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Memorandum

To: Local Board Chairs
Copy to: Councillor Simpson (Chair of Finance and Performance Committee), Councillor Darby and Councillor Cashmore (Liaison Councillors), Mayor’s office
From: Shane Ellison, Chief Executive
Date: 18 August 2020
Subject: Local Board Transport Capital Fund for 2020-2021

Kia ora e nga rangatira

I hope you and your loved ones remain well during these trying times.

The purpose of this memo is to clarify what was quite a wide-ranging discussion at the Chair’s Forum on August 10 around the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF) for 2020-2021. The presentation from the meeting is also attached.

In answer to specific questions raised:

1. How much money is there in the LBTCF this financial year?

   The Council’s emergency budget has allocated $5 million to spend amongst all local boards, less the amount already committed through works in progress. That leaves approximately $3.4m in total, across the 21 Local Boards (LB).

2. Why was the LBTCF reduced from $20m to $5m?

   The Council’s financial issues as a result of Covid-19 have been well documented at it was forced to make a number of hard decisions. AT’s capital budget, as a result, was materially reduced overall. As discussed at our meeting, AT has some $600m of contractually committed projects this year, so all projects which were not contractually committed have been materially reduced. Some parts of the budget have been impacted even more than the LBTCF. For instance, the budget for new footpaths has been reduced to $1 million, and the budget for seal extensions has been reduced to $1 million. Some projects now have no investment at all for this financial year.

3. What about funding for next year and the year after?

   We simply don’t know what funding will be available to be allocated for the 2021/22 financial year or what funding will be available to deliver on projects which previously had been decided upon by LBs.

   The Council whanau’s financial position is uncertain – for example an underpinning assumption for the 2020/21 financial year is that Auckland would be at Alert Level 1 for the whole year – clearly this has proven optimistic. In this context indications are that AT’s overall capital programme is likely to remain constrained for some time and therefore it is likely that the LBTCF will reflect this new reality for at least the next couple of years.

   We note that due to the uplift in capital delivery (from 90% to 95% of the capital budget) and the decision to enable LBs to ‘rollover’ funds from one electoral term to another means that it will become increasingly challenging to fund in one year the amount of cash required to deliver the backlog of nominally allocated LBTCF projects.

4. What happens to the previously unspent LBTCF money? Can these be carried forward, or are they “written off”?

   As above, Covid-19 has forced us to defer the majority of projects which are not contractually committed. In addition, we may be operating in a constrained capital environment for an extended period of time, so it is difficult to predict whether there is scope to catch up on investment which was...
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Previously deferred, or whether there will in effect be a permanent deferral. Any work done to date however (e.g. design, consenting, consultation) will not be lost. Essentially the projects are “paused” if and when further funding becomes available. They key now is that each local board has a list of prioritised projects that can be invested in, if/when funding becomes available in the future.

5. Why isn’t the LBTCF ring fenced and held separately? Why aren’t previously unspent amounts automatically carried forward?

AT’s capital programme and the LBTCF is funded by Council and is not ringfenced or funded from a separate bank account. As part of the Emergency Budget, AT’s capital programme was prioritised against investment across the broader Council family, e.g. due to the water crisis, Watercare received more funding while AT got less. While AT normally tries to absorb “deferrals” from one financial year to the next, the extent of the reductions in the Emergency Budget, mean that we only had the ability to carry forward contractually committed items into 2020/21. This is not to say there isn’t the potential for a catch up in future years, it just means that we, collectively, cannot spend anything in 2020/21 other than the $5m currently budgeted.

We will be workshopping the LBTCF with your local board in the coming weeks, with a view to assisting you to put together a list of projects that can realistically be progressed under the current constrained financial environment.

6. What capacity is there to deliver LBTCF projects in 2021/22

It is likely that the level of contractually committed projects in AT’s capital programme will be significantly less than in 2021/22. In 2009/10 approximately 80% of AT’s total capital budget including the LBTCF is in contract. In 2021/22 early estimates suggest that less than 50% of the capital envelope which might be available will be committed. In theory this would leave significantly more funding available for LBTCF projects.

However, while the Emergency Budget allocated an initial $5 million for the LBTCF will allow some progress on a pipeline of projects for 2021/22 and beyond this is insufficient to do enough preparatory work to deliver the $38 million of nominal LBTCF projects which has accrued at 30 June 2020.

I appreciate these are complex issues. We look forward to working with you and Governing Body constructively to resolve the financial challenges brought about by Covid-19 moving forward.

Separately, in September and October we will be coming to you with workshops looking at AT’s forward works programme for your area, so you will have a sense of activity coming up and what opportunities you may have to provide input.

Nga mihi

Shane Ellison
CHIEF EXECUTIVE
Member’s Report: Andrew Shaw

This report covers my Kaipātiki Local Board Activities July and August 2020. Due to COVID-19, many things have been disrupted, including the frequency of my reporting to the Board. There has been a second Level 3 shut down during this time and we are currently at Level 2.5 at the time of writing.

Outside organisation appointments

- Glenfield Community Centre (GCC)

The GCC Board has had difficulty meeting during the year due to the health and safety restriction of COVID. There has been only two Board Meetings this year and trouble with the accessibility of online resources for the Board to meet remotely.

I have kept in contact with the Centre Manager Nigel Green. One of the main issues discussed within the Board and with the Centre Manger during this time is the Cladding Claim which is now before the Court. The hearing is set down for eight weeks with the judge likely to reserve judgment not until February 2021. After the decision is handed down, there is facility to appeal within 60 days (from memory). However, a settlement can occur at any stage in this process.

This is a complex relationship between the Church, GCC Society and the Council, which I do not have a clear picture of as yet. In short, a collective conversation needs to be facilitated to get all parties up to speed and for all future possible options and risks to be discussed and available to the three parties. GCC have previously proposed a brownfield redevelopment of the Centre, Library, CAB and KLB Offices as a solution. This formed part of their submission to the KLB Draft Plan in 2017 and was included in the LBP with the intention support GCC. In addition, the draft Glenfield Centre (30 year) Plan has provision for the development of more civic space in the Glenfield Centre. As KLB liaison for GCC I am advocating that be explored further without delay.

I have attached the GCC Submission to the Kaipatiki Local Board Draft Plan 2017 from the Glenfield Community Centre Incorporated. 30 June 2017
Safe School Streets

An Auckland Transport initiative, which is something I really support – improving safety at the school gates. Willow Park is one of six participating schools in Auckland and has undergoing a trial on 29 July of this year.

The trial involves tactical urban design that make changes to reduce the number of cars very close to the school, along with other speed and road design changes. An example, a rubber rounded about like in the photo below was planned, and may be implemented after the trial outcome has been written up. I look forward to seeing the results of this trial and further work of the Community Transport Team in the Kaipātiki area.
Constituent issues

Birkdale Intermediate School (BIS)- I have asked our Auckland Transport Elected Member Relationship Manager to investigate the BIS, school bus contract. The concern is that the current procedures as to how the school bus contract is delivered, are considered unsafe.

Events and functions
Events and functions attended as a Kaipātiki Local Board Member:

- Opaketai Beach Haven Garden August 2
- Kauri Park Primary- Feasita- August 2
Submission to the Kaipātiki Local Board Draft Plan 2017
from the Glenfield Community Centre Incorporated
30 June 2017

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Kaipātiki Local Board Draft Plan 2017. The following feedback represents the views of the Glenfield Community Centre Incorporated’s Governance Group.

The primary contact points for this feedback are:

Frankie Godfrey-Robson  
Governance Chair  
frankie.g.robson@gmail.com  
027 624 4926

Nigel Green  
Centre Manager  
manager@glenfieldcommunitycentre.co.nz  
09 444 5023

1 Introduction
1.1 This submission is from the Glenfield Community Centre Incorporated. We are a not-for-profit (NFP), incorporated society with charitable status that was established in 1997 to:

“Focus on recognising and responding to the social, cultural, recreational and educational needs of the Glenfield/ Kaipātiki community, and finding ways to meet these needs with special recognition for those who have the least opportunity to participate in decision-making in the community.”

1.2 The Centre was built in 1993 with funding from the North Shore community, several national Grant funding bodies, and the Takapuna City Council. The Centre incorporates the Mission Hall (built in 1915, a Category A historic place scheduled under the Auckland Unitary Plan), and sits on land belonging to the Methodist Church of New Zealand under a tripartite lease between the Society, Church and Council (set to expire in 2060), and zoned Special Purpose 9—Community Use.
1.3 Zoning restricts the Centre to operate non-commercial activities and a proportion of the existing structure has therefore been let to external NFPs that are similarly focussed on supporting the community: Royal Plunket Society of NZ, Beneficiaries Advocacy Information Service, Dementia Auckland, Literacy Auckland North, and Sweet Charity (owned and operated by the Grief Centre and Supporting Families Auckland).

1.4 The Centre manages the Glenfield Early Learning Centre that opened as a crèche in 1980. It aims:

“To provide affordable and educational programmes for all pre-school children in the community, and to encourage and aid children’s personal development.

Our vision is for our people to have a voice, our diversity to be celebrated, and for our children to be cherished.”

1.5 Between 60 and 70 families with children between the ages of 1 and 5 utilise this service and take advantage of the Government’s 20-hours free subsidy. The November 2016 ERO Review found the ELC “Well-placed” “...is very welcoming to parents and whānau," and "...is a happy place for children and families to enjoy.”

1.6 The Centre also provides rooms for the community to hire in order to run workshops, seminars, training sessions, cultural support networks, counselling sessions, physical training, mentoring, mental health and awareness programmes, educational training, English as a Second Language (ESL) training, and drug and alcohol rehabilitation courses. User groups are predominantly ‘Arts and Cultural’ (e.g. Chinese New Settlers Services Trust), ‘Other Special Interest’ (e.g. Counselling), and ‘Religious’.

1.7 Utilisation of the Centre has increased over 2015/2016 — 2016/2017 with the average hours booked per month increasing from 420 to 580, average visits per month increasing from 2,323 to 2,406 (approximately 29,000 per year). However, when you count in the number of persons who receive services through our Early Learning Centre and Tenant groups, this figure grows closer to 45,000 visits per annum or 120 per day.

\* Using Auckland Council’s Arts, Culture and Events (ACE previously CDAC) statistical classification system.

---
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1.8 The Centre acts as a referral point for information—assisting members of the public with multiple queries (around 300 a month), redirecting them to other services, and we collaborate with other local organisations to assist in supporting the community of Glenfield/Kaipātiki.

1.9 All this is summed-up by our maxim:

“Ko te Hapori tō mātou Pokapū—Community is at our Centre”

1.10 Finally, we partner with the Kaipātiki Local Board to provide a schedule of annually agreed community-focussed outcomes that align with priorities set out in the current Local Board Plan, for which we receive an annual operating grant of $47,388.10 GST-ex.

2 Summary
2.1 Our submission focuses on the following three, inter-related aspirational outcomes set out in the Draft:

- **Our urban centres are vibrant**—He wāhi hihi te pokapū tāone
- **Our community facilities and infrastructure is high quality and well managed**—He rangatira, he tōtika te aratiki i ō tātau urunga hapori me ēna kaupapa whakahaere
- **Services are well managed and meet community needs**—He tōtika te arataki i ngā ratonga kia eke ai ngā hiahia o te hapori

2.2 Glenfield lies at the geographic centre of Kaipātiki—literally 15 minutes away from any suburb in the ward; making it a key node for effective service delivery to the 82,500 persons in the area.

2.3 However, it has been the ‘poor cousin’—overlooked as, over the years, significant infrastructure spending has occurred in other sections and communities of the Shore.

2.4 With the exception of the privately owned and operated Glenfield Mall, the township lacks a well-established central destination or focus; it is more of a ‘drive-through on the way to somewhere else’ and the existing road and transportation network does little to discourage this impression.
2.5 It has only recently the Local Board has begun a programme to revitalise areas of Kaipātiki. The Glenfield community and business district need this commitment in terms of place making and investment in the future with somewhere the community can access a range of resources and activities, and actively participate in community life.

2.6 We argue the Local Board needs to present a plan to the community that meets their needs for the next fifty years and this means committing to larger scale projects designed to make a significant difference to the area over that timeframe.

2.7 We argue that Kaipātiki needs a ‘heart’ in the form of a ‘one-stop shop’ for community services similar to the concept being proposed for the Westgate community:

“An integrated community hub enabling people to come together to create, explore, connect, belong, learn and participate, delivered through a partnership between Auckland Libraries and Arts, Community and Events departments.”

---


---
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2.8 Our Centre would like to be an equal partner in a vision for Kaipātiki that delivers facilities for our community that could include:

- Community multipurpose spaces:
  - Adult and community education hub
  - Local business innovation hub
  - Food hub (kitchen and community garden)
  - Event hub (large cultural/multipurpose space)
  - Arts and heritage hub (Mission Hall)
  - Meetings rooms for hire (small, medium, large)
  - Large foyer/multi-use space (i.e. exhibitions, meetings)
- Childcare facilities
- Library spaces
- Council (Local Board) offices
- Spaces for Social Agencies e.g. Plunket, Citizens’ Advice Bureau, and
- General amenities (toilets, storage).

2.9 Our Centre’s Philosophy is one of family support and enhancement of community life through a commitment to and active involvement in working at the grass-root level alongside individuals and groups to help them find appropriate support and resources.

2.10 We have delivered on that philosophy for over 40 years, and alongside the Council and our stakeholder groups, have built a community at our Centre that we wish to see thrive and evolve. As such:

We would support working together with the Local Board towards the development of a Glenfield Community Civic Centre that would form a hub for community services as the heart of a keystone project to reinvigorate the Glenfield Township and support the people of Kaipātiki.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to be part of this important discussion.