

Attachment F: Local Board Feedback on the Legacy rates remission and postponement policies

Summary

The local boards were split between supporting the option to replace the legacy schemes with grants (eight boards) and wanting to retain the existing schemes (eight boards, plus one further board which supports either retention or a regional scheme). Seven of the boards that support retention also wanted to consider options for a regional remission scheme.

Of the nine boards that support retention, six have a legacy local council scheme for community and sporting activities. Properties in these board areas receive \$350,000 (85 per cent) of the local community and sporting rates remissions granted.

The boards supporting retention of remissions were concerned that the grants option proposed:

- does not address the existing inequities between board areas in how community and sports facilities are supported by council
- lacked certainty regarding ongoing funding
- does not integrate with the draft Sports Facility Investment Plan.

Council support for local community and sporting facilities varies between boards depending on the policies of the former councils. In some areas community and sports facilities are often located on council land and supported by community leases. In other areas such facilities are usually owned directly by a community or sporting organisation. These organisations received varying levels of support from the previous councils, through mechanisms such as contracts for services, grants and rates remissions.

Officers have acknowledged local board concerns regarding the ongoing funding for community and sports facilities in those board areas where a greater proportion of such facilities are community owned and supported with rates remissions. Addressing the issue of regional equity for funding local community and sports facilities is outside the scope of the review of the Rates remission and postponement policy. As was noted by some boards, this issue needs to be considered alongside the council's wider reviews of funding for plans for community and sports facilities, such as the development of the Sports Facility Investment Plan.

In response to this feedback officers have modified the recommend option so that remissions classed as local transferred to a new local asset based grants budget rather than the LDI budget. Officers will also report on the integration of the legacy grants with the council's investment strategies for sports and community facilities, including the Sports Facility Investment Plan within the three year transition.

Local Board feedback - Preferred Options:

Option	No of boards supporting	Boards Supporting
1. Replace with grants	8	Albert-Eden Henderson-Massey Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Ōrākei Ōtara-Papatoetoe Puketāpapa Waitematā Whau
2. Retain current remissions and postponement schemes	8	Devonport-Takapuna Hibiscus and Bays Howick Kaipātiki Manurewa Papakura Rodney Upper Harbour
3. Expand into regional remission and postponement scheme	0	
4. Remove schemes with no replacement	0	
5. Supports grants in principle but require more information before agreeing this approach. In interim supports either retaining current remissions with greater local control or development of a consistent regional remission policy	1	Franklin
6. Want options for a regional remission scheme to be considered	7	Devonport-Takapuna Franklin Hibiscus and Bays Kaipātiki Manurewa Rodney Upper Harbour
7. Supports feedback of the other boards	1	Waiheke
Board chose not to give feedback at this time	2	Great Barrier Maungakiekie-Tāmaki
Delegated feedback not yet received	1	Waitākere Ranges

Other Feedback provided:

Feedback	No of boards supporting	Boards Supporting
Options do not address equity issues	6	Devonport-Takapuna Hibiscus and Bays Kaipātiki Manurewa Rodney Upper Harbour
Request options for regional remissions scheme	7	Devonport-Takapuna Franklin Hibiscus and Bays Kaipātiki Manurewa Rodney Upper Harbour
Lack of certainty regarding ongoing funding	6	Devonport-Takapuna Hibiscus and Bays Kaipātiki Manurewa Rodney Upper Harbour
Grants supported if easy process for community to apply for grants to pay rates	1	Puketāpapa
Requests more information on how grants will be integrated into LB Funding Policy	2	Puketāpapa Whau
Request communication plan	1	Papakura
Requires more info on the level of remission currently granted	1	Franklin
Requires clarification whether future grants pool will cover remissions for rates increases and new sporting or community organisations.	1	Franklin
Could adopt an interim approach, retaining existing remissions but with oversight from local boards	1	Franklin
Wants remissions considered alongside other forms of council support such as community leases to ensure equity	1	Franklin
All legacy remissions and postponements including those classed as regional are local and should transfer to local board grants	1	Albert-Eden
Seeks clarification on the transition process to ensure local board discretionary funding equity following the three-year period.	1	Waitemata
Supports the feedback provided by other boards	1	Waiheke
Does not support transition of the regional heritage (covenanted land) remissions into a regional grant programme, in particular covenants under the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act.	1	Waiheke

Local Board

Albert-Eden

That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

- a) Supports option 1 to address the legacy council remission and postponement schemes which is to integrate remissions and postponements with grants schemes with three year transition (excluding the Manukau postponement scheme for sports clubs).
- b) Requests that the regional and local legacy remissions and postponements funding be moved to local grant budgets as all the groups identified are local in nature and should therefore be governed by local boards.

Devonport-Takapuna

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

- a) does not support the officer recommended Option one, to integrate with the contestable grants scheme due to the following concerns:
 - i. there is no assurance to local boards that the funding provided to local boards is increased in line with rates increases so that the proportion of rates relief available to eligible parties also increases and is commensurate.
 - ii. the current remission scheme is inequitable because not all former legacy council areas had such a scheme in place and integrating this with the contestable grants scheme does not address this inequity.
- b) considers that the recommended option one does not address outstanding equity issues because:
 - i. where community halls and other facilities are owned and maintained by local communities they provide a service to the community without cost to council
 - ii. the current remissions policy goes a small way to address the differential between community operated facilities and those facilities that are fully council funded in other areas, by providing rates relief to communities who would otherwise receive no funding; this is fair given the service the community operated facilities provide
 - iii. adjusting the remissions policy to require that groups apply for an annual grant is inequitable in light of the funding available in other areas, and worsens the situation instead of improving it by removing the certainty for communities and making their funding subject to annual decision making
 - iv. if the equity issues are to be properly addressed, all community halls and other facilities which rely on rates remissions should be fully funded on the same basis as those halls and facilities in other legacy council areas.
- c) requests an additional option be investigated for the development of a region-wide scheme, which may have some local decision-making, that supports community and

sporting organisations and natural and historic heritage assets as all current options identified seek to deal with legacy schemes rather than setting a holistic policy to achieve agreed outcomes through this investment.

- d) supports option two in the interim to retain the legacy remission and postponement schemes (status quo) until further investigation is undertaken on the option of a region-wide scheme, noting the following comments:
- i. Section 98 of the Auckland Council Community Grants Policy states that rates rebates, rates remissions and rates postponements are out of scope for the Community Grants Policy.
 - ii. the grant system being suggested is only for a three year period which means that there is no certainty for those community groups owning and operating halls that the arrangement would continue beyond that three year period
 - iii. the proposal states “this will be smoothed over time by the Local Board Funding Policy” but it is unclear how legacy areas where the rates remission type of arrangement was in place will be impacted or affected in the future and how this improves upon current inequities.
 - iv. the limitations with the Smarty Grants system already has many community groups expressing concerns on how onerous it can be to apply for a grant and the local board expresses its concern regarding the use of this process for rates remissions.
 - v. there are unresolved concerns that have been raised previously by the northern local boards regarding funding gaps identified for community houses, community centres and art facilities due to inequitable levels of funding and the use of local board’s operational Locally Driven Initiatives budget to fund these centres whereas in other areas funding is provided through Asset Based Services funding is not adequately provided.
 - vi. it is unclear whether this Rates Remission and Postponement Policy Review is taking into account the Sports Facility Investment Plan, which is looking to take a systematic approach to regional investment in a network of sport facilities and moving away from an ad hoc and inconsistent investment across legacy councils and as the draft Sports Facility Investment Plan looks for increased revenue opportunities while moving away from removal of rates remissions and postponements.

Franklin

That the Franklin Local Board:

- a) **delegate authority to the local board chair and deputy chair to provide feedback on the options to address the legacy council rates remission and postponement schemes;**

Franklin Local Board submits the following feedback on the options to address the legacy council rates remission and postponement schemes:

- a) Franklin Local Board generally supports the principle of a move from legacy rates remissions to local grants, as recommended by officers. This is because it offers more

public transparency around funding support for sporting and community organisations.

- b) The information provided to date does not give a clear picture of why some organisations are getting a lower remission amount by percentage than others, when they are all subject to a remission value of '50% to 100%'. More detail is needed on current variances, so that the local board can gain a fuller understanding of the future impact of moving to an LDI funded grant scheme, before a decision is made.
- c) Clarification is required of whether any future grants pool can be expanded to cover remissions for rates increases and new sporting or community organisations. The outcome of that could impact on the board's Locally Driven Initiative fund, requiring further prioritisation of funding between activities and projects. Guidance would be required in regard to development of policy wording to ensure Local Boards do not put themselves in difficult situations when managing a potential increase in applications for a remission grant.
- d) Until the further information sought at clauses b) and c) can be provided, an interim approach could be to develop an 'enhanced status quo' option, which incorporates local input based on members' up to date knowledge of sites and clubs. This will even out current discrepancies prior to moving to a local grants based scheme.
- e) An Auckland wide policy on what organisations and groups are eligible would help to achieve a consistent approach.
- f) There is concern that the current policy approach is inequitable for some organisations, when considered holistically with other council schemes and mechanisms. A move to a grants based scheme should also be considered alongside community leases to sporting and community organisations.

Great Barrier

That the Great Barrier Local Board:

- a) receive the local board feedback on rates remission and postponement policy review report and note that the board will not be providing feedback at this stage.

Henderson-Massey

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

- a) supports option 1 - Integrate remissions and postponements with grants schemes with three year transition (excluding the Manukau postponement scheme for sports clubs) to align with practice in the Henderson-Massey local board area.

Hibiscus and Bays

That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board provides the following feedback on the options to address the legacy council rates remission and postponement policy review:

- a) does not support the recommended Option One, to integrate with the contestable grants scheme due to the following concerns:
 - i. there is no assurance to local boards that the funding provided to local boards through the grant scheme will be increased in line with rates increases so that the proportion of rates relief available to eligible parties will also increase and be commensurate.
 - ii. the current remission scheme is inequitable because not all former legacy council areas had a scheme in place and integrating this with the contestable grants scheme does not address this inequity.
- b) considers that the recommended Option One does not address outstanding equity issues because:
 - i. where community halls and other facilities are owned and maintained by local communities, they provide a service to the community without cost to council.
 - ii. the current remissions policy goes a small way to address the differential between community operated facilities and those facilities that are fully council funded in other areas, by providing rates relief to communities who would otherwise receive no funding; this is fair given the service the community operated facilities provide.
 - iii. adjusting the remissions policy to require that groups apply for an annual grant is

inequitable in light of the funding available in other areas, and worsens the situation instead of improving it by removing the certainty for communities and making their funding subject to annual decision-making.

- iv. if the equity issues are to be properly addressed, all community halls and other facilities, which rely on rates remissions, should be fully funded on the same basis as those halls and facilities in other legacy council areas.
- c) request an additional option be investigated for the development of a region-wide scheme, which may have some local decision-making, that supports community and sporting organisations and natural and historic heritage assets as all current options identified seek to deal with legacy schemes rather than setting a holistic policy to achieve agreed outcomes through this investment.
- d) supports option two in the interim to retain the legacy remission and postponement schemes (status quo) until further investigation is undertaken on the option of a region-wide scheme, noting the following comments:
 - i. section 98 of the Auckland Council Community Grants Policy states that rates rebates, rates remissions and rates postponements are out of scope for the Community Grants Policy.
 - ii. the grant system being suggested is only for a three-year period which means that there is no certainty for those community groups owning and operating halls that the arrangement would continue beyond that three year period.
 - iii. the proposal states “this will be smoothed over time by the Local Board Funding Policy” but it is unclear how legacy areas where the rates remission type of arrangement was in place will be impacted or affected in the future and how this improves upon current inequities.
 - iv. the limitations with the Smarty Grants system already has many community groups expressing concerns on how onerous it can be to apply for a grant and the local board expresses its concern regarding the use of this process for rates remissions.
 - v. reiterates concerns raised previously by the northern local boards that they are either forced to use Locally Driven Initiatives budgets to fill gaps in funding for community houses, centres and facilities, or going without and leaving community assets unfunded, where other legacy areas are fully funded via Assets Based Services funding.
 - vi. it is unclear whether this Rates Remission and Postponement Policy Review is taking into account the Sports Facility Investment Plan, which is looking to take a systematic approach to regional investment in a network of sport facilities and moving away from an ad hoc and inconsistent investment across legacy councils and as the draft Sports Facility Investment Plan looks for increased revenue opportunities while moving away from removal of rates remissions and postponements.
- e) supports an option to develop a holistic region-wide policy to address rates remissions and postponements to reconcile the current legacy arrangements.
- f) notes that the responsibility for the administration of the rates remission and postponement policy implementation is not clear as it sits outside local board decision making.
- g) agree that attachment D to the agenda report remain confidential.

Howick

resolve to retain the status quo (Option 2), that legacy remission and postponements schemes continue unchanged.

Kaipātiki

That the Kaipātiki Local Board:

- a) does not support the recommended option one, to integrate with the contestable grants scheme due to the following concerns:
 - i. there is no assurance to local boards that the funding provided to local boards through the grant scheme will be increased in line with rates increases so that the proportion of rates relief available to eligible parties also increases and is commensurate; and

- ii. the current remission scheme is inequitable because not all former legacy council areas had such a scheme in place and integrating this with the contestable grants scheme does not address this inequity.
- b) considers that the recommended option one does not address outstanding equity issues because:
 - i. where community halls and other facilities are owned and maintained by local communities they provide a service to the community without cost to council;
 - ii. the current remissions policy goes a small way to address the differential between community operated facilities and those facilities that are fully council funded in other areas, by providing rates relief to communities who would otherwise receive no funding; this is fair given the service the community operated facilities provide;
 - iii. adjusting the remissions policy to require that groups apply for an annual grant is inequitable in light of the funding available in other areas, and worsens the situation instead of improving it by removing the certainty for communities and making their funding subject to annual decision making; and
 - iv. if the equity issues are to be properly addressed, all community halls and other facilities which rely on rates remissions should be fully funded on the same basis as those halls and facilities in other legacy council areas.
- c) request an additional option be investigated for the development of a region-wide scheme, which may have some local decision-making, that supports community and sporting organisations and natural and historic heritage assets as all current options identified seek to deal with legacy schemes rather than setting a holistic policy to achieve agreed outcomes through this investment.
- d) support option two in the interim to retain the legacy remission and postponement schemes (status quo) until further investigation is undertaken on the option of a region-wide scheme, noting the following comments:
 - i. section 98 of the Auckland Council Community Grants Policy states that rates rebates, rates remissions and rates postponements are out of scope for the Community Grants Policy.
 - ii. the grant system being suggested is only for a three year period which means that there is no certainty for those community groups owning and operating halls that the arrangement would continue beyond that three year period.
 - iii. the proposal states “this will be smoothed over time by the Local Board Funding Policy” but it is unclear how legacy areas where the rates remission type of arrangement was in place will be impacted or affected in the future and how this improves upon current inequities.
 - iv. the limitations with the Smarty Grants system already has many community groups expressing concerns on how onerous it can be to apply for a grant and the local board expresses its concern regarding the use of this process for rates remissions.
 - v. there are unresolved concerns that have been raised previously by the northern local boards regarding funding gaps identified for community houses, community centres and art facilities due to inequitable levels of funding and the use of local board’s operational Locally Driven Initiatives budget to fund these centres where-Asset Based Services funding is not adequately provided.
 - vi. it is unclear whether this Rates Remission and Postponement Policy Review is taking into account the Sports Facility Investment Plan, which is looking to take a systematic approach to regional investment in a network of sport facilities and moving away from an ad hoc and inconsistent investment across legacy councils and as the draft Sports Facility Investment Plan looks for increased revenue opportunities while moving away from removal of rates remissions and postponements.
- e) request the governing body form a political working party made up of governing body and

local board members to review the policy and recommend an equitable way forward.

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu board:

- a) support option 1, to integrate remissions and postponements with grants schemes with three-year transition.
- b) further give the following comments noting:
 - that option 1 will allow for equity, transparency and local governance oversight.
 - the board are interested to receive information and analysis following public consultation.

Manurewa

That the Manurewa Local Board:

- a) does not support the recommended option one, to integrate with the contestable grants scheme due to the following concerns:
 - i) there is no assurance to local boards that the funding provided to local boards through the grant scheme will be increased in line with rates increases so that the proportion of rates relief available to eligible parties also increases and is commensurate.
 - ii) the current remission scheme is inequitable because not all former legacy council areas had such a scheme in place and integrating this with the contestable grants scheme does not address this inequity.
- b) considers that the recommended option one does not address outstanding equity issues because:
 - i) where community halls and other facilities are owned and maintained by local communities they provide a service to the community without cost to the council
 - ii) the current remissions policy goes a small way to address the differential between community operated facilities and those facilities that are fully council funded in other areas, by providing rates relief to communities who would otherwise receive no funding; this is fair given the service the community operated facilities provide
 - iii) adjusting the remissions policy to require that groups apply for an annual grant is inequitable in light of the funding available in other areas, and worsens the situation instead of improving it by removing the certainty for communities and making their funding subject to annual decision making
 - iv) if the equity issues are to be properly addressed, all community halls and other facilities which rely on rates remissions should be fully funded on the same basis as those halls and facilities in other legacy council areas.
- c) request an additional option be investigated for the development of a region-wide scheme, which may have some local decision-making, that supports community and sporting organisations and natural and historic heritage assets as all current options identified seek to deal with legacy schemes rather than setting a holistic policy to achieve agreed outcomes through this investment.
- d) support option two in the interim to retain the legacy remission and postponement schemes (status quo) until further investigation is undertaken on the option of a region-wide scheme, noting the following comments:
 - i) section 98 of the Auckland Council Community Grants Policy states that rates rebates, rates remissions and rates postponements are out of scope for the Community Grants Policy.

- ii) the grant system being suggested is only for a three year period which means that there is no certainty for those community groups owning and operating halls that the arrangement would continue beyond that three year period.
- iii) the proposal states “this will be smoothed over time by the Local Board Funding Policy” but it is unclear how legacy areas where the rates remission type of arrangement was in place will be impacted or affected in the future and how this improves upon current inequities.
- iv) the limitations with the Smarty Grants system already has many community groups expressing concerns on how onerous it can be to apply for a grant and the local board expresses its concern regarding the use of this process for rates remissions.
- v) it is unclear whether this Rates Remission and Postponement Policy Review is taking into account the Sports Facility Investment Plan, which is looking to take a systematic approach to regional investment in a network of sport facilities and moving away from an ad hoc and inconsistent investment across legacy councils. At the same time the draft Sports Facility Investment Plan looks for increased revenue opportunities while moving away from removal of rates remissions and postponements

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

- a) receives the rates remission and postponement policy review report;
- b) support review of legacy arrangements to ensure transparency and looks forward to giving a formal view in May 2018.

Ōrākei

That the Ōrākei Local Board agrees that Option One; that the legacy schemes be replaced with grants as its preferred option to address the legacy council remission and postponement schemes.

Ōtara-Papatoetoe

That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

- a) support option 1, to integrate remissions and postponements with grants schemes with three-year transition.
- b) request information and analysis of the feedback received from public consultation on this proposal.

Papakura

That the Papakura Local Board:

- a) resolve to retain the status quo (option 2), that legacy council rates remission and postponement schemes continue unchanged.
- b) request staff to prepare a communication plan about any proposed changes to the rates remission and postponement schemes.

Puketāpapa

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

in principle supports Option 1, pending further development of this option, in particular, an easy process for community organisations to apply for grants to cover the cost of rates and understanding how the remission funding will be integrated into the local board funding formula

Rodney

That the Rodney Local Board:

- a) provide the following feedback on the options to address the legacy council remission and postponement schemes:
 - i) does not support the recommended option one, to integrate with the contestable grants scheme due to the following concerns:
 - a) it is not the local board's role to be involved in rating and rates remissions; this is best dealt with consistently at a regional level.
 - b) if administered through the grant scheme there is no assurance to local boards that the funding provided to local boards is increased in line with rates increases so that the proportion of rates relief available to eligible parties also increases and is commensurate.
 - c) consider that the current remission scheme is inequitable because not all former legacy council areas had such a scheme in place and integrating this with the contestable grants scheme does not address this inequity.
 - d) considers that the proposed option one does not address outstanding equity issues because:
 - i) where community halls and other facilities are owned and maintained by local communities they provide a service to the community without cost to council
 - ii) the current remissions policy goes a small way to address the differential between community operated facilities and those facilities that are fully council funded in other areas, by providing rates relief to communities who would otherwise receive no funding; this is fair given the service the community operated facilities provide
 - iii) adjusting the remissions policy to require that groups apply for an annual grant is inequitable in light of the funding available in other areas, and worsens the situation instead of improving it by removing the certainty for communities and making their funding subject to annual decision making
 - iv) if the equity issues are to be properly addressed, all community halls and other facilities, which rely on rates remissions, should be fully funded on the same basis as those halls and facilities in other legacy council areas.
 - ii) supports Option 2 to retain the legacy remission and postponement schemes (status quo) and provide the following comments:
 - a) Section 98 of the Auckland Council Community Grants Policy states that rates rebates, rates remissions and rates postponements are out of scope for the Community Grants Policy.
 - b) The grant system being suggested is only for a three year period which means that there is no certainty for those community groups owning and operating halls that the arrangement would continue beyond that three year period.
 - c) The proposal states "this will be smoothed over time by the Local Board Funding Policy" but it is unclear how legacy areas where the rates remission type of arrangement was in place will be impacted or affected in the future and how this improves upon current inequities.

- d) The limitations with the Smarty Grants system already has many community groups expressing concerns on how onerous it can be to apply for a grant and the local board expresses its concern regarding the use of this process for rates remissions.
 - e) The local board reiterates concerns raised previously by the northern local boards that they are either forced to use Locally Driven Initiatives budgets to fill gaps in funding for community houses, centres and facilities, or going without and leaving community assets unfunded, where other legacy areas are fully funded via Assets Based Services funding.
 - f) The draft Sports Facility Investment Plan is looking for increased revenue opportunities while moving away from rates remissions and postponements. It is requested that the Rates Remission and Postponement Policy Review take this into account.
- iii) supports an option to develop a holistic region-wide policy to address rates remissions and postponements to reconcile the current legacy arrangements.

Upper Harbour

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

- a) does not support the recommended option one, to integrate with the contestable grants scheme due to the following concerns:
 - i. there is no assurance to local boards that the funding provided to local boards through the grant scheme will be increased in line with rates increases so that the proportion of rates relief available to eligible parties also increases and is commensurate.
 - ii. the current remission scheme is inequitable because not all former legacy council areas had such a scheme in place and integrating this with the contestable grants scheme does not address this inequity.
- b) considers that the recommended option one does not address outstanding equity issues because:
 - i. where community halls and other facilities are owned and maintained by local communities they provide a service to the community without cost to council
 - ii. the current remissions policy goes a small way to address the differential between community operated facilities and those facilities that are fully council funded in other areas, by providing rates relief to communities who would otherwise receive no funding; this is fair given the service the community operated facilities provide
 - iii. adjusting the remissions policy to require that groups apply for an annual grant is inequitable in light of the funding available in other areas, and worsens the situation instead of improving it by removing the certainty for communities and making their funding subject to annual decision making
 - iv. if the equity issues are to be properly addressed, all community halls and other facilities which rely on rates remissions should be fully funded on the same basis as those halls and facilities in other legacy council areas.
- c) request an additional option be investigated for the development of a region-wide scheme, which may have some local decision-making, that supports community and sporting organisations and natural and historic heritage assets as all current options identified seek to deal with legacy schemes rather than setting a holistic policy to achieve agreed outcomes through this investment.

- d) support option two in the interim to retain the legacy remission and postponement schemes (status quo) until further investigation is undertaken on the option of a region-wide scheme, noting the following comments:
- i. section 98 of the Auckland Council Community Grants Policy states that rates rebates, rates remissions and rates postponements are out of scope for the Community Grants Policy.
 - ii. the grant system being suggested is only for a three year period which means that there is no certainty for those community groups owning and operating halls that the arrangement would continue beyond that three year period.
 - iii. the proposal states “this will be smoothed over time by the Local Board Funding Policy” but it is unclear how legacy areas where the rates remission type of arrangement was in place will be impacted or affected in the future and how this improves upon current inequities.
 - iv. the limitations with the Smarty Grants system already has many community groups expressing concerns on how onerous it can be to apply for a grant and the local board expresses its concern regarding the use of this process for rates remissions.
 - v. there are unresolved concerns that have been raised previously by the northern local boards regarding funding gaps identified for community houses, community centres and art facilities due to inequitable levels of funding and the use of local board’s operational Locally Driven Initiatives budget to fund these centres where Asset Based Services funding is not adequately provided.
 - vi. it is unclear whether this Rates Remission and Postponement Policy Review is taking into account the Sports Facility Investment Plan, which is looking to take a systematic approach to regional investment in a network of sport facilities and moving away from an ad hoc and inconsistent investment across legacy councils and as the draft Sports Facility Investment Plan looks for increased revenue opportunities while moving away from removal of rates remissions and postponements.

Waiheke

That the Waiheke Local Board:

- a) delegate to Chairperson P Walden and Member J Meeuwsen to provide feedback on the options to address the legacy council remission and postponement schemes.

Delegated Feedback Received:

The Waiheke Local Board supports the feedback provided by other boards but in particular does not support transition of the regional heritage (covenanted land) remissions into a regional grant programme, in particular covenants under the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act.

Chairperson P Walden and Board member J Meeuwsen

On behalf of the Waiheke Local Board

22 December 2017

Waitākere Ranges

That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

- a) receive the LB feedback on Rates remission and postponement policy review report

b) delegate to Deputy Chair and Member Coney for feedback

Waitematā

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) support Option 1 that the legacy rates remission schemes be replaced by grants for a period of three years.
- b) seek clarification on the transition process to resume local board discretionary funding equity following the three-year period.

Whau

That the Whau Local Board:

- a) Option one – Integrate remissions and postponements with grants schemes with three year transition (excluding the Manukau postponement scheme for sports clubs)