	<p>Panuku's urban development mandate could be confused with marina operating activity.</p> <p>Any proposed transfer of the waterfront properties in the future would need to consider potential impact on the council's rates and debt.</p> <p>No single entity owning waterfront spaces – potential for misalignment</p> <p>Future public space assets would need to be maintained by the council and Auckland Transport while these entities do not have legal ownership.</p> <p>Panuku risk losing momentum and leadership over the waterfront development and may impact their reputation in the market – this would be mitigated by giving Panuku appropriate delegations.</p> <p>May have possible tax implications that would</p>	<p>Panuku risk losing momentum and leadership over the waterfront development and may impact their reputation in the market – this will be mitigated by giving Panuku appropriate delegations.</p> <p>Transaction costs of approximately \$300,000 to \$500,000.</p>

Option 1: Status quo	Options 2 and 3: Partial transfers	Option 4: Full transfer
-------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------------

significantly impact the council's rates and debt.

Transaction costs of approximately \$300,000 to \$500,000.

---