



Waitakere City Council
Te Taiao o Waitakere

NOTICE OF MEETING

CULTURE AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

I hereby give notice that a meeting of the Culture and Community Committee will be held on:-

DATE: Wednesday, 9 December 2009 **TIME:** 9.30 am

MEETING ROOM: Council Chamber

VENUE: Waitakere Central, 6 Henderson Valley Road, Henderson, Waitakere

to consider the business as set out herein and to take any necessary action connected therewith.

4 December 2009

Ngareta Delamere
COMMITTEE SECRETARY

Telephone (09) 836 8000 extn 8552

MEMBERSHIP:

Councillors	JP	Lawley, JP (Chairman)
	AK	Corban, OBE, JP (Deputy Chairman)
	DQ	Battersby, QSM, JP
	BA	Brady, JP
	MFP	Chan, JP
	JM	Clews, QSO, JP
	RI	Clow
	LA	Cooper, JP
	RP	Dallow, QPM, JP
	WW	Flaunty, QSM, JP
	MM	Jolley
	PG	Mitchell
	VS	Neeson, JP

Mayor RA Harvey, QSO, JP (ex officio)
Deputy Mayor PA Hulse (ex officio)

(Quorum 5 members)

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

(Meeting Room could be subject to change)

(The reports and recommendations contained in all agendas are reports and recommendations only and are not to be construed, in any way, as Council policy until adopted.)

**AGENDA FOR A MEETING OF THE CULTURE AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEE TO BE
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER AT WAITAKERE CENTRAL, 6 HENDERSON
VALLEY ROAD, HENDERSON, WAITAKERE ON WEDNESDAY,
9 DECEMBER 2009, COMMENCING AT 9.30 AM**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>ITEM</u>		<u>PAGE NO.</u>
1	APOLOGIES	1
2	URGENT BUSINESS	1
3	CONFLICTS OF INTEREST	1
4	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	1
5	PRESENTATION – MCCAHERN HOUSE	2
6	CHAPEL OF FAITH IN THE OAKS RESTORATION	2
7	GIFT OF HEAVY CLAY COLLECTION	4
8	LEASE OF HISTORIC HENDERSON RAILWAY STATION	8
9	WAITAKERE REGIONAL HOCKEY TURF TRUST FUNDING UPDATE	12

AGENDA FOR A MEETING OF THE CULTURE AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEE TO BE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER AT WAITAKERE CENTRAL, 6 HENDERSON VALLEY ROAD, HENDERSON, WAITAKERE ON WEDNESDAY, 9 DECEMBER 2009, COMMENCING AT 9.30 AM

1 APOLOGIES



2 URGENT BUSINESS

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information 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 Committee by resolution so decides; and
- (ii) the Chairman has explained at the beginning of the meeting (when open to the public) that the item will be raised for discussion and decision, why the item is not on the agenda, and why it cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

The Committee may make a decision on a matter determined to be urgent.

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



3 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The Council has acknowledged in its Code of Conduct that Members need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a Member of the Council and any private or other external interest they might have. This note is provided as a reminder to Members to check that no such conflicts arise in relation to any items on this agenda.



4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes - Wednesday, 11 November 2009

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Culture and Community Committee resolve to:

Receive the minutes of the meeting of the Culture and Community Committee held on Wednesday, 11 November 2009, as circulated, and that they be taken as read and now be confirmed.



5 PRESENTATION – MCCAHERN HOUSE

The Manager: Arts will give an update to the Culture and Community Committee on McCahon House.



6 CHAPEL OF FAITH IN THE OAKS RESTORATION

GLOSSARY

New Zealand Historic Places Trust	(NZHPT)
Chapel of Faith in the Oaks	(the Chapel)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the report is to advise the Culture and Community Committee on progress towards the restoration of the Chapel of Faith in the Oaks (the Chapel). The Chapel is listed as a Category I heritage item in the District Plan and Category II by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT). The Chapel has deteriorated over time and a complete restoration is required to save it. The Chapel was returned to Council ownership in November 2008. In the 2009/2010 financial year, \$800,000 has been approved to restore the Chapel. Building and resource consent plans were lodged in October 2009. NZHPT has provided a letter of support for the restoration work. Physical works are due to commence in January 2010 with an estimated project completion date of May 2010.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Culture and Community Committee resolve to:

Receive the Chapel of Faith in the Oaks Restoration report.

BACKGROUND

1. The Chapel was built in 1886 to enable Waikumete Cemetery to provide burial services for the dead. The Chapel later fell into a state of disrepair when Waikumete Cemetery was administered by Auckland City Council. In 1969, it was due for demolition when a group of concerned residents stepped in to save it from destruction.
2. The Chapel then underwent a modest restoration between the 1970s and early 1980s when it was partially stabilised, the guttering replaced, new stained glass windows fabricated, a new matai floor installed and the doors, locks and hinges replaced. During this period the chapel was administered by the Chapel Trust consisting of representatives from various church denominations, the Friends of Waikumete, a Councillor and community representation.
3. The former Chapel Trust had a long term lease of the building and embarked on a second restoration of the building. The physical works that occurred during 2008, namely the installation of a concrete cut-off wall, concrete apron, truss repair and structural strengthening of one corner of the Chapel, was funded by a grant of \$125,000 from the Portage and Waitakere Licensing Trusts. Council contributed \$139,000 for the strengthening in one corner and the replacement of a rotten timber truss.

4. The structural engineer to the contract, Hugh Fendall Consultants, became concerned at the poor construction techniques and building materials when supervising the physical works. Load testing and modelling of the building led to a recommendation to Council that the building was no longer structurally sound and should be closed to the public as it could potentially collapse in either an earthquake or high winds.
5. The Chapel came back into Council's ownership in late 2008 when the Trust was dissolved. However, the Chapel Trust ensured that the balance of funds they had in their account, of approximately \$16,000, was transferred to Council in 2008 to help pay for the additional work required to repair the building. The Long Term Council Community Plan 2009-2019 set aside \$800,000 for the Chapel's restoration. Funding for this item is from the sale of the property associated with the old New Lynn Hotel.

DECISION MAKING

Issues

Restoration

6. Council employed a heritage architect to prepare drawings that would:
 - Upgrade the foundations;
 - Restore walls for structural integrity;
 - Restore floor for structural integrity;
 - Upgrade building fabric to current structural seismic requirements;
 - Improve surface drainage;
 - Improve air circulation throughout; and
 - Restoration of original features.
7. The works required to upgrade the Chapel are extensive and will require approximately six months to complete. The floor of the Chapel has been removed. When the concrete footings are poured, it will be simpler to have access from inside and outside the building. The foundations will be strengthened with a continuous beam below and inside the existing perimeter wall. The concrete apron will be removed and a gravel path installed around the outside of the building. Additional sub-floor and above floor ventilation will increase the air circulating throughout the building. The sub-floor framing will be repaired and rotten or dislodged timber piles will be replaced. Additional drainage will be installed to the perimeter of the Chapel.
8. Seismic upgrading will be achieved through removal of the plaster on the internal walls and application of carbon fibre wrap and re-plastering. The truss-bearing surfaces will be strengthened and any rotten timber replaced.
9. The flashings and gutters will be replaced with traditional ones and missing slates on the roof replaced. The porches will be repaired and properly secured to the building. The existing rainwater heads will be replaced with those manufactured locally by Galbraiths. The new ones will have greater capacity to remove water efficiently.
10. The porches will be repaired, repositioned and properly secured to the building. All cracks will be repaired and the entire building re-painted inside and out. A damp-proofing osmosis system will be installed to provide long term protection against rising damp.

11. The security system for the Chapel including lighting will be renewed and upgraded.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

12. Historic heritage is a matter of national importance under section 6(f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 and Council has a wide range of duties and responsibilities to protect built, natural and cultural heritage resources.
13. The restoration of the Chapel is supported by NZHPT.

CONSULTATION

14. Consultation has occurred with NZHPT and the Friends of Waikumete.

RESOURCES

15. The Council allocated \$800,000 in the Annual Plan 2009/2010 for the restoration of the Chapel.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

16. There are no implementation issues associated with this report.

AUCKLAND COUNCIL TRANSITION ISSUES

17. The decision making proposed in this report is not constrained by section 31 of the Local Government (Tamaki Makaurau Reorganisation) Act 2009, as it does not directly or because of its consequences: significantly prejudice the reorganisation, significantly constrain the powers or capacity of the Auckland Council or any subsidiary of the Auckland Council following the reorganisation, or have a significant negative impact on the assets or liabilities that are transferred to the Auckland Council as a result of the reorganisation.

Report prepared by: Alina Wimmer, Principal Advisor: Heritage.



7 GIFT OF HEAVY CLAY COLLECTION

GLOSSARY

Portage Ceramics Trust (PCT)
New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Council's collection of heavy clay items, acquired after restoration of the Ambrico Kiln in the early 1990s, was at first destined for a regional ceramics museum. The museum concept was put on hold due to an ownership dispute over the artefacts.

Over the last five years, the Portage Ceramics Trust (PCT) has acquired a significant collection and has a 10 year lease of the Ambrico Studio. The PCT plan to house their collection at Ambrico Studio, conserve the items and develop exhibitions. This report recommends that the Council should gift its collection, worth between \$50,000 and \$90,000, to the PCT. This would enable the collection to remain in New Lynn.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Culture and Community Committee resolve to:

1. **Receive** the Gift of Heavy Clay Collection report.
2. **Agree**, subject to resolution 4 below, that the Council's heavy clay collection be gifted to the Portage Ceramics Trust.
3. **Agree**, subject to resolution 4 below, that a formal gift agreement be entered into for the gifting of Council's heavy clay collection to the Portage Ceramics Trust.
4. **Note** that resolutions 2 and 3 above be subject to confirmation by the Auckland Transition Agency.

BACKGROUND

1. The Ambrico Reserve is located on part of the former Gardner Brothers and Parker's Brickworks site. In 1901, the Gardner brothers arrived in Auckland from Glorit on the Kaipara where their parents had a farm. They then purchased 48 acres of land adjoining the New Lynn railway station and formed a new company known as Gardner Brothers and Parker. The Gardner Brothers were well acquainted with brick making.
2. The first Rice Owen Clark was their maternal grandfather and R O Gardner was named after him. Briar Gardner, New Zealand's first woman studio potter, moved with her relatives to New Lynn to act as housekeeper. In 1922, John Gardner introduced a pottery wheel into the works and brought out to New Zealand William Spiers, an expert thrower at the Royal Doulton factory in England. In 1926, the downdraft kiln that survives today was designed by Athol Miller under the guidance of Henry Clark and then built by Clark.
3. The Ambrico Kiln is listed as a Category I heritage item. The New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) has noted that "very few kilns survive in New Zealand and the retention of this one is of national importance." The Ambrico Kiln was closed in 1973. It was restored by a local historic committee with help from Rotary in the 1990s.
4. In 1992, the Council issued a building consent for an ancillary building on the Ambrico Kiln reserve to be developed for a ceramics museum. The community group that restored the Ambrico Kiln collected items relating to the clay industry during the early 1990s but there was later a dispute over the ownership of some of the collection. Ownership was finally resolved in the late 1990s and the remains of that collection belong to the Council.

DECISION MAKING

Issues

5. The Council's collection was valued between \$50,000 and \$90,000 in July 2005 by John Perry. The items include terracotta roof tiles, a mobile brick press, free standing brick maker, metal artefacts and Crown Lynn plates. The entire collection is valued at between \$50,000 and \$90,000.
6. The Council does not have a mandate to own or operate a ceramics museum. There is a shortage of skilled curators to care for and display the collection.
7. The collection has value to the local community and would add value to that of the PCT's. If the collection is gifted to the PCT, they will make the collection accessible to the public and learning institutions on-line.
8. If the collection is gifted to the PCT, the Council should draw up a legal agreement to formally transfer ownership. The legal agreement would supplement the resolution of the Culture and Community Committee and provide the items' provenance.

Options Identified

9. There are two options: gift the collection to the PCT or keep the collection and let the Auckland Council deal with it. The status quo has a cost of continued storage and insurance.

Assessment of Options

10. The table below highlights the advantages and disadvantages of either keeping the collection (the status quo) or gifting the collection.
11. The following table also highlights some of the wider issues:

	Option 1 – gift the collection		Option 2- status quo	
	Disadvantages	Advantages	Disadvantages	Advantages
Social	Nil.	The collection will be put on the internet by the PCT and made available to the public.	The collection is currently inaccessible to the general public.	The collection is owned by Council.
Economic	The Council will not own the collection valued at \$50,000-\$90,000.	The Council will not have a liability relating to the long term secure storage of the collection, insurance and space	There is a cost associated with the storage of the collection and its insurance.	The Council may be able to sell the collection in the future.
Cultural	Nil.	The PCT has the resources to make the collection more available to the public.	The collection is not able to be accessed by the public at present.	The collection is in public ownership.

	Option 1 – gift the collection		Option 2- status quo	
	Disadvantages	Advantages	Disadvantages	Advantages
Environment	Nil.	The Ambrico Studio will be able to curate/display the collection alongside its other exhibits.	Nil.	Nil.

12. The collection only has items relating to New Zealand European heritage.

Consideration of Community Views

13. Waitakere City Council has consulted with NZHPT and the PCT. The items have additional significance when viewed in the New Lynn context and in association with the other collections owned by PCT.

Preferred Option

14. The preferred option is option 1: to gift the collection.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

15. Historic heritage is a matter of national importance under section 6(f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 and Council has a wide range of duties and responsibilities to protect built, natural and cultural heritage resources.

CONSULTATION

16. Consultation has occurred internally with the Arts Manager and Council's Property Manager.

RESOURCES

17. There are no resources associated with this other than staff time.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

18. There are no implementation issues associated with gifting the collection to PCT.

AUCKLAND COUNCIL TRANSITION ISSUES

19. The Local Government (Tamaki Makaurau Reorganisation) Act 2009 imposes restrictions on Waitakere City Council's decision making capabilities in respect of disposal of assets under s31(4)(f).
20. Section 31(4)(f) states:-

“to purchase or dispose of assets other than in accordance with its long term council community plan...”

- (6) *The chief executive of the existing local government organisation must ensure that the decision has been confirmed in writing by the Transition Agency before implementing the decision.*
- (7) *A decision to which this section applies is void and of no effect until it is confirmed”*

21. It is considered that disposal of the collection will simplify the transition to the new structure and also ensure that the items stay in New Lynn.

Report prepared by: Alina Wimmer, Principal Advisor: Heritage.



8 LEASE OF HISTORIC HENDERSON RAILWAY STATION

GLOSSARY

Henderson Heritage Trust	(HHT)
Auckland Regional Council	(ARC)
New Zealand Historic Places Trust	(NZHPT)
Historic Henderson Railway Station	(the Station)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Culture and Community Committee for the Council's support of the Henderson Heritage Trust (HHT). This report provides an update on the Historic Henderson Railway Station (the Station) restoration project. The HHT has negotiated with ONTRACK for the long term lease of the Station over the last four years and agreed to a 30 year lease of the land and building. The lease agreement came about through the Council's support for the HHT and paves the way for the Station's restoration.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Culture and Community Committee resolve to:

1. **Receive** the Lease of Historic Henderson Railway Station report.
2. **Agree** that the Council should support the Historic Henderson Railway Station's restoration by:
 - Processing building and resource consents in a timely manner;
 - Facilitating discussions with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust; and
 - Providing officer time for the Historic Henderson Railway Station restoration project.

BACKGROUND

1. The Station is listed in the Waitakere City District Plan as a Category I Building and is also scheduled by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) as a Category II Building.
2. The Station is associated with the early development of rail, passenger transport and the growth of Waitakere. The expansion of the western line as far as Henderson was completed in 1881 and the growth and development of early settlements is linked with the development of the "main trunk line".

3. The first original Station at Henderson comprised a timber structure with a shelter shed, a ladies' waiting room and a toilet. In 1892, Henderson became a flag Station. By 1897, the Station comprised a passenger platform complete with shelter shed, a cart dock and goods shed.
 4. Evidence of the expanding township included the Falls Hotel built in 1875. By 1902, a suburban working men's train linked Henderson and Auckland. From 1907-1912, rapid growth in suburban traffic meant that the Station needed to be enlarged in 1909 and in December 1912, and completion was a Class B Station.
 5. In 2004, the Council again passed a resolution to apply for resource consent to relocate the Station from its original site to the Corban Estate. This was to enable the new transport interchange and double tracking project to happen without constraints.
 6. The Council entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the HHT stating that Council would meet the relocation expenses. However, following an interim decision by the Commissioner, it was determined that the Station should remain on the rail corridor and the resource consent was subsequently withdrawn. The HHT had a two year lease over the building and its immediate environs from ONTRACK. That lease expired in May 2007 and the HHT entered into a new lease agreement in September 2009.
 7. The Infrastructure and Works Committee considered a report on the Station in December 2007 and resolved the following:
 - “2. That the Infrastructure and Works Committee approves payment to the Henderson Heritage Trust of \$50,000 to enable them to progress the restoration of the old Henderson Railway Station, subject to the approval of the long term lease.
 3. That Council's Project Manager: Strategic Property Projects and Property Services Manager be instructed to undertake the feasibility of sub-leasing it be reported back to the Infrastructure and Works Committee be approved.”
- 3864/2007

DECISION MAKING

Issues

Implication of Heritage Listing

8. The Category I heritage listing of the Station means that any external additions or alterations to the building will need discretionary resource consent. The only exception to this requirement is if ONTRACK wish to alter the building using their powers under the designation for rail purposes. A designation acts as a spot zoning to enable typically Crown agencies or infrastructure companies to undertake works that are essential to their role.
9. About five years ago, the heritage listing was an impediment to the relocation of the Station. The Auckland Regional Council (ARC) and NZHPT opposed its removal.

10. The HHT were concerned that if ONTRACK should ever want to remove the building from its current location in the future, that it should be assisted to do so using the special designation process in the Resource Management Act 1991. The designation process has the advantage that the Council can only put conditions on an application, it cannot refuse to grant consent. The lease has been altered to enable that to occur. However, it should be stated that the HHT intend to restore and adaptively re-use the building.
11. The final future use of the Station is still to be determined. The HHT will go through a publicly advertised process to seek expressions of interest for the building that will determine the type of interior refurbishment. The HHT is an independent legal entity and will make the final decision on tenancy.

Sub-leasing option and public transport

12. The Council's Project Manager: Strategic Property and Manager: Property Assets have advised that the Council does not require additional office space.
13. The parking strategy provides for flexibility in the application of the District Plan parking rules in town centres. The Station is located in a transport corridor, therefore, the HHT will expect visitors to the restored Station to mainly utilise public transport.

Options Identified

14. The Council's options in this case are to support the work of the HHT or do nothing.

Assessment of Options

15. There is an intangible value in the restored Station; it is a symbol of Victorian achievement juxtaposed beside modern transport interchange.
16. Both the Council and the HHT have added value to Henderson by creating spaces where historic heritage can be enjoyed by the public.
17. There is no further specific financial assistance to be offered to the HHT apart from staff time. The HHT is eligible to apply for any refund of building and resource consent fees.
18. The Council has two options – either to continue to support the work of the HHT or do nothing.
19. The following table provides an analysis of the two options:

	Option 1 – support the work of the HHT		Option 2 – do nothing	
	Disadvantages	Advantages	Disadvantages	Advantages
Social	Nil.	The Station will continue to be part of the social fabric of Henderson.	Nil.	Nil.
Economic	There has been \$50k worth of expenditure to help keep the	The Council's re-roofing and the eventual restoration of the building will provide for local	The restoration process would be slower if Council did nothing.	No cost to Council.

	Option 1 – support the work of the HHT		Option 2 – do nothing	
	Disadvantages	Advantages	Disadvantages	Advantages
	building weather-tight.	employment, and significant contingent beneficial effects.		
Cultural	Nil.	Heritage buildings can be appreciated by the community and foster a sense of pride.	Council cannot positively influence investment in the Station.	Nil.
Environment	Nil.	The restored Station will add amenity to its surroundings.	Council cannot positively influence investment.	Nil.

Consideration of Community Views

20. There is support for the restoration of the Station from NZHPT, ARC, the West Auckland Historical Society, Council and the general public.

Preferred Option

21. The preferred option is option one.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

22. Historic heritage is a matter of national importance under section 6(f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Council has a wide range of duties and responsibilities to protect buildings, natural and cultural heritage resources.
23. The ARC and NZHPT support the restoration of the historic railway Station in its original location. The HHT may be eligible for some funding of their project from the ARC's environmental initiatives fund.

CONSULTATION

24. Key Council officers, Councillors, NZHPT and ARC have been consulted about this project.

RESOURCES

25. There are no resources other than staff time required to support the HHT. However the success of the restoration project is dependant on external funding from charitable trusts. The Council can support this through letters of support.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

26. There are no implementation issues associated with this item.

AUCKLAND COUNCIL TRANSITION ISSUES

27. The decision making proposed in this report is not constrained by section 31 of the Local Government (Tamaki Makaurau Reorganisation) Act 2009. It does not directly (or because of its consequences): significantly prejudice the reorganisation, constrain the powers or capacity of the Auckland Council or any subsidiary of the Auckland Council following the reorganisation. Neither does the decision have a significant negative impact on the assets or liabilities that are transferred to the Auckland Council as a result of the reorganisation.

Report prepared by: Alina Wimmer, Principal Advisor: Heritage.



9 WAITAKERE REGIONAL HOCKEY TURF TRUST FUNDING UPDATE

GLOSSARY

Hockey Turf and Pavilion Project	(the Project)
Henderson High School	(the School)
Waitakere Regional Hockey Turf Trust	(the Trust)
Quantity Surveyors	(QS)
Babbage Consultants Limited	(Babbage)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to update the Culture and Community Committee on the progress of the Hockey Turf and Pavilion Project (the Project) at Henderson High School (the School) and the current funding situation.

The Waitakere Regional Hockey Turf Trust (the Trust) have started work on developing the full sized hockey turf and have appointed a lead consultant who have completed detailed design and engineers estimates. The engineers estimates came back higher than expected due to significant increases in the cost of lighting and the increased earthworks required to stabilise and retain the site. The result means the Trust face a budget shortfall to complete the hockey turf and are requesting the Council consider making available the remaining \$502,000 of the \$1.852 million to enable the hockey turf to proceed this summer.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Culture and Community Committee resolve to:

1. **Receive** the Waitakere Regional Hockey Turf Trust Funding Update report.
2. **Agree** to allow the Waitakere Regional Hockey Turf Trust to draw down on the remaining \$502,000, set aside for the hockey pavilion at Henderson High School, to complete the hockey turf, under the following conditions:
 - The Waitakere Regional Hockey Turf Trust investigates all cost saving solutions and the hockey turf budget is approved by the Director: Community Wellbeing;
 - The \$502,000 be used only if needed for the hockey turf and any unspent budget to be held by the Council for the hockey pavilion; and

- If the hockey turf is delayed and does not proceed until summer 2010 the full \$502,000 remains for the hockey pavilion and the Waitakere Regional Hockey Turf Trust are required to fundraise the shortfall for the hockey turf.

BACKGROUND

1. In September 2005, the City Development Committee recommended to the Long Term Council Community Plan and Annual Plan Special Committee the allocation of \$1.885 million for a hockey facility at the School based on an in-depth analysis and evaluation of the three possible sites. The following resolution was passed:

“2. That the City Development Committee recommends to the Long Term Council Community Plan and Annual Plan Special Committee that budget be allocated in the 2006/2007 Annual Plan to the value of \$1,885,000 for the development of an artificial hockey turf and pavilion at Henderson High School.”

1698/2005

2. The Council initially agreed to fund 50% of the total project costs, which in 2005 was estimated to be \$3.6 million. A condition of the Council funding was that the Trust had to raise the additional \$1.8 million before construction began.
3. At its meeting on 10 June 2009, the Culture and Community Committee agreed to allow the Trust to develop the Project in two stages; stage one being the full sized hockey turf and lighting, and stage two being the hockey pavilion. The Culture and Community Committee agreed to release \$1.35 million of the total \$1.852 million allocated in the Annual Plan 2008/2009 to the Trust to develop the hockey turf. The following resolution was passed:

The Culture and Community Committee resolved to:

“2. Agree to enter into a Funding Agreement with the Waitakere Regional Hockey Turf Trust and make available up to \$1.35 million of the \$1.852 million allocated in the Annual Plan 2008/2009 to develop stage one; a full sized hockey turf with lights, at Henderson High School and hold the balance until other funding is secured to complete stage two; the pavilion and practice turf.”

940/2009

DECISION MAKING

Issues

4. The Trust obtained a Quantity Surveyors (QS) estimate in March 2009 for the cost of building the hockey turf and it was estimated to cost \$1.78 million. The Trust and Council officers also obtained costings from recently completed hockey turfs and turf providers with all estimates averaging between \$1.6 and \$1.75 million to construct.
5. Based on these estimates, the Trust set a budget of \$1.78 million to develop the hockey turf, with the School contributing \$430,000 and the Council agreeing to release \$1.35 million of the budgeted \$1.852 million.

6. The Trust engaged Babbage Consultants Limited (Babbage) to be the lead consultant and have worked with Babbage in developing detailed design and engineers estimates for the hockey turf. The initial engineer's estimate came to \$2,571,666, which included Babbage's design fees and consent fees. This estimate is based on current market rates provided by the various contractors and include a 10% contingency on all construction work.
7. The increase is driven primarily by lighting and earthworks costs, although all items appear to have increased. According to Babbage, the lighting costs have increased significantly in the past 12 months. The original QS estimated the lighting would cost approximately \$150,000 with Babbage's estimate coming to \$485,815. The other major pricing increase was for earthworks. During detailed design, Babbage discovered some pockets of peat on the site which require more earthworks and fill than was initially expected. The hockey turf has to be situated at a much lower level requiring greater excavation, resulting in a much greater area needing to be retained than previously thought.
8. These two factors have contributed to a \$791,666 increase in the estimated costs of the hockey turf. The Trust went back to the original QS to comment on the variance and they responded by stating that information on lighting and earth conditions were not available when the QS was produced and that the engineer's estimate was realistic given the current parameters identified through the detailed design.
9. The Trust and Council officers are in the process of further reviewing the current project estimate against budget and actuals from recently completed hockey turfs. Of the greatest concern, is the increase in lighting costs and the Trust is attempting to validate these figures. The Trust is also working with Babbage to cut any unnecessary costs and look at cost saving solutions. At the time of writing this report the results were not known, but will be verbally reported at the Culture and Community Committee meeting on Wednesday, 9 December 2009.

Funding

10. The Trust currently has approved funding of \$1.78 million for the development of the hockey turf. This is made up of \$430,000 from the School and \$1.35 million from the Council. The School has a further \$150,000 and the Council a further budget of \$502,000 for the development of the hockey pavilion bringing the total Project funding available to \$2.432 million.
11. The hockey pavilion was estimated to cost approximately \$2 million, based on the initial QS estimate. Babbage has not produced detailed design for the hockey pavilion so engineer's estimates are not available. The QS estimate was based on a two storey pavilion with a glass frontage, meeting room, changing facilities, viewing platform etc. As it currently stands this would take the total estimated cost of the Project to be in excess of \$4.5 million, almost \$900,000 more than the original budget of \$3.6 million which was estimated in 2005. Given the original estimate was made in 2005 and with inflation, this figure is not unrealistic. Actual figures from recently completed hockey turfs indicate that a budget of between \$3.6 and \$4 million is still feasible.
12. The Council agreed to release the initial \$1.35 million with the expectation that the Trust would raise the balance of the funding required for the hockey pavilion before the remaining \$502,000 be released. This would, therefore, ensure that the Council invested no more than 50% of the overall Project costs, with the Trust funding 50%.

13. The Trust and Council officers have investigated funding opportunities for the balance of the Project. The funding environment has changed significantly over the past 12 months, with decreased funding and increased demand on funds, and the Trust is very aware of this. There are three primary funders that the Trust will also likely apply to:
 - ASB Community Trust – Community Building Fund;
 - Lotteries Community Facilities Fund; and
 - Waitakere and Portage Licensing Trusts.
14. The ASB Community Trust did not fund large capital projects last year due to the global financial crisis, and will only reopen this fund in February 2010. This is now a two staged process with a decision on funding not due until March 2011. This fund is likely to be oversubscribed because of the cancellation of the funding round in 2009. However, the Trust has a good chance of securing some funding, albeit much less than other similar projects have received in the past.
15. The Trust will apply to the Lotteries Community Facilities Fund in March 2010 and can expect a decision by July 2010. Again, the Trust is likely to secure some funding, however, any application needs to be realistic given the current environment.
16. Finally, the Trust will apply to the Waitakere and Portage Licensing Trusts which can be done once resource consent is obtained. The Project will attract and benefit the community City-wide and therefore funding from both Licensing Trusts may be feasible.
17. The Trust is also in the process of putting together a fundraising and sponsorship plan and will be looking to raise in excess of \$100,000, outside of the key funding agencies, to contribute towards the cost of the Project. The Trust believes a realistic fundraising target would be approximately \$1 million to \$1.2 million. Council officers agree this is a realistic target given the current environment and after discussions with the key funders. Due to the timing of the funding rounds and the need to have resource consent in place before applications for funding can be made, the Trust have not secured any additional funding for the hockey pavilion. Fundraising will start in early 2010.

Timeline

18. The Trust has lodged resource consent and remains on target to begin construction of the hockey turf in early 2010, if the budget issues are resolved and consents issued. All earth and site works need to be started by the start of March 2010 to provide the best opportunity for the hockey turf to be installed before winter as the artificial turf requires warm dry weather to lay. There is a risk that the hockey turf itself may not be able to be installed due to the weather even if earthworks are started by March 2010 in which case the base will be completed and the Trust will wait for the spring 2010 to lay the hockey turf. The Trust however is committed to doing everything possible to have the hockey turf ready for play for the start of winter 2010.
19. The earliest the Trust can apply to one of the above mentioned funding agencies, to meet the current budget shortfall, is in March 2010 and they are unlikely to get a decision before May 2010. This funding timing issue directly impacts on the timeline of this Project.

Options Identified

20. **Option 1 - Make available remaining Council funding for the hockey turf:** The Council agrees to make available the remaining \$502,000, currently set aside for the hockey pavilion, for the Trust to use for the hockey turf if needed.
21. **Option 2 – The Trust fundraise the shortfall:** The Trust look to fundraise for the shortfall in the hockey turf budget and the Council continues to hold the \$502,000 for the hockey pavilion.

Assessment of Options

22. **Option 1 - Make available remaining Council funding for the hockey turf:** If the Council makes available the remaining \$502,000 currently set aside for the hockey pavilion and the School invested a further \$150,000, which they have agreed to do, the Trust would have access to funding of \$2,432,000 for the hockey turf development.
23. The current engineer's estimate is \$2,571,666, leaving a shortfall of \$139,666. However, the Trust have yet to explore all cost savings solutions and are yet to go to tender. Once all cost savings measures have been investigated and tenders have been received, the Trust is confident (by reducing the lighting levels and taking away the practice facility and cutting back on security fencing) the hockey turf budget will be under the \$2,432,000 which will enable the hockey turf to progress as planned.
24. This option provides the only possibility of the hockey turf being completed before winter 2010. However, there is still some risk to the timeline as the construction is weather dependent.
25. Council investing the entire \$1.852 million into the hockey turf would equate to approximately 75% of the total funding of the hockey turf, with the other 25% funded by the School. This provides the best chance for the hockey turf to be built, and the community having access to this much needed community facility, before winter 2010. The risk to the Council is that if the Trust fails to raise the funds needed to construct the hockey pavilion, therefore not completing the project as anticipated, it leaves the Council as the majority funder of a school hockey turf.
26. Given the increased estimated cost of the hockey turf and the current funding environment, the Trust is likely to only have a budget of approximately \$1.2 million to develop the pavilion. This will mean the scope of the pavilion is reduced from the original concept. However, the Trust and Council officers are confident a functional pavilion can still be developed within this budget. The most important part of the Project is the development of a quality hockey turf that meets the needs of the hockey players. The quality of the hockey turf should therefore not be sacrificed, if at all possible, for a state of the art hockey pavilion as the integrity of the hockey turf is paramount to the development of hockey in the region.
27. **Option 2 – The Trust fundraise the shortfall:** Should the Council not make the remaining funding available to the Trust, the development of the hockey turf will be postponed until summer 2010/2011. The Trust will have to apply to at least one of the funding agencies to cover the shortfall, if not two with the earliest a decision is likely being May 2010. Earthworks construction needs to start no later than 1 March 2010 to maximise weather conditions, however as the earliest the Trust would hear back from a funding agency would be June 2010, the funds could not be guaranteed to meet construction deadlines.

28. There is some risk around the School funding from the Ministry of Education if this project is not started before the end of this financial year. The School has already carried this funding over and believe there may be some issues with continuing to carry it forward for another year.
29. The risk to Council of not pushing forward with the hockey turf is the loss of interest by the key stakeholders and the community given this project has taken some time to develop. Also with the transition to the Auckland Council there is risk that the support Council currently provides, in the form of a Project Manager and Project Coordinator and the relationships developed are lost leaving the Trust to start again.

Preferred Option

30. The preferred option is Option 1: for council to make available the remaining budget for the hockey turf. This provides the best chance of the hockey turf being completed by winter 2010. However, it is not guaranteed due to the reliance on weather conditions.
31. The Trust has no ability to fundraise the current shortfall because the closing dates for the major funders is too late to enable works to begin in early 2010. If the hockey turf does not proceed this financial year, there is risk that the School funding may be withdrawn.
32. The completion of the hockey turf will enable the community and in particular youth to begin playing hockey, meeting the needs of the community. With or without the hockey pavilion, the hockey turf will be well used as artificial turf space continues to be in high demand in Waitakere and throughout the Auckland region. Given that the hockey turf will be able to be used for other activities reinforces the community benefit this hockey turf is likely to provide.
33. If Option 1 is approved by the Council, the remaining \$502,000 should only be made available to the Trust on the following conditions:
 - The Trust investigates all cost saving solutions and the hockey turf budget is approved by the Director: Community Wellbeing;
 - The \$502,000 be used only if needed and the balance to be held by the Council for the hockey pavilion; and
 - If the hockey turf is delayed and does not proceed until summer 2010 the full \$502,000 remains for the hockey pavilion and the Trust are required to fundraise the shortfall for the hockey turf.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

34. Through the Strong Communities community outcome, the Council outlines its commitment to undertaking initiatives that will contribute to making Waitakere a safe, informed and healthy place to live and to improving local leisure and recreation opportunities and choices. Council's adoption of First Call for Children Priorities sees commitment to proactively supporting children, young people and their families in Waitakere. Direct financial assistance to organisations providing facilities and activities to get people more active, assists the Council's commitment to these policies.
35. New facilities create more opportunities for residents to participate in sport and or physical activity and will complement the initiatives being implemented through the 'Te Waka ki Mua Move It Waitakere' Action Plan.

36. Through the Working Together community outcome Council, looks to partner with organisations to efficiently utilise our time, people and resources. Partnerships with schools provide an ideal opportunity to share resources and maximise facilities to benefit the community.

CONSULTATION

37. Sport Waitakere consulted with a number of external stakeholders in the development of the "Hockey in Waitakere City" report. This report outlines key steps for the development of hockey in Waitakere and is being used to direct the actions of the Trust.

RESOURCES

38. There is \$1.852 million allocated in the Annual Plan 2009/2010 for the development of the Project at the School. The Council has agreed to release \$1.35 million of this for the development of the hockey turf, while holding the remaining \$502,000 for the hockey pavilion at a later stage.
39. The Leisure Services - Recreation Planner is Council's non-voting representative on the Trust and attends all Trust meetings and provides a liaison between the Council, the Trust and other key stakeholders on all Trust and Project related issues.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

40. If Council do not agree to Option 1, the hockey turf will not be completed by winter 2010. This could put the School's funding at risk and there is some uncertainty of Council's continued involvement in the Project as Council transitions into the new Auckland Council.

AUCKLAND COUNCIL TRANSITION ISSUES

41. The decision making proposed in this report is not constrained by section 31 of the Local Government (Tamaki Makaurau Reorganisation) Act 2009, as it does not directly or because of its consequences: significantly prejudice the reorganisation, significantly constrain the powers or capacity of the Auckland Council or any subsidiary of the Auckland Council following the reorganisation, or have a significant negative impact on the assets or liabilities that are transferred to the Auckland Council as a result of the reorganisation.

Report prepared by: Rob McGee, Recreation Planner - Leisure Services.

