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Community Liaison Group for Senior Housing Needs
a delegation to the Local Board 26 August 2020

Background. As a result of a Community meeting held at the Seaside Sanctuary in November 2019, held to discuss the living situations for seniors on Waiheke, three separate active focus groups emerged. One is headed by Julie Cairns from the local Health Trust. One is a group investigating possibilities involving the Seaside Sanctuary property in Surfdale. The third is our group, a community group, who have continued to meet regularly over the last 9 months.

Our purpose is to ensure that all seniors who wish to continue living on Waiheke Island are able to do so.

Our Objectives:

- Research alternative housing solutions for seniors
  (We have investigated, shared and produced a large amount of researched material that is currently held by the CAB)

- Encourage Auckland Council to develop a Housing Policy that includes pensioner housing

- Lobby and support the Local Board for Council Land on Waiheke to be used for senior housing
  Specifically at the moment, 7 Waitai Rd,

- Liaise with other groups who are serving senior housing needs. i.e. Waiheke Health Trust, Healthy Housing Group, Seaside Sanctuary Feasibility Study Group, Waiheke Community Housing Trust.

- Identify specific ways to support other interest groups Healthy Housing Initiative and the Seaside Sanctuary Feasibility study group.
  We are currently actively supporting the Seaside Sanctuary Feasibility Study Group.

- Compile and distribute an overview of elderly care services on Waiheke
The key issue we want to highlight at this meeting is the purchase of the property at 7 Waitai Rd.

- There are many groups and individuals who have been here before us to stand for the provision of land owned by council for the benefit of our residents.

- We endorse and compliment the Local Board for the work already done to retain the Waitai Rd property to date.

- We believe there are currently two pieces of Council owned land near the current Council buildings in Ostend. One is in Belgium Street and the other at 7 Waitai Rd.

- We understand that the land at 7 Waitai Rd was purchased in the 1940s, as a site for pensioner housing.

- We understand that there is already a business case in existence that justifies the development of the Waitai Rd land for intensive pensioner housing. We wonder if the new business case currently being undertaken may be able to draw on the earlier one to assist your case.

- We are offering to do everything that is possible to enable the Local Board to influence Auckland Council and be successful in the retention and development of Watai Rd for intensive pensioner housing.

This issue has wide-spread interest: There is a huge concern about the needs of seniors on Waiheke. In the last 9 months alone, the groundswell of support has been evident. There was an unexpectedly large turn-out at the Seaside Sanctuary Meeting held November 3rd 2019. It was also the top issue during the Auckland Council initiated focus groups about the future needs for Waiheke. The recent forums in relation to the 30 year plan for Auckland city identified housing as a vital issue. In particular housing for the elderly.
A: Our Statements:
As a proactive and enthusiastic group of community residents, we will do anything to support you as the Local Board in the purchase of Waitai Road for pensioner housing.

We have created a strategy for this to become an island wide project. This includes a petition, shared research, regular published items, a business case, questions directly to Auckland Council.

As part of our research we attended a presentation by HBH Edencare. They are a NFP organisation. We have information about them and recognise they would be an excellent resource for input to any design and build for seniors which could include 3 levels of care.

B: Our Requests:
- The Local Board research into and advise our group of all Council-owned land that could possibly be made available for senior housing needs.
- That the Local Board request the Auckland Council creates a Housing Policy and that this includes the needs for Seniors in the Community.
- The Local Board do everything in its power to ensure the purchase of the property at Waitai Road for Senior Housing.
- Please advise us of the status of the Belgium Street property originally bought for a new council building.

Thank you for the time and energy you already contribute to making Waiheke an Island to be proud of. With your partnership we can together also attend to the needs of seniors who for a variety of reasons currently are forced to leave the Island and people they love.

Signed by Jennifer Nathan, Anna Rees, Rozanne Gold, Lin Carter, Anne Bailey on behalf of the community group.
Waiheke Local Board feedback to the Finance and Performance Committee – Retention of 7 Waitai Road, Waiheke Island, for Community Housing and Health Services

(Formally adopted at the Waiheke Local Board business meeting 26 August 2020)

Executive Summary

1. The Waiheke Local Board asks that the Finance and Performance Committee remove 7 Waitai Road from the asset recycling process, or at very least place its sale on hold to enable it to be further investigated for community housing and health services.

2. This request is based on the Waiheke Local Board taking a governance leadership role on the proposal and working with the Ngāti Paoa Iwi Trust and other partners on development. Formal interest in exploring co-location opportunities for a health hub as well as housing has been received from the Waiheke Health Trust.

3. Considerable investigation into community housing on this site has already been undertaken and initial financial modelling suggests the proposal could be structured in a way to make it viable. If necessary, land purchase by lead partners can be investigated, although as this is Council land the board considers a lease approach would be the most appropriate.

4. There are very strong social and community objectives that can be achieved here for housing and also with a complementary health hub. These are well aligned to Council’s social objectives.

5. Developing community housing on Waiheke is a key priority in both the Waiheke Local Board Plan and the new draft Waiheke Area Plan. 7 Waitai Road (and potentially 6 Belgium Street next door) is the only Council owned land on Waiheke suitable for this purpose.

6. To enable its leadership the Waiheke Local Board will formally seek an appropriate delegation from the Governing Body in the context of the Waiheke Governance Pilot to give it the tools to advance this proposal with its housing and health partners.

Waiheke Governance Pilot

7. The purpose of the Waiheke Governance Pilot approved by the governing body in 2017 and now in its third year is “to pilot an increased level of devolved decision making to the Waiheke Local Board”. This allow the Waiheke Local Board to test whether having more authority and doing things differently can make a positive difference in its community.

8. Council’s Research and Evaluation unit recently completed a “mid-pilot” evaluation which included the recommendation that additional governance, managerial and staff delegations for the Waiheke Local Board be
investigated. The evaluation heard that efforts under the pilot to obtain such authority over policy, finance and a range of operational matters had largely not been supported by Auckland Council for a variety of reasons.

9. The Waiheke Local Board requests that the necessary authority, delegations and support be provided to the board to enable it to formally investigate social/community housing and health services on this site. The board is ready, willing and able to lead on this project with its partners.

10. There is a precedent for such authority already under the Waiheke governance pilot with the Waiheke Local Board being delegated authority by the governing body to make land use and development decisions over public land at Mātiatia. This delegation has enabled addressing issues at Mātiatia to be one of the more successful outcomes of the pilot to date.

11. In this context the Waiheke Local Board should be treated differently and the suggestion that all local boards should equally have property sales applying to them should not apply in this case.

7 Waitai Road - Community Housing and Health Services

12. 7 Waitai Road was acquired by the Waiheke Roads Board in the 1950 for a depot as it adjoined the then roads board office (now Council’s Waiheke Service Centre and Waiheke Local Board office). It has been used for an associated purpose since that time.

13. Auckland City Council originally leased 6 Belgium St which backs onto 7 Waitai Road for storage and civil defence purposes and purchased it around 1996 to enable a combined service centre/library to be developed, neither of which happened.

14. The plan at the end of this paper shows the position of 7 Waitai Road and 6 Belgium Street within the Ostend commercial centre. Ostend is mostly a mix of commercial, residential and community functions and is the administrative centre for Waiheke.

15. The Waiheke Local Board, other Waiheke agencies, trusts and community groups have been seeking opportunities to develop community/social housing on Waiheke for many years now. 7 Waitai Road is perfectly located for community housing and accommodation for care purposes, retired, elderly or disabled persons is a permitted activity on these sites. 7 Waitai Rd and 6 Belgium St are the only parcels of Council land on Waiheke suitable for this purpose and 7 Waitai Road should not be sold while this matter is investigated.

2016 business case and needs assessment

16. In 2016 a detailed housing business case to develop social housing at 7 Waitai Road and 6 Belgium Street, with a focus on housing for older persons was undertaken in partnership with Waiheke mana whenua Ngāti Paoa and
presented to Panuku. The business case indicated that at least 40 people in one and two bedroom units could be housed on the two sites given the need to provide for wastewater disposal on site.

17. The Waiheke Local Board initiated the establishment of a steering group to take a leadership role in the preparation of the business case, the identification of appropriate partners, including development partners, asset and tenancy managers and to develop a workable financial model that would include options for ownership and management.

18. The proposed was premised on Ngāti Paoa being the lead partner and providing the development capital, Auckland Council contributing the land, a community housing provider contributing property development, tenancy and asset management services and a range of other service providers contributing funding, rent subsidies, social services, and expertise. With development and operational costs estimated at $7m (assuming the land is made available at no cost) and rental income of $500,000pa, the proposal was considered to be marginally financially viable.

19. The business case involved extensive research and consultation with a wide range of Waiheke stakeholders, the NZ community housing sector and included various Council and Panuku representatives. The Waiheke Local Board allocated $20,000 to fund and commissioned this work due to the importance the board accorded to this matter.

20. The analysis indicated a clear need on Waiheke for healthy and affordable housing for older people and that this need was not being met by the market.

21. The number of over 65s on Waiheke grew by 50% between 2006 and 2013, around 120 over 65’s received the accommodation supplement and 27 presented to social services agencies in 2015 with acute housing needs.

22. Older people and social agencies spoke of the issues resulting from living in substandard rental accommodation, the isolation they felt and the stress caused by lack of security of tenure and escalating rental costs. While the average cost of a one-bedroom unit on Waiheke in 2016 was $320 a week, it is now $405 a week. These needs are even greater today and not currently being met by the market.

23. At the same time the Waiheke Local Board requested assistance to develop a local housing policy enabling the land to be made available at no cost and to address the lack of policy relevant to Waiheke’s situation i.e. not being an area of strong growth or high historical need. Council’s Housing Development Office indicated at that time that it supported the Waiheke Local Board in these efforts as the provision of social housing was consistent with its Housing Action Plan to drive housing opportunities on Council-owned land.

24. Ultimately however nothing came of these representations with the main reasons provided being the lack of a policy basis on which to proceed, the
price of the land and the costs of de-contaminating these sites resulting from their previous uses.

25. Currently 7 Waitai Rd is leased by Downers as a yard, an activity which is a poor fit with the objectives sought for Ostend within the Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan. As it provides a financial return to Council, there is no need for its disposal at this time and indeed disposal in the current economic climate is unlikely to realise the best return.

26. 6 Belgium St is not included in the asset recycling schedule as it is currently occupied by AIL Services, a business unit of Council. In the longer term, some of the below opportunities would fit very well on that site.

27. Until earlier this year, these sites were being actively investigated by the Waiheke Local Board for a swimming pool, but that project is now focused on redeveloping the existing Te Huruhu School pool.

Current proposal

28. The Waiheke Local Board Plan and the new draft Waiheke Area Plan which are now open for public consultation, both advocate for community housing to be advanced on Waiheke.

29. The Ngāti Paoa Iwi Trust which is Tangata Whenua and Mana Whenua for Waiheke is keen to partner with the Waiheke Local Board to investigate how this whenua can be retained and developed for housing.

30. In July 2020 the Crown and the Ngāti Paoa Iwi Trust agreed to formally sign the Deed of Settlement which now paves the way from Ngāti Paoa to actively pursue these aspirations. The delegation to be sought by the Waiheke Local Board to take a leadership and governance role supports this.

31. A role for Haumaru Housing, which provides housing for the elderly in a joint venture between Auckland Council and Selwyn Village, had been suggested. Haumaru’s mandate is existing housing and development where there is a high social demand and funding is available. The extent of social demand and the achievement of wider social objectives will be further explored in the business case.

32. The Waiheke Housing Trust which has experience in the provision of community housing on Waiheke, formally indicated an interest in partnering with Ngāti Paoa and the Waiheke Local Board as part of the 2016 business case and has again reiterated its interest on this proposal.

33. Preliminary financial scenarios developed for 7 Waitai Road suggest 14 single units (see superimposed image – the white rectangles - on the below plan) could be developed for around $2.6m and returning around $150,000 annually in rentals. Twenty multi-storey units could also be accommodated on site but at a higher cost and reduced economic viability.
34. The financial modelling relies on the involvement of a registered housing provider to access income related rent subsidies for tenants. Parties which have signalled an interest in this proposal include registered housing providers.

35. These scenarios are for 7 Waitai Road only, so obviously a larger number of units could be built if 6 Belgium St is included. This number of units reflect the main site constraint which is the need for on-site effluent disposal. Costs to decontaminate the land given its past and current industrial use are included in these costings.

36. The Waiheke Health Trust has also approached the Waiheke Local Board with a proposal for a one stop health hub which it considers to be a good complementary fit with community housing. This would require the option of the 6 Belgium St site being investigated further too.

37. Under its place making role, the Waiheke Local Board sees real merit in taking a more holistic approach to the provision of community services on this site. Having a health hub on Council land would free up land along Belgium Street currently occupied by these services and enable other businesses to move in, which is a known need. This helps address the lack of available business land in Ostend and the district plan approach of enhancing Ostend as a commercial and community services centre.

38. The board notes that asset recycling is in part based on whether sites meet Panuku’s Unlock and Transform criteria. These are primarily designed for Auckland’s growth areas and where large landholdings provide the opportunity for significant gains. These criteria are less applicable to Waiheke and this is one reason why the Waiheke Local Board seeks separate authority to advance this proposal.

Conclusion

39. As with the 2016 proposal, the Waiheke Local Board has again assembled parties with local connections and the mandate, relationships and skills to lead on this proposal. If 7 Waitai Road is retained in Council ownership the Waiheke Local Board will make a formal request to Auckland Council for a delegation to advance this.

40. The Waiheke Local Board is not seeking Council to be financially involved in the proposal but rather to enable the above proposal to be explored.

41. Covid 19 has starkly shown how essential the provision of community/social housing and health services on Waiheke Island. The Waiheke Local Board sees the investigation of this fitting in well with Council’s new strategy of focusing on communities that need us most and also clearly supporting Council’s wider social objectives.
7 Waitai Road context plan
(white rectangles on 7 Waitai Rd site show possible layout of community housing units)
Formal feedback to the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review

The Waiheke Local Board appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback to the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review. This is an important piece of work as it is now a decade since Auckland’s unique governance model was put in place.

In 2017 a three-year Auckland Council pilot programme was established to trial greater devolution of decision-making to the Waiheke Local Board. It also sought to improve relationships and how the local board works with CCOs. The pilot is due to conclude in October 2020 and findings will be reported to the Governing Body and shared with other local boards and participating CCOs.

Improved collaboration with Auckland Transport on transport issues was a focus of the pilot and as a result a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Auckland Transport and Waiheke Local Board was signed in May 2019. The MoU is a key instrument in shaping the relationship between Auckland Transport and the board, allowing for greater alignment to achieve transport outcomes that meet Waiheke’s needs. It provided the guiding framework for delivery, among other things, of a unique 10-year Transport Plan which supports the priorities and aspirations of both the board and the Waiheke community. The MoU underpins a much more robust relationship that has been established between the two parties, but it is less than a year in and it is still early to see the full effect, as the new intentions have to find their way in the old setting of Auckland Transport. The leadership ethos of the organisation is refreshing and brings hope that the much-needed culture change will be established in time.

The board’s feedback is based on the two overall objectives of the review:

- whether CCOs are an effective and efficient model for delivering services to the council and Aucklanders, and
- whether the CCO decision-making model provides sufficient political oversight, public transparency and accountability:

Feedback

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a. notes that the timing of the public engagement of the CCO Review precludes the Waiheke Local Board receiving and reflecting on current community views in providing local feedback, however, note the community survey led by Council’s Research Investigation and Monitoring Unit (RIMU) during the Waiheke pilot provided insight into community views.

b. agrees that the Council Controlled Organisations can be an effective and efficient model for delivering services to Council and Aucklanders but CCOs have variable track records at delivering services, as do departments of council’s own operations.

c. agrees that the CCO decision-making model can enable sufficient political oversight, public transparency and accountability, however, note that culture and CCO priorities influence the degree to which a CCO delivers sufficiently to local outcomes. A corollary
question might be what models do CCOs need to utilize to satisfy each of the objectives of political oversight, public transparency and accountability.

d. agrees that it is appropriate that CCO’s operate and present themselves as distinct from Auckland Council externally, if they are sufficiently and demonstrably connected with Auckland Council and each other internal and strategically. Conversely a single identity for such a large organisation carries intrinsic reputational risks where one component impacts the whole.

e. identifies the following opportunities to foster greater internal connection between Auckland Council, including local boards and the community:

i. CCO staff and board members to receive governance inductions to create a shared understanding of the Auckland governance model and to generate a greater respect for respective roles and responsibilities.

ii. CCOs to actively engage at the development stage of local strategic plans which provide the context for local strategic priorities, and to reference these in the development of the statement of intent to facilitate regular, relevant and joined-up reporting and engagement.

iii. Auckland Council to facilitate local board input into the development and approval of CCO Statement of Intent (SOIs), including providing analysis of SOIs in terms of local outcomes and facilitating formal feedback and in doing so provide a platform for ongoing engagement and delivery partnerships.

iv. CCOs and council to create a shared agenda of values, commitments and aspirations, rather than council directing these. If CEOs, CCO Boards, and politicians shared a process, the chances of CCOs delivering to it are much higher. This is how the Waiheke Local Board developed a MOU with Auckland Transport’s CE and leadership team. We share ownership.

f. note that, with the exception of Panuku Development Auckland, CCOs do not take a place-based approach to delivery, which creates a disconnect with local and community aspirations. The independent panel has an opportunity to consider and clarify the mandate of CCOs in the place-shaping space and either divest this to Auckland Council or require CCO’s to prioritise and resource a place-based approach.

g. provide the following feedback on the approach to roles and responsibilities, accountability and engagement with Council and community by CCO:

**Auckland Transport**

- is currently appointing to a new management role specific to Waiheke to address the shortfall between the MOU with the Local Board and the delivery of the intended outcomes:
  - to ensure that the board has early visibility of local community feedback to inform board deliberations;
  - to ensure local priorities and outcomes in the planning and delivery of projects and initiatives;
  - to bridge the gap in local communications on transport projects within the community that currently defaults to the local board;
  - to provide an effective voice internally within AT for local projects.
Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development
- has met with the Waiheke local board to understand how ATEED and the local board might better align in the future but has not advanced the agenda for that.
- beyond event delivery, does not seek meaningful economic development initiatives at a local board level.
- promotes tourism and visitor strategies that directly impact Waiheke and its communities and ecology but without reference to the priorities of the local board, including the Waiheke Local Board Plan.
- provides no financial support or alignment with council and other CCOs to meet the infrastructure demands and negative impacts of visitors on Waiheke.
- provides no support for Waiheke to access national tourism funding nor council funding.

Panuku Development Auckland
- has allowed significant asset deterioration over council properties that it has been responsible for leasing, rather than a balanced approach that includes reinvestment in assets over time.
- should be retained as a CCO in for property and urban development but responsibility for its service and other properties not planned for development should be returned to the Council group.

Regional Facilities Auckland
- noting that while Waiheke Local Board area does not have any regional facilities, Regional Facilities regularly and adequately engages with the local board through their Elected Member Relationship Manager.

Watercare
- are successful in engaging with local communities in the development of projects and activities
- are accessible and approachable at a staff and CE level and makes an effort to understand the local environment
- noting that Waiheke Island is not reticulated other than for Oneroa Village and Watercare only has one small wastewater plant on the island.

Waiheke Local Board
21 April 2020
Formal feedback to the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review

The Waiheke Local Board appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback to the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review recommendations. This feedback should be read in conjunction with the feedback the board provided in April 2020, which is attached for your reference.

The Independent Panel are commended for the well-rounded review, summation findings and comprehensive recommendations.

The board supports the recommendations and the implementation of them as a package. It is noted that success of the review will lie in its implementation, and request to be involved in the full life cycle of the implementation programme.

The board requests more detailed information about how local boards might provide input to the process of setting expectations and strategic direction for the CCOs.

The Waiheke Local Board provides the following specific feedback on the recommendations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFA and ATEED</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>The board supports the proposed merger as it would bring together two entities with more similarities than differences. It would produce economies of scale and cost savings and would enable better accountability and monitoring by reducing the number of CCOs from five to four. There are other tangible benefits to having a combined entity that would be attracting and delivering events, managing the city’s cultural institutions, venues and stadiums, and attracting visitors, business and investment that foster social, cultural and economic wellbeing. Development of meaningful economic development initiatives at a local board level should be a key objective. The joint management and operation of the city’s four stadiums with the Eden Park Trust and the addition of the Auckland War Memorial Museum into the merged entity should be explored further as part of the implementation programme. The board requests involvement of local boards in discussions around developing guidance to CCOs on how to balance public and commercial interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>The board supports the recommendations relating to Auckland Transport and the need for the CCO to involve local boards in the design of its annual work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>It is noted the recommendations do not address the question of whether Governing Body members should be Auckland Transport board members, and this should be addressed. The board recognises that the Governing Body can direct CCOs through its governance function and that therefore there should be no need for Governing Body members to sit on CCO boards. However, should governing body members be appointed to CCO boards then one of the positions should be filled by a local board member given the critical interface that CCOs have with local boards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panuku</td>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>The board agrees with the recommendations relating to Panuku. The board supports the needs for a comprehensive property strategy and the need to remove responsibility from Panuku for identifying non-service property for disposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watercare</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>The board supports the recommendations relating to Watercare and looks forward to providing input into a long overdue three waters strategy for Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>20-43</td>
<td>The board agrees with recommendation 23 regarding the creation of a set of common key performance measures and request that local boards be able to provide input into how these are developed. The board reiterates its request for CCOs to actively engage at the development stage of local strategic plans which provide the context for local strategic priorities, and to reference these in the development of the statement of intent to facilitate regular, relevant and joined-up reporting and engagement. Note that recommendations 20, 25, and 30 from the review, and recommendation (e) from staff to the Governing Body will require additional staff at a time when the council is reducing staff numbers and request a commitment from the Chief Executive that staff will be made available for this project. Given the skill base required the senior roles should be recruited competitively in the open market, thus also opening the pathway to CCO applicants. The board supports the recommendations to improve CCO accountability to Maori through adopted plans and IMSB oversight. The board supports recommendation 43 that CCO boards need to become more diverse, and request that the recommendation is implemented more broadly to encompass experience of community development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>44-64</td>
<td>The board supports all recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The board requests that the implementation programme looks at the planning cycles for Auckland Council and CCOs and how they can be better aligned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Waiheke Local Board  
26 August 2020