

**AGENDA FOR AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE CITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
TO BE HELD IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, 6 WAIPAREIRA AVENUE, LINCOLN,
WAITAKERE CITY, ON THURSDAY, 3 JUNE 2004,
COMMENCING AT 9.30 AM.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>ITEM</u>		<u>PAGE NO.</u>
1	APOLOGIES	1
2	URGENT BUSINESS	1
3	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	1
4	SIGN OFF FOR HENDERSON CREEK CORRIDOR RESERVES MANAGEMENT PLAN	2
5	REVISION OF STREET DAMAGE DEPOSITS	4
6	NEW RULE FOR SETTING SPEED LIMITS	7
7	MANAGEMENT OPTIONS FOR THE SUMMERLAND DRIVE COMMUNITY FACILITY	10
8	HOUSING DISCUSSION PAPER SUBMISSION	16
9	HARBOURVIEW - ORANGIHINA UPDATE	20
10	WESTGATE PLANNING	24
	PROCEDURAL MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC	24

**AGENDA FOR AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE CITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
TO BE HELD IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, 6 WAIPAREIRA AVENUE, LINCOLN,
WAITAKERE CITY, ON THURSDAY, 3 JUNE 2004,
COMMENCING AT 9.30 AM.**

1 APOLOGIES



2 URGENT BUSINESS

Section 46A(7) and (7A) of the Local Government Official Information Act and Meetings Act 1987 provides that where an item of business is not on the agenda, it may only be dealt with at the meeting if:

- (i) the item is a minor matter; and
- (ii) the Chairperson has explained at the beginning of the meeting (when open to the public) that the item will be raised for discussion, why the item is not on the agenda, and why it cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting; and
- (iii) the Committee resolves to deal with the item.

No resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of the item except to refer the item to a subsequent meeting for further discussion.

NOTE: Urgent Business need not be dealt with now and may be delayed until later in the meeting.



3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Ordinary - Thursday, 6 May 2004

RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the City Development Committee held on Thursday, 6 May 2004, as circulated, be taken as read and now be confirmed.



4 **SIGN OFF FOR HENDERSON CREEK CORRIDOR RESERVES MANAGEMENT PLAN**

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to bring before the City Development Committee Te Huru-huru-Henderson Creek Corridor Reserves Management Plan and request that it be signed off on the recommendations of the Henderson Creek Reserves Management Subcommittee.

BACKGROUND

The administration and management of reserves is governed by the Reserves Act 1977. This Act requires that an administering body prepare a Management Plan for all reserves (other than esplanade reserves) under its authority.

In 1999, Council began preparing a Management Plan for the 14 reserves within Te Huru-huru-Henderson Creek Corridor. This Plan included Flanshaw Esplanade, Sherwood Park, Colletta Esplanade, Chilcott Brae, Swan Arch, Tui Glen, Tui Glen Esplanade, Falls Park, Newey's Corner, Trading Esplanade, Cranwell Park, Cranwell Esplanade, Epping Esplanade and Henderson Creek Esplanade Reserves.

Te Huru-huru-Henderson Creek Corridor Reserves Management Plan was publicly notified in September 2000 and submissions to the draft closed in December 2000. The publication of the draft Plan was delayed to allow a separate submission process for Tui Glen Reserve, following the closure of the camping ground there. Following this consultation, a Concept Plan was developed, was approved by the City Development Committee in July 2002 and then included in the draft Henderson Creek Plan which was notified for submissions in October 2002.

As the Henderson Creek Corridor spans both Henderson and Massey Wards, both Henderson and Massey Community Boards were involved in the early preparation of the Plan. However, the Creek Corridor itself is identified as a City-wide Green Network Reserve and the bulk of the reserves included in the Plan are City-wide reserves. In order to hear the submissions to the draft Plan, a special committee with delegated authority was appointed by Council. The Henderson Creek Reserves Management Subcommittee was established as a subcommittee of the City Development Committee in May 2003 and included representatives of both the Henderson and Massey Community Boards.

The membership of the Henderson Creek Reserves Management Subcommittee is as follows:

Cr Nash, JP (Chair)
Cr Battersby, JP
Cr Brady, JP
Cr Stone
Cr Yates, JP
Ms Nakhid, (Henderson CB)
Cr Hoskin, (Massey CB)

A1 The Scope and Delegations of the Henderson Creek Reserves Management Subcommittee is attached at page A1.

The Henderson Creek Reserves Management Subcommittee had delegated authority to hear the submissions to the draft Henderson Creek Reserves Management Plan and to make recommendations to the City Development Committee on the content of the Henderson Creek Reserves Management Plan as necessary.

In July 2003, the Henderson Creek Reserves Management Subcommittee met to hear the submissions to the draft Management Plan. At this hearing recommendations were adopted by the Henderson Creek Reserves Management Subcommittee and a representative of the Subcommittee elected to approve the final Plan.

The Plan went to print in October 2003, having been signed off by the elected representative and currently in use as an adopted Plan.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The Henderson Creek Corridor Reserves Management Plan is being prepared in the context of the Waitakere City Council Parks Strategy, which provides guidelines on the management of parks within the City. The Parks Strategy has its own internal classification system under which all parks are either City-wide, Local or Neighbourhood, depending on their size, facilities and the catchment of users. Under this system, the bulk of the Henderson Creek reserves are classified as City-wide reserves. In addition, the Corridor itself is a City-wide Green Network Corridor.

ISSUES

Following a recent query regarding the status of the Reserves Management Plan, it has come to light that the Plan was not referred back to the City Development Committee for final sign-off as required under the scope and delegations of the Henderson Creek Reserves Management Subcommittee.

This does not in any way affect the integrity of the Plan, as the correct procedure was followed for the hearing of submissions and making of amendments, both of which are the scope of the Henderson Creek Reserves Management Plan Subcommittee. It is only the final sign-off, which is the scope of the parent Committee, that was not carried out and needs to be implemented to complete the full process.

RESOURCES

No additional resources are required other than that allocated through the Annual Plan process.

CONCLUSION

Te Huru-huru-Henderson Creek Reserves Management Plan was adopted by the Henderson Creek Reserves Management Subcommittee following the hearing of submissions to the draft Plan in July 2003. The Henderson Creek Reserves Management Subcommittee had the delegated authority to hear submissions to the draft Plan and to make recommendations back to the parent committee for approval of the Plan. However, it appears that the final step of recommending the Plan back to the City Development Committee for final approval was not taken.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Sign Off For Henderson Creek Corridor Reserves Management Plan report be received.
2. That the City Development Committee approve the final Henderson Creek Reserves Management Plan as recommended by the Henderson Creek Reserves Management Subcommittee.

Report prepared by: Mandy McMullin, Parks Planning.



5 REVISION OF STREET DAMAGE DEPOSITS

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This report is to seek the approval from the City Development Committee to revise the current street damage deposit structure.

BACKGROUND

The provisions available under the current street damage deposit system introduced in June 1997 are not sufficient to cover the repair cost of the roading infrastructure, due to any potential damage by a developer or a builder. The deposit system needs to be revised to suit current and future circumstances.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

Waitakere City Council's 'Integrated Transport and Communication' platform provides the strategic context for this report. The Council is to demonstrate integrated design focused on essential needs, including safety, for example, a pedestrian friendly environment for all ages.

Damage to footpaths, vehicle crossings and carriageways caused by heavy vehicle movements associated with the developments will reduce the safety of all modes of travel and financial provisions must be available to ensure that such damage can be quickly repaired.

ISSUES

The Current System

Developers/Builders deposit a contingency sum known as the 'street damage deposit'. This acts as a bond against any issue of non-compliance in relation with the construction of vehicle crossings, footpaths roads and other road and traffic infrastructure on the building or development site.

The current street damage deposit fees as approved by the Council's Corporate Affairs Committee on 18 June 1997 are shown in table 1 below.

	Work Value	Deposit
a)	Permits for work less than \$5,000	Nil
b)	Permits for work value between \$5,000 - \$50,000	\$500 (plus GST)
c)	Permits for work value greater than \$50,000	\$1,000 (plus GST)

Table 1 - Current Street Damage Deposits

The use of these deposits to ensure prompt repairs of damage to footpath road and traffic infrastructure and completion of vehicle crossings has been highlighted as the main benefit to the Council.

Purpose of the Review

Recently staff have observed footpaths and berms excessively damaged at several locations, by developers who often use the footpath and berm for parking of heavy machineries and transporters. In these cases the street damage deposits available are not sufficient to cover the cost of damages to council assets. Occasionally developers or builders fail to repair the damaged sections and the fees retained, as street damage deposits, are not sufficient for the Council to cover the cost of repairs. Council has to bear additional costs over the deposit amount to repair the damaged sections.

Legal Opinion

Legal advice confirms that Council is able to revise the current street damage deposits under existing bylaws.

Other Councils

Council staff have researched the street damage deposits charged by other Councils within the Auckland Region.

The Auckland City Council revised its street damage fees in April 2003 and the North Shore City anticipates reviewing its fee structure in the near future.

The current fees charged by the other councils are shown in table 2.

Nature of Work	Auckland	North Shore	Manukau
Residential swimming pools	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	Not available
Residential or commercial building works below \$20,000	Nil	\$500.00 (Discretionary)	Nil
Residential alterations \$20,000 - \$99,000	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$300.00
Residential alterations \$100,000 and over	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$300.00
New single unit and single storey dwelling	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$600.00 per frontage
Multi unit and multi storey dwelling	\$2,500.00	\$1,500.00 (up to 5 units) \$2,500.00 (6 units and over)	\$600.00 per frontage
Commercial building work between \$20,000 - \$99,999	\$1,000.00	Nil*	\$1,000.00
Commercial building work between \$100,000 - \$249,999	\$2,500.00	Nil*	\$1,000.00
Commercial building work between \$250,000 - \$500,000	\$3,500.00	Nil*	\$1,000.00
Commercial building work \$500,000 and over	\$5,000.00	Nil*	\$1,000.00
Building removal, demolition or relocation	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$800.00

* North Shore City is considering a street damage deposit of \$2,000.00 for all Commercial Developments.

Table 2 - Other Council's Street Damage Deposits

Proposed Solution

After consideration of all the above factors and following internal consultation a scale of fees is proposed as shown in table 3 below.

Work value	Deposit (per street frontage)
Any residential building work below \$5,000	No deposit
Residential alterations, additions, swimming pools and associated fences	\$1,000
New single unit, single storey dwellings	\$1,000
Multi unit and multi storey dwellings (2-5 units)	\$2,500
Commercial building work, sub division work between \$5,000 and \$99,999	\$1,000
Commercial building work, sub division work between \$100,000 and \$249,999	\$2,500
Commercial building work, sub division work between \$250,000 and \$499,000	\$3,500
Commercial building work, sub division work above \$500,000	\$5,000
Building relocation, removal or demolition works	\$1,000

Table 3 - Proposed Street Damage Deposits

Conclusions

The Waitakere City Council's Scale of Street Damage Deposits, approved in 1997 is proving insufficient to deal with street damages associated with developments. A proposed new schedule has been formulated to recover costs and provide parity with other councils.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Revision of Street Damage Deposits report be received.
2. That it be recommended to Council that the current schedule of deposits for street damage be updated with effect from 1 October 2004, in pursuant to clause 11 (a) of Bylaw No 22, 1990: Use of Public Roads, as scheduled below:

Work Value	Deposit (per street frontage)
Any residential building work below \$5,000	No deposit
Residential alterations, additions, swimming pools and associated fences	\$1,000
New single unit, single storey dwellings	\$1,000
Multi unit and multi storey dwellings (2-5 units)	\$2,500
Commercial building work, sub division work between \$5,000 and \$99,999	\$1,000
Commercial building work, sub division work between \$100,000 and \$249,999	\$2,500
Commercial building work, sub division work between \$250,000 and \$499,000	\$3,500

Work Value	Deposit (per street frontage)
Commercial building work, sub division work above \$500,000	\$5,000
Building relocation, removal or demolition works	\$1,000

Report prepared by: Upali Ileperuma, Transport Engineer, Transport Assets.



6 NEW RULE FOR SETTING SPEED LIMITS

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the provisions of the new rule regarding the setting of speed limits.

BACKGROUND

In early 2003 the Minister of Transport signed a new rule altering the way speed limits are set in New Zealand. The new rule came into force in April 2004. Under the new rule Councils and other road controlling authorities take over many of the Land Transport Safety Authority's responsibilities for setting speed limits.

There have been numerous reports in the media about the changes, many of which give a misleading impression of the changes. The elected members are often the first point of contact for members of the public with traffic concerns, and it is desirable that they are well informed of the process and rules for setting speed limits.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The Waitakere City Council's 'Integrated Transport and Communication' platform provides the strategic context for this report. The vision is for public transport and communications systems that provide fast, effective services, and for city travel facilitated by integrated, environmentally responsible, and innovative design, with a focus on meeting the essential needs of all, for access, communication, and safety.

Safe and appropriate speed limits play an essential role in ensuring motorist safety when using Council's road network.

ISSUES

A2 Under the new rule Council is legally required to follow a certain procedure set out in the rule when setting or reviewing speed limits. This process comprises three steps, firstly conducting a speed limit rating survey, then conducting consultation, then finally passing a bylaw and registering the speed limit, as attached at page A2. The detail of each step is elaborated on below:

Speed Limit Rating Survey

In this survey the road is divided into a series of 100 metre sections each of which is given a development rating and a roadway rating which are then combined together to get a total rating.

The development rating is based on the number of houses and businesses that have direct access onto the road combined with a value based on the development in any side road. A residence with its own driveway is worth one rating point while businesses and other facilities or several houses sharing a driveway are worth between one and four rating points based on the scale and type of the development. Only schools and kindergartens can be worth more than four rating points, their value being based on the number of pupils.

The roadway rating is based on the number of pedestrians, the availability of a footpath, the number of cyclists, the number of cars parked on street and their distance from the traffic lanes, the forward visibility for drivers, the presence of a flush median or median barrier, the presence of traffic control devices like "Stop" and "Give Way" controls and pedestrian crossings, road classification and the type of development adjacent to the road. Each of these factors is considered and a number of rating points assigned. These are totaled and compared to the total number of development rating points. If there are more roadway rating points than development points then the roadway rating is reduced to equal the development rating.

The combined total rating is then used to find a speed limit for the section of road: the attached chart shows the number of rating points required for a particular speed limit as well as other criteria. The speed limits for all the sections within a road are then compared with a view to achieving a consistent speed limit throughout the road. A small section of developed land within an undeveloped area will not warrant a reduced speed limit, neither will a small undeveloped section within an urban area warrant an increased speed limit. Rules for the minimum distance between speed limit changes and where to place the boundaries are included within the new rule. Thus the final limit chosen for a road will be the same for the entire road or large sections of the road. The speed limits in connecting roads also need to be taken into account.

It is important to note that since the roadway rating cannot exceed the development rating, regardless of other factors, the development adjacent to the roadway is the driving factor in determining speed limits. A well developed urban area will have 50km/h limit regardless of other factors, whilst an undeveloped rural area will have a 100km/h limit. This means that a 100km/h limit may apply on a road where, because of a number of curves in the road or other geometric features, it is unsafe or impossible to travel at the speed limit. Mountain Road is a good example of a road with a 100km/h limit which cannot be safely traversed at 100km/h. In situations like these roadway delineation and warning measures like curve warning signs, chevron signs, advisory speed signs, edge marker post and edge lines can be used to improve motorist safety.

Consultation

The new rule requires that Council consult the following parties in writing before setting a new speed limit, as follows:

- The Land Transport Safety Authority;
- The Police;
- The Automobile Association;
- The Road Transport Forum;
- Any other road controlling or territorial authority affected by the change;
- *'Persons which may be affected by the proposed speed limit'* (In practice this will normally mean members of the public or business whose properties are adjacent to the road or use the road regularly).

Council is obliged to take into account any submissions received during consultation when setting speed limits, however this does not relieve Council of the requirement to set limits according to the rigid procedure laid down in the rule.

Bylaw and Registration of Speed Limits

The final step in setting a speed limit is for Council to make a bylaw setting the new limit. Council is also required to keep an up to date register of all speed limits in the City and all correspondence and other documentation relating to speed limits for seven years. Council must inform the Land Transport Safety Authority of any change in the speed limit at least 14 days before the new limits come into effect.

The new rule requires that road controlling authorities pass a bylaw ensuring that all existing speed limits are retained before any new speed limits are set. The Land Transport Safety Authority are currently producing a model bylaw for councils which is expected to be released in the near future.

Role of the Land Transport Safety Authority

The role of the Land Transport Safety Authority under the new rule is to oversee the application of the rule by road controlling authorities. A consistent national approach is essential and the Director of the Land Transport Safety Authority has the power to compel Council to review or change a speed limit or by notice in the New Zealand Gazette change a speed limit if Council refuses to do so.

Differences when Compared with the Old Method for Setting Speed Limits

The method by which speed limits are set has not changed significantly. The speed limit ratings survey which is the determining factor in choosing a limit is the same method previously used by the Land Transport Safety Authority. The consultation requirements are new, but as the limit chosen is determined by the survey result this makes little practical difference. The main change is an administrative one, Council rather than the Land Transport Safety Authority is now responsible for the bulk of the administration of speed limits and this will enable faster processing of reviews and requests.

Timeframe for Setting New Speed Limits

After the bylaw has been passed the process for changing a speed limit is still likely to be rather lengthy. The speed limit rating survey can be undertaken quite quickly, but consultation and the process required to pass a new bylaw whenever a speed limit is changed are both likely to take some time. The 14 days notice that must be given to the Land Transport Safety Authority before a new limit comes into effect will also add another two weeks to the time needed to change a speed limit.

The new rule requires Council to review all non-50 limits in urban areas and all non-100 limits in rural areas before 1 July 2005, for this reason there are likely to be a number of speed limit changes within the next year.

Pilot Study

At the request of the Waitakere Community Board, Transport Assets is conducting a pilot application of the new rule in Candia Road. Final outcomes of the pilot will be distributed to all Community Boards and the City Development Committee.

RESOURCES

The requirement to review a number of speed limits before 1 July 2005 will require approximately three person months of time. This can be absorbed into existing budgets through the use of Transport Assets staff time and consultants paid for from the transport planning budget.

CONCLUSION

The new rule for setting speed limits represents more of an administrative change than a major shift in the philosophy of setting speed limits in New Zealand. Council will take over much of the administrative workload to do with speed limits from the Land Transport Safety Authority but the actual limits that can be set will still be determined by the necessarily rigid rules used previously to set limits. For this reason it is unlikely that there will be many extensive changes to speed limits within the City.

The main benefit of the new rule to Council is that Council may now review limits when it feels that a change may be warranted rather than wait for the Land Transport Safety Authority to process a review of the limit. The speed limit review process was also very drawn out when it was conducted by the Land Transport Safety Authority. Council now has the ability to ensure that speed limit reviews are conducted promptly where constituents consider that there is a discrepancy.

The main disadvantage to Council is that the majority of the cost of administering the speed limits must now be borne by Council.

RECOMMENDATION

That the New Rule for Setting Speed Limits report be received.

Report prepared by: Paul Schischka, Transport Engineer.



7 MANAGEMENT OPTIONS FOR THE SUMMERLAND DRIVE COMMUNITY FACILITY

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of the report is to provide an analysis of potential management options for the Summerland Drive Community Facility currently being developed next to the Summerland Primary School. The report also seeks the City Development Committee's approval to proceed with the recommended management option for the facility.

BACKGROUND

A partnership between Council and the Ministry of Education was established several years ago to develop the idea of co-locating a community facility with the now existing Summerland Primary School in Sturges Valley. The concept of a community facility co-located with the school was presented to the community for consultation, with resulting support for a collaborative approach.

The Community Facilities and Recreation Committee resolved as follows:

“That \$350,000 be included in the 2001/2002 Annual Plan to complete the purchase of sites adjoining the new Sturges Valley Primary School on which new community facilities can be co-located at a future date.”

4112/2000

The land was subsequently purchased in the 2001/2002 financial year and the 2002/2003 Annual Plan provided a further \$30,000 to progress the concept plan for a proposed community facility and to undertake comprehensive community consultation. In December 2002 the City Development Committee endorsed the consultation and concept development process (3522/2002) undertaken by Leisure Services, with the following outcomes sought:

- A basic concept plan with estimated costs and project brief;
- A community planned facility that will meet the needs of the area as it continues to grow; and
- A stronger cohesive community.

The 2003/2004 Annual Plan provided \$60,000 to progress the project and commence detailed design and future capital development funding was forecast in the Long Term Council Community Plan for 2004/2005. In October 2003 the Projects Special Committee resolved:

“That Summerland Drive Community Facility detailed design commence during the 2003/2004 year and be funded from the funding provided in the 2003/2004 Annual Plan for a facility size of 300 sqm, with potential to extend.”

2000/2003

The Projects Special Committee also resolved to recommend to Council that out-year funding for the development of the facility be re-confirmed. In October 2003 Council resolved:

“That the cost of the Summerland Drive Community Facility as provided in years 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 be re-confirmed at \$660,000 and be available for 2004/2005.”

3094/2003

The October 2003 report to Project Special Committee outlined funding options and advised that an analysis of potential management options for the Community Facility would be completed further down the design process. It is now timely to consider the management options as the architect firm Graeme Johansen were engaged in March 2004 and are developing concept and detailed designs for the project and the facility is planned to be completed by June 2005. The Summerland Drive Community Facility Project Advisory Group (which includes local representatives and the Summerland Primary School Principal) also recently met with Graeme Johansen to contribute ideas to the design process.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The development of the Summerland's Community Facility contributes to the "Urban Village" concept through improving social contacts for residents and protecting the natural environment. Through partnerships with the Ministry of Education and the local school community it was envisaged that the new primary school would become the focal point for the area and also be a leading national example of sustainable development through the integration of:

- Sustainable building principles;
- Energy, waste and water efficiency;
- Co-location and shared use of school and community facilities; and
- Green network projects.

Community and Leisure facilities and activities contribute to Council's Well Being and Urban and Rural Villages strategic and policy objectives by helping provide networks of appropriate and accessible public buildings as key community focal points, and through a wide range of low cost, low impact community activities.

Council's strategic objective for leisure is that a comprehensive range of leisure, recreation and sports services and facilities are provided.

Through adoption of First Call for Children, Council has also stated its commitment to proactively supporting children, young people and their families in Waitakere City.

The Local Government Act defines one of Council's responsibilities as to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural well being of communities, in the present and for the future.

ISSUES

Council agreed in October 2003 that the facility would be Council funded and therefore there are two possible options available for the management of the facility as detailed below:

Option One: Council Owned and Operated

This option would see Council fund the development of the facility and the on-going operation of the facility. It would be staffed by Council employees, who would report to a manager within Council. Council would fund any depreciation or renewals on the building and assets. Funding implications are full capital and development costs and annual operational and staffing costs through the annual plan budget. An example of this type of facility management is the Council's Community Centres.

Option Two: Council Owned and Community Managed

This option would see the development of the building, land and other fixed assets funded by Council, who would lease them to a Community Management Committee. The Community Management Committee could be a Trust or an Incorporated Society or some other form of community organisation.

Key elements of this partnership are:

- Community Management Committee/Board of Trustees made up of representatives from the local community who oversee the management and direction of the facility.
- Three year funding agreement between the Community Management Committee and Council, setting out roles and responsibilities, and Council's contribution towards funding the facility, including any reporting requirements and service level agreements.
- Council funding covers the depreciation and renewal of the fixed assets, including any major maintenance items. The Council funding (in the form of a grant) also covers the employment of a Community House Co-ordinator, employed by the Community Management Committee. The co-ordinator is responsible for the day-to-day running of the facility, as well as taking bookings, promoting the facility, organising programmes and so on.
- The facility is leased to the Community Management Committee for a nominal rent (in keeping with the Community Leases Policy).
- The Community Management Committee sets the user fees for the facility, and keeps any income to offset operational costs. All operational costs must be met by the Community Management Committee.
- The Community Management Committee is eligible to and responsible for securing additional funding from external sources for the likes of purchase of equipment for the facility, and other non-fixed assets.

An example of this is type of facility management is the Council's Community Houses.

A set of criteria has been established to assess the viability of the management options as outlined:

1. Sense of community ownership;
2. Responsive to the needs of the local community, and meets community needs;
3. Robust structure with long-term stability;
4. Financially secure; and
5. Ability to source community funding.

The following table (Table 1) provides a high-level assessment of the extent to which each management option meets the criteria outlined above. Following the table is some further analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the two management options.

Table 1

Criteria	Management Option	
	Council Owned and Operated	Council Owned and Community Managed
Sense of community ownership	L	H
Responsive to community, meets community needs	L	H
Robust structure, long term stability	H	M
Financially secure	H	M
Ability to source community funding	L	H

In Table 1, each management option is rated high, medium or low against each criteria.

The advantages and disadvantages of each option are summarised as follows:

Council Owned and Operated

Advantages

- Provides the most secure and stable management arrangement; and
- Through rates, has a reliable long term funding source.

Disadvantages

- Council-owned facilities are not able to source alternative funding, placing full financial burden on the ratepayer;
- Perceived to be a “Council facility”, rather than a “community facility”;
- Less community sense of ownership and pride in the facility; and
- Not as responsive to the needs of the local community.

Council Owned and Community Managed

Advantages

- Greater sense of community ownership;
- More responsive to the needs of the local community;
- Local people have direct input into the running of the facility;
- Ability to source funding from community trusts and external funding sources, meaning less financial burden on the ratepayer; and
- Secure and robust in the long term with some security of on-going funding through a funding agreement with Council.

Disadvantages

- Reliance on community volunteers for management body/governance; and
- Risk of dominance or 'take-over' by sector(s) of the community, however risk is mitigated with Council partnership.

Overall it is considered that the Council Owned and Community Managed (Community House) option provides the best framework in terms of combining Council funding as well as the community responsiveness and ownership. The vision of the local community, as identified during the community consultation is most effectively met through the Council-Community partnership option. The local vision includes: a multi-functional local facility that provides this new community with a hub; has input from local residents in terms of management, services, and classes provided; and blends in with the surrounding homes and school. In addition, the Summerland's Primary School Hall will compliment the facility if run as a Community House as the Hall offers a larger space to cater to the active recreation needs of the community. The facilities would therefore strengthen the concept of a community hub/focal point based around the community house and school.

This report recommends that the Council Owned and Community Managed (Community House) option be the preferred management. This is due to the:

- Long-term funding options;
- Fit with the local community vision for the facility; and
- Provides direction and commitment from Council on the long-term viability of this project.

Proposed Process to establish a Community Management Committee for the Facility

If Option Two is agreed, a Community Management Committee will need to be established from June 2004 in order to provide sufficient time for the following tasks to be carried out:

- Attract interest from local community members in being involved in the volunteer management committee;
- Establish the group as a legal entity (Incorporated Society or Trust) in order to apply for funds and operate as an accountable and sustainable community group;
- Apply for funding for the internal fit-out of the Summerland's Community Facility (as Council funding covers the design, build and landscaping only); and
- Apply and negotiate a lease for the building with Council.

The local community representative members of the Project Advisory Group have indicated their interest to Council officers in being included in the establishment of a management committee for the facility and are meeting with Leisure Services in June 2004 to progress this.

RESOURCES

In 2003/2004, Council provided financial support via funding agreements at a total of \$157,000 for the six existing Waitakere Council supported Community Houses. The grants range from \$20,000 to \$30,000 per house depending on open hours and user groups and numbers. If approved by the Committee that the Summerland Drive Community Facility be managed as a Community House, annual operational funding for the Community House will be included in the 2005/2006 draft Annual Plan. The level of proposed funding will be assessed in consultation with the management committee and according to the proposed operational hours of the house and projected user numbers and is likely to be between \$20,000 and \$25,000 per year.

Council staff provide information and advice to Community House Co-ordinators and Management Committees and also have a role in monitoring the funding agreements and would be available to assist the establishment of a volunteer management committee for the Summerland Drive Community House. In addition to annual operational grants for Community Houses Council also provides the Community House Training Fund of \$3,500 administered by Waitakere Workers Education Association. The Training Fund is used to fund external training and facilitation needs for the Community Houses, Co-ordinators, and Management Committee Members.

The Waitakere Workers Educational Association also forms part of Council's support to Community Houses. Council grants \$8,350 per year for the Waitakere Workers Educational Association to provide additional support and training for Community House Co-ordinators and Management Committees.

CONCLUSION

In October 2003 Council resolved that the Summerland Drive Community Facility next to Summerland Primary School be funded \$660,000 in 2004/2005 for detailed design and construction. The facility is currently being developed and is due to be completed by July 2005. Comprehensive community consultation was undertaken in 2002/2003 and provided Council with a clear understanding of the local community vision for the facility including: that it is a multi-functional local facility that provides this new community with a hub; has input from local residents in terms of management, services, and classes provided; and blends in with the surrounding homes and schools.

This report outlines two possible options for the management of this Council owned facility including: Option One: Council Owned and Operated (such as a Community Centre); and Option Two: Council Owned and Community Managed (such as a Community House). Overall it is considered that the Council Owned and Community Managed (Community House) option provides the best management framework in terms of combining Council funding as well as the community responsiveness and ownership. The local community representative members of the Project Advisory Group have already indicated their interest to Council officers in being included in the establishment of a management committee for the facility. This option also most effectively meets the vision of the local community, as identified during the community consultation and provides an already established framework, profile, and support network from within which the Community House would operate.

Council currently funds the six existing Council owned Community Houses between \$20,000 and \$30,000 each per year towards operational costs, in addition to \$3,500 for training as administered by the Waitakere Workers Education Association. If the Committee agrees that the Summerland Drive Community Facility be managed as a Community House, annual operational funding for the Community House will be included in the 2005/2006 draft Annual Plan. The level of proposed funding will be assessed in consultation with the management committee and according to the proposed operational hours of the house and projected user numbers and is likely to be between \$20,000 and \$25,000 per year. The Summerland Drive Community House would also have access to additional support and training as provided by the Waitakere Workers Education Association and in accordance with their funding agreement with Council.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Management Options for the Summerland Drive Community Facility report be received.
2. That the City Development Committee approve Option Two: Council Owned and Community Managed (Community House) as the preferred management option for the Summerland Drive Community Facility currently under development.
3. That Leisure Services staff work with the existing community members from the Summerland Drive Community Facility Project Advisory Group to establish a volunteer Community Management Committee for the Summerland Drive Community House.
4. That a report be brought back to the City Development Committee early in 2005 regarding a proposed funding agreement with the Summerland Drive Community House Management Committee to manage the operations of the Summerland Drive Community House (once they have obtained legal entity status).

Report prepared by: Polly O'Brien, Leisure Services, Community Resources Project Leader.



8 HOUSING DISCUSSION PAPER SUBMISSION

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to:

- bring the newly released New Zealand Housing Strategy discussion paper to the committee's attention,
- propose an initial direction to Waitakere City Council's submission in preparation, and
- to present two options for further submission development and adoption to the City Development Committee.

BACKGROUND

Central Government has prepared a discussion paper for a New Zealand Housing Strategy, to provide a vision and strategic direction for the next 10 years. It seeks to address the many housing issues brought about by increasing demand, changes in the housing market, and a changing population.

Submissions on the discussion paper are required by 30 July 2004, and the final Housing Strategy is due for release by the end of this year. This item assumes that Council will wish to provide a submission to this national strategy.

The full and summary documents have been placed in the Councillor's Lounge for information.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

Housing has been identified by Council as an activity whereby many social and economic issues can be addressed. To this end, Council has allocated \$50,000 in the draft Annual Plan 2004/2005 to develop a Sustainable Housing Strategy for Waitakere.

This work will consider:

- A review of Council's roles and options for housing,
- Older Adults housing;
- Housing affordability in Waitakere City;
- Issues raised by increasing cultural diversity;
- Sustainable building initiatives - energy, water etc;
- Location and accessibility.

This project is still in the initial scoping stages, and Councillor input will be sought before the project plan is adopted. This scoping work is expected to take place over July and August this year. The project is intended to provide a framework for the many housing initiatives already underway by Council, and to provide guidance for housing related initiatives in the future.

A3-A4

It is expected that a nationally led strategy would provide critical input and direction to a local strategy. The framework and areas for action suggested in the discussion paper are attached at pages A3 to A4.

ISSUES

Discussion paper issues

The discussion document states a vision to the effect that:

"The vision for the New Zealand Housing Strategy is that all New Zealanders have access to affordable, sustainable, good quality housing appropriate to their needs" (p19).

There is much to support in this discussion paper. Points particularly to note are:

- the recognition of the development of the urban design protocol under the Sustainable Development Programme of Action (p32);
- the signals towards more collaborative approaches to address local housing issues (p34);
- the proposed actions to improve housing quality (Area 5, p46 - 51); and
- moves towards seeing housing within the broader framework and contexts of economic and cultural wellbeing.

However, an initial assessment suggests that, while the vision is stated, and there are many aspects to be supported, the six action areas and actions suggested do not provide a clear sense of how this vision is to be achieved. The strategy needs to be more explicit as to whether the vision is to support access to home ownership for all, or whether 'access' itself is the primary goal, which would imply a reshaping of a cultural norm currently prevalent in New Zealand and a reshaping of the housing market. The vision statement does stress access not ownership.

The discussion document identifies six areas for action to achieve the New Zealand Housing Strategy's vision. While many of the proposed actions would be supported by Council, some issues need to be addressed. Comments from an initial staff assessment follow:

Area 1: Improving housing assistance and housing affordability

- Concerns that there is little discussion or awareness of local government role;
- There is a concern that the need for more information and research, while recognised as necessary, could act as a brake on the undertaking of immediate action which is also very necessary.

Area 2: Responding to housing markets under stress

- This section, while recognising some roles of Local Government, does so mostly through continuing support for the relatively small Local Government Fund. If local authorities wish to become more active and effective in housing provision, this fund will need to be extended.
- The discussion document (p 30) notes the use of Crown land and possibly Local Government land to be identified as suitable for affordable housing, which is a position that this Council would probably support. However, this paragraph then uses as an example, that Whenuapai Airbase land "could potentially be considered for mixed housing development". Given Council's clearly stated objectives for this area, it is expected that Council will wish to comment on this paragraph.
- Council may wish to make comments about the lack of emergency and mental care housing in Waitakere City. There is little comment about methods of identifying and managing local needs.

Area 3: Innovative home ownership programmes

- Council may wish to comment on the impact of the Accommodation Supplement in economic terms e.g. whether or not the supplement acts in reality as a subsidy to the middle class; whether it actually is working to ensure people are getting the housing they need; whether it is distorting the market; and finally, whether Government should take a strategic step backwards and look at whether this form of subsidy is an effective use of public money in the longer term.
- Again the issue of whether ownership or secure tenure is the preferred goal is not clear.

Area 4: Developing the private rental sector

- There are no large private sector rental organisations in New Zealand comparable to overseas organisations. This provides a unique private sector profile internationally. Council may wish to consider whether they wish the final strategy to signal more support for Councils who wish to play a greater role in housing provision.

Area 5: Improving housing quality

- While reviews of various regulatory tools are proposed, which is considered necessary, and the actions also include initiatives towards energy retrofitting, staff assessment is that there is a lot more to be done in this area than the current proposed actions suggest e.g. this strategy could also give more guidance and funding support for water, transport, and alternative materials and design initiatives.
- The proposed actions should include recognition of the work of the sustainable cities work stream under the Sustainable Development Action Plan and include an action which enables initiatives from that work stream to be picked up in the final strategy.

Area 6: Building capacity and capability across the housing sector

- While this section discusses the building sector and partnerships with the private sector for research etc, there is little discussion of the capacity of Housing New Zealand itself to work in partnership with local authorities. The examples used on p57 are welcome but it is suggested that effective delivery will require clustering of more than social services only.
- Council recognises the current national debate about the need for more technical skills in the workplace, and supports initiatives to redress this imbalance in the workforce. However, there is no recognition of existing Local Government initiatives such as the Waitakere Employment and Skills programme.

The discussion document concludes with a section on meeting diverse needs, some sections of which do not include proposed actions as do each of the previous sections. This is considered a major gap which needs to be addressed urgently given the increasing cultural diversity particularly in Auckland.

Process

While this agenda item raises a first draft of potential issues, the notes are not complete and key issues are noted for consideration only.

In order to develop the submission more fully, it is proposed that a workshop be convened for Councillors during mid June 2004 to consider more fully the major issues in the discussion paper. It is envisaged that a further agenda item on 8 July 2004 to the City Development Committee could then adopt the key issues in the submission, with delegated editorial signoff for due date 30 July 2004. This disadvantage of this option is that June 2004 has a heavy load of meetings for Long Term Council Community Plan and Annual Plan requirements.

An alternative process could be that a workshop be held in early July 2004 and an agenda item proposing the key elements of the submission is prepared for Council on 28 July 2004. The disadvantage of this option is that it leaves little time for any editorial input before due date of 30 July 2004.

RESOURCES

While the position of Senior Analyst; Social Policy is vacant (probably until August 2004) submission preparation will be undertaken by an internal team largely composed of staff within the Strategy and Development Group. As a cross check, an external review of the proposed submission will be sought prior to signoff by Elected Members.

CONCLUSION

The Government has released the New Zealand Housing Strategy discussion paper for comment. Submissions are due 30 July 2004. While there is much to be supported in this discussion document, this report also presents some commentary from an initial staff assessment for Council consideration.

The report presents two options for this Committee to further develop and adopt a submission from Waitakere City Council:

- (a) that a workshop be held mid June 2004 with adoption by this Committee on 8 July 2004;
- (b) that a workshop be held early July 2004 with adoption by Council on 28 July 2004.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Housing Discussion Paper Submission report be received.
2. That Waitakere City Council prepare a submission by 30 July 2004 to the discussion document titled 'Building the Future: Towards a New Zealand Housing Strategy'.
3. That Councillors provide direction to staff as which option they wish to adopt for the development and adoption of the submission.

Report prepared by: Cathy Kenkel, Group Manager: Strategic Planning and Policy.



9 HARBOURVIEW - ORANGIHINA UPDATE

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to provide an update on progress with Harbourview - Orangihina development project and outline the works proposed for the coming year.

BACKGROUND

At the Council meeting of 29 May 2001 Council received a proposal from Te Atatu Residents and Ratepayers Association in relation to the then 'People's Park' on the Harbourview land. As a result of that meeting Council resolved to undertake the planning process for an Open Space Management Plan and to develop the land as park alongside investigation into a marae site in Te Atatu and appropriate reserve classification and District Plan environment identification for the project.

At the Council meeting of 27 February 2002 Council received the report and recommendations regarding site options for a marae at Te Atatu Peninsula. As a result of that meeting Council resolved to provide 2.5 hectares on Harbourview for Te Atatu Marae.

An Open Space Management Plan for the remaining 80 hectare of park land was adopted in February 2003. This plan outlined proposed development of Harbourview - Orangihina as a park with an associated concept plan which all subsequent park development would be based upon.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

Due to the size and proposed use of the Harbourview - Orangihina, the area meets the criteria for a City-wide park.

The City Development Committee has the delegated authority to hear submissions and make decisions on the Open Space Management Plan and associated detailed concept design and implementation work for the park.

The Open Space Management Plan for Harbourview - Orangihina has been prepared in the context of the Parks Strategy, which provides guidelines on the management of parks within the City. The Parks Strategy aims to improve the quality of parks and provide parks services in a fair and equitable way for Waitakere people within financial constraints.

The Open Space Management Plan for Harbourview - Orangihina has also been compiled within the context of the Greenprint, Leisure Strategy, Weed Strategy as well as other statutory and strategic documents for the City and, where appropriate, the region.

ISSUES

Open Space Management Plan

Since the last update report to the City Development Committee, the Open Space Management Plan has been formatted and printed. Hard copies are available for the public at request and are also available on the Council's website.

Stage One Works

Stage one works were completed in June 2003. The stage one works provided an entrance to the park from Gloria Avenue round-about and a small carpark area for access to the existing path network and the heritage timber villa. It also included planting of swale drainage areas and specimen tree planting.

Near the completion of the stage one works a community planting day was held (Saturday, 31 May 2003). This event was organised to celebrate the nearing completion of stage one works and the opening up of the northern part of the park for public use. Approximately 100 interested residents attended.

Unfortunately some of the planting from stage one was not successful. Planting during May - June 2004 will occur to replace unsuccessful plants. Part of the replacement work will be carried out under the maintenance requirements of the contract for the planting works. It is believed that weather, soil conditions and drainage are likely contributors to the unsuccessful planting.

Work to rectify the problem areas will include:

A5 Removing the planting beds in the middle of the large open grassed area as indicated on the map attached at page A5. These will be reverted back to grass for the short to medium term.

It is likely that these planting beds have been unsuccessful due to unanticipated wet conditions and soil compaction during construction of stage one. Significant work is required to raise the planting beds and provide better drainage and soil conditions. Due to budget constraints it is thought that money would be better spent elsewhere to develop new park areas.

Planted areas near the entrance have also been partially unsuccessful. This again is likely related to drainage issues, in which selected plant species have struggled. These species will be replaced with plants that have been particularly successful on the site to date ie. *Carex secta*, in order to provide the dramatic planting display at the park entrance.

Remaining plants from these gardens will be replanted in more suitable locations within Harbourview - Orangihina.

Stage Two Works

Stage two works are near completion. Stage two consisted of developing a path that runs from the carpark (developed in stage one) south along the escarpment to the southern end of Harbourview - Orangihina. It is a 2m wide path with four bridges. The bridges will soon have unique bridge railings installed.

At the time of writing the report the path and bridge bases were completed. However, due to safety reasons, the path remains closed until the bridge railings are installed.

The path will open up the entire length of Harbourview - Orangihina for access by the public.

A5 Council is taking over another large area in the centre of the park and opening it up for public access, as indicated on the map attached at page A5. This was previously leased to the Te Atatu Pony Club. During May - June 2004 the Te Atatu Pony club will be removing all improvements and materials placed on the land by the club. Remaining fences will be removed and Council will begin mowing the area.

The vandalised information sign adjacent to the carpark will also be replaced during this period (May - June 2004) and a park sign will be installed at the entrance.

Furniture Design

An artist has been commissioned to develop concepts which will add a unique component specific to Harbourview - Orangihina to standard Council park furniture elements. It includes developing modifications to the standard designs for bridge railings, seating (bench and backed) and picnic tables.

New bridge railings will be installed as part of stage two works (as mentioned above).

Painted Apple Moth

Weed control was undertaken on the southern end of Harbourview - Orangihina as part of the Painted Apple Moth control in 2002. The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry has allocated resources to allow revegetation to occur on the site.

Approximately 5000 plants have been allocated for the southern escarpment end of Harbourview - Orangihina. Planting is expected to be undertaken in June 2004.

Weed Control and Planting Plan

Consultants have been commissioned to update previous work, and to develop a long term planting and weed control plan for Harbourview - Orangihina. This is to help establish a work and maintenance programme for the whole site and to assist in prioritisation of work.

District Plan Variation

The Council notified Plan Change 2 to the District Plan on 9 June 2003. Copies of this Plan Change were sent to all Henderson Community Board Members prior to notification. Copies were also sent to all District Plan holders, all those who made a submission on the Open Space Management Plan, all those who have properties that front onto the Harbourview - Orangihina, and the usual statutory bodies and Iwi Authorities.

This Plan Change seeks to change the current Harbourview South and Living Environment into Open Space Environment and Marae Special Area. Submissions closed on 7 July 2003, and the Council held a hearing of submissions during December 2003 and made decisions on 16 December 2003. One Environment Court Appeal has been received from Te Atatu Residents and Ratepayers Association. One preliminary meeting between Council and the Association's representatives has been held to discuss the appeal. The first Environment Court facilitated mediation is scheduled for 16 June 2004.

The Plan Change is separate to the work that is progressing the integrated public transport interchange and ferry. If, following consultation and further consideration by the Council, it decides to proceed with the interchange, that will be progressed as a separate process to Plan Change 2 under the Resource Management Act 1991 (most likely via a designation under section 168A of the Act).

Conservation Plans

Draft Conservation Plans have been prepared for the Auckland Brick and Tile Company Site and the Te Atatu Heavy Anti Aircraft Gun Emplacement.

By the time of the Committee meeting it is expected that the plans would have been publicly notified for submissions. The plans will be open for Submissions from May to Friday, 30 July 2004.

The Open Space Management Plan will allow for implementation of recommendations from Conservation Plans for the preservation and management of historical sites in the Park.

Forthcoming Work

The following work will be progressed over the next financial year with regard to this project:

- Undertake detailed design and contract documentation for stage three and four.
- Stage three works – Second roundabout and park entrance (to be undertaken and funded by the traffic and roading section of Council) opposite Toru Street into a small carparking area.
- Stage four works - Boardwalk developments, minor path developments, new seating and plantings.
- Update Harbourview – Orangihina requirements for eco-sourcing contract for plant supply for next three years.
- Work with Forest and Bird to investigate opportunity for wetland sponsorship to enhance project work on wetland rehabilitation education and interpretation.
- Investigate options and processes for establishing a community group to work with Council on the implementation of the park concept and maintenance.
- Investigation of heritage restoration requirements and costings for the timber cottage.
- Investigation of heritage restoration requirements and stabilisation (erosion control) of the Auckland Brick and Tile Company site.

RESOURCES

The Harbourview - Orangihina development is being resourced from the separate rate of \$9 and provides approximately \$400,000 per year for expenditure on capital works. There are two years remaining for the separate rate.

Once the separate rate fund ends, Council will need to decide how to fund any future works. To this end, work is underway to establish a work programme for the remaining funds, options for new works and ongoing budget implications for maintenance and depreciation.

CONCLUSION

The Harbourview - Orangihina project has a number of elements which are being progressed. Work completion and site maintenance over the next month will significantly increase the access and public usage of the park.

There are a number of projects planned for the next financial year which will further develop the park.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the 'Harbourview - Orangihina update report' be received.
2. That ongoing maintenance of Harbourview - Orangihina be included in the 2005/2006 Annual Plan.

Report prepared by: Gyles Bendall, Strategic Parks Planner; Parks Planning.



10 WESTGATE PLANNING

This item will be considered in the Confidential Supplement of the agenda, and has been circulated to members separately with this agenda.

PROCEDURAL MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

That the public be excluded from the following part of the proceedings of this meeting, namely the and Westgate Planning.

The general subject of the matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation of the matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of the matter to be considered.	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to the matter.	Ground(s) under Section 48(1)(a) for the passing of this resolution.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Westgate Planning.	<p>The withholding of information is necessary in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).	<p>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist.</p>

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by 7(2)(i) of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public as follows:

- *The report contains information that if released would affect the Council's negotiations.*

