

**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,
14 APRIL 2010, 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	LEISURE FACILITY PARTNERSHIP FUND 2010/2011 STAGE ONE APPLICATIONS AND EXISTING PROJECTS UPDATE	2
6	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY FACILITY IN GLENDENE AND KELSTON	9
7	WAITAKERE WELLBEING COLLABORATION PROJECT UPDATE	15

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, 14 APRIL 2010, 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, 10 March 2010

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, 10 March 2010, as circulated, and that they be taken as read and now be confirmed.



5 **LEISURE FACILITY PARTNERSHIP FUND 2010/2011 STAGE ONE APPLICATIONS AND EXISTING PROJECTS UPDATE**

GLOSSARY

Leisure Facility Partnership Fund	(LFPF)
Leisure Facility Partnership Fund Review Group	(Review Group)
Department of Cycling Incorporated	(DoC)
Henderson Intermediate School	(HIS)
Taipari Strand Water Sports Group	(TSWS)
Manukau Volunteer Coastguard Incorporated	(MVC)
Massey High School	(MHS)
Waitemata Table Tennis Association	(WTTA)
Peninsula Primary School	(PPS)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Culture and Community Committee to determine which applicants should progress through to stage two of the assessment process for the Leisure Facility Partnership Fund (LFPF). The report also seeks to briefly update the Culture and Community Committee on the progress of the existing applicants at stage three of the LFPF.

Seven applications were received for the 2010/2011 stage one round of the LFPF. The Leisure Facility Partnership Fund Review Group (Review Group) assessed the applications against the stage one criteria and have recommended that the five applicants that meet the criteria should progress to stage two. The five applicants were the Department of Cycling Incorporated (DoC), the Manukau Volunteer Coastguard Incorporated (MVC), Massey High School (MHS), the Taipari Strand Water Sport Group (TSWS) and the Waitemata Table Tennis Association (WTTA).

Three of five past LFPF applicants have recently commenced construction for their projects, namely Green Bay High School, Ken Maunder Community Trust and Sunnyvale Primary School. Completion of these projects is expected to be by the middle of the year. The remaining two applicants, Marina View School and Waitakere College, have raised all required funds and are in the design phase of their projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. **Receive** the Leisure Facility Partnership Fund 2010/2011 Stage One Applications and Existing Projects Update report.
2. **Approve** to stage two of the Leisure Facility Partnership Fund 2010/2011 process, the projects from the following applications:
 - Department of Cycling Incorporated;
 - Manukau Volunteer Coastguard Incorporated;
 - Massey High School;
 - Taipari Strand Water Sport Group; and
 - Waitemata Table Tennis Association.

BACKGROUND

1. The purpose of the LFPF is to enable the Council to strategically direct capital development assistance to community leisure and sporting projects. Traditionally the Council responded to such capital development requests on an ad hoc basis, which raised the potential risk that worthy projects may have gone unsupported for the simple reason that they were presented before the Council at an inopportune time.
2. The Council's funding will be used to secure access to facilities for community use. Funding is only available for capital development projects (new facilities and expanding/refurbishing existing facilities) and specifically excludes debt servicing, annual maintenance, Council owned assets and operational funding. The fit-out of facilities is not generally eligible, however, a single chattel costing more than \$100,000 will be considered, such as floodlighting of sports pitches.
3. In any given year, an amount of \$500,000 is available to be shared amongst successful applicants at stage three. This funding is contested, with final allocation resting solely at the Council's discretion. The Council may choose not to fund any of the proposed projects in a given year or alternatively may forward fund in another year.
4. Proposals to the LFPF will be analysed in three distinct stages, each with their own evaluation criteria. The policy has been set out this way so as to minimise the level of work community organisations are required to undertake when making an initial proposal.
5. There are currently five projects from previous funding rounds that are in stage three of the LFPF. These five applicants are working closely with the Council officers to ensure the continued progression and completion of these projects.

DECISION MAKING

6. Stage one applications for the LFPF closed on 5 March 2009 and seven applications were received. A Review Group consisting of Council officers from Leisure Services, Parks Planning and Parks Assets, and Public Affairs as well as a sport development representative from Sport Waitakere, assessed the applications against the criteria as outlined in the policy document.

7. Table 1, set out below, summarises the Review Group's assessment against the criteria.

Stage One Criteria	Department of Cycling Inc	Henderson Intermediate School	Manukau Volunteer Coastguard Inc	Massey High School	Peninsula Primary School	Taipari Strand Water Sports Group	Waitemata Table Tennis Association
Project Description	Bike Hub at Te Rangī Hiroa Reserve	Gymnasium	Rescue vessel storage shed and public jetty	Performing Arts Centre	Drive and car park to the existing pool	Floating jetty	Expansion of the table tennis stadium
Demonstrated community active or passive leisure or sports benefits.	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Not-for-profit and legally constituted.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Submitted by Kenley Ski club on behalf of.	Yes
Located in Waitakere	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Aligns with Council's strategic objectives	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Acceptable location with easy community access	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
The project must be financially viable.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Estimated Cost	\$250,000	\$200,000 - S2	\$350 - 400,000	\$3,950,600	\$89,860	\$160,000	\$1.3 - 1.5 million
Own contribution	\$5,000	\$270,729 - S1	\$15,000	\$3,100,000	\$36,000	\$40,000	\$50,000
Proposed contribution by Council	\$195,000	\$200,000	\$75,000	\$500,000	\$50,000	\$100,000	\$250,000
Project to be completed by	Early 2011	October 2010	February 2011	January 2011	December 2011	December 2010	March 2010

Table 1: Summary of the applicants against the stage one criteria

8. Those successful in progressing to stage two will be provided with a set of criteria they will have to meet, which will include specific areas of interest as identified by the Review Group as well as the stage two criteria as outlined below.
9. The criteria used to assess stage two will be:
 - To what extent will the facility support increased community participation, in particular leisure or sporting activities?
 - Has the proposed facility got community support and involvement?
 - Detailed investigation into the likely community use of the proposed facility and how does that compare to the size of the capital grant being sought?
 - Is there a need for the facility of this nature in that particular area?
 - The potential of the project to resolve existing community facility or capacity building problems.
 - Detailed evidence of the financial viability of the project, including which organisations have signalled they will fund this project and how much are they going to contribute.
 - The degree to which partner organisations have shown the ability and willingness to develop and share in a joint vision in a facility (e.g. has the potential partner shown a willingness to enter into a partnership with the Council).
 - The extent to which the organisation has demonstrated the ability to develop and then operate the proposed facility.
10. It is important to note that by progressing applicants to stage two it does not guarantee funding to the applicant. All amounts expressed in Table 1 above are indicative only and based on high level costings of similar projects. The more comprehensive stage two application involves more detailed costs.

Department of Cycling Incorporated (DoC)

- A1
11. DoC has applied to develop Te Rangi Hiroa Reserve into a cycling hub for Waitakere. The intention is to deliver a number of projects to enhance the facilities that exist and to develop new facilities that will encourage club and public use. Projects that were indicated in the proposal included a mountain bike track, a bridge, fence, practice area and redevelopment of the BMX track set out in the proposed development plan attached at page A1.
 12. The Review Group considered there to be great potential for DoC's proposal. The proposal met the stage one criteria and would be a fantastic asset for both the local and wider community. If successful in progressing, the Review Group would require their stage two application to address detailed costings and funding sources as well as formal evidence of partnership between park users. Leisure Services is undertaking the development of a recreation plan for Te Rangi Hiroa Park which may also identify additional objectives which can be incorporated into a stage two proposal.

Henderson Intermediate School (HIS)

- A2
13. Henderson Intermediate School have begun construction of a school gymnasium which has two stages. HIS has sufficient funds to complete stage one, which includes the gymnasium, entry and kitchen. However assistance is required for stage two which includes a store room, showers, changing room and toilets which is set out in the proposed development plan attached at page A2.

14. The Review Group considered the gymnasium location at the back of the school as not ideal for a facility that will be used by the community, a key criteria of the fund. The construction of the gymnasium is underway meaning there is no opportunity of altering the gymnasium location and therefore, the project is unable to meet the LFPF criteria for location and accessibility. The Review Group therefore recommended that this project does not progress to stage two.

Manukau Volunteer Coastguard Incorporated (MVC)

- A3 15. The MVC propose to construct a new boat shed at the end of the Parade at French Bay, Titirangi to house their rescue vessel. The proposal incorporates an enhancement of the reclamation area adjacent to the boat shed for public use including landscaping, park benches and the construction of a new jetty which is set out in the proposed development attached at page A3. The boat shed will also assist Coastguard in their delivery of educational programmes.
16. The current proposal does not meet the criteria of providing new leisure / recreation opportunities. However, the Review Group saw potential in the application. The Review Group suggested that MVC look to involve another community partner and expand the scope of the facility to provide for their needs too. The Review Group recommends MVC progress, however, would require their stage two application to address the issue of providing new leisure opportunities and partnerships.

Massey High School (MHS)

- A4 17. MHS received a special grant for non-teaching space and after community consultation decided to build a performing arts centre. The facility will include a theatre, back stage area, dressing rooms, kitchen, café, administration suite and foyer. The special grant is significant, however, it has conditions around its use which has meant MHS require external funding to provide a facility that will meet the needs of the community and a proposed floor plan is attached at page A4.
18. The Review Group agreed that the project met the stage one criteria and recommends it progress to stage two of the LFPF. Issues raised by the Review Group that they would like addressed in the stage two application include community need, level of input for facility design, suggested funding sources and timeframes.

Peninsula Primary School (PPS)

19. PPS have applied for the improvement of access infrastructure to their indoor heated pool. The proposal included vehicular and pedestrian access and a car park.
20. The Review Group recommends that this proposal is not progressed to stage two as a car park and access road do not meet the criteria of the LFPF. It is to be noted that a precedent has been set when Woodland Park School's proposal to the LFPF for a car park was also declined for not meeting the LFPF criteria.

Taipari Strand Water Sports Group (TSWS)

- A5
21. An application was received by Kenley Ski Club on behalf of the TSWS. The proposal was for a new floating jetty to replace the existing one which is no longer meeting the needs of the clubs or the community. The new jetty would be longer allowing for extended use of the Henderson creek and allowing kayakers and rowers to get in and out of their craft easier. A proposed development plan is attached at page A5.
 22. The proposal met the stage one criteria and it is recommended that the project progress to stage two. The Review Group was pleased to see the collaborative application by the clubs and could see the benefit the jetty would provide for both the clubs but also other community users. If successful in progressing, the Review Group would require their stage two application to address the management of the jetty as well as requiring detailed costings to be determined.

Waitemata Table Tennis Association (WTTA)

- A6
23. WTTA propose to redevelop their stadium. The redevelopment would include the increase of playing space from five tables to twelve as well as an upgrade to the reception area, lounge, changing and toilet facilities, kitchen and spectator area which is set out in the proposed development plan is attached at page A6. The facility would be the sub-regional base for table tennis and help the WTTA cater for growing numbers as well as help attract regional and national tournaments to Waitakere.
 24. The proposal meets the stage one criteria and the Review Group recommends progression to stage two. If successful in progressing, the Review Group would require their stage two application to address the timing of funding sources to ensure the project continues to progress.

Consideration of Community Views

25. Community organisations have the opportunity to apply to the LFPF for assistance in capital development projects that increase leisure and recreation opportunities for the community.

Preferred Option

26. The Review Group recommends the following groups progress to stage two of the LFPF as their proposals meet, or with modification has the potential to meet, stage one and two criteria:
 - DoC;
 - MVC;
 - MHS;
 - TSWS; and
 - WTTA.

27. The Review Group recommends the following groups do not progress to stage two of the LFPF as they don't meet the stage one criteria:

- HIS; and
- PPS.

Update of Existing LFPF Projects

28. Five applicants are currently involved at stage three of the LFPF and all are making exciting progress. Green Bay High School's auditorium, Ken Maunder Park Community Trust's indoor training facility and Sunnyvale Primary School's multi-purpose facility are currently progressing through the construction phase of their projects. These projects will be complete by the middle of the year.
29. Marina View School's gymnasium and Waitakere College's all weather turf have raised all necessary funds and are completing the design phase of their projects. These projects are envisioned to begin construction this year and be complete by the middle of next year.
30. The new clubrooms at Starling Park is not a LFPF project. However, it is bound by the same conditions and requirements of the LFPF policy. This project has also recently began construction.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

31. 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. Through adoption of First Call for Children, the Council has also stated its commitment to proactively supporting children, young people and their families in Waitakere. Direct financial assistance to organisations providing recreation facilities and activities assist the Council's commitment to these policies.
32. New facilities create more opportunities for residents to participate in sport and or physical activity and will complement the initiatives being implemented through the Active Waitakere 'Move It Waitakere' Action Plan.

CONSULTATION

33. Internal consultation occurred as the Review Group consists of Council officers from Leisure Services, Parks Planning, Parks Assets and Public Affairs. A sport development representative from Sport Waitakere is the external representative on the group and is involved as part of the partnering agreement between Council and Sport Waitakere.

RESOURCES

34. Council has set aside \$500,000 in the draft Annual Plan 2010/2011. Other resources for the LFPF include dedicated staff time to review and assess the applications and assist and direct the organisations.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

35. It is important that Council continues to work closely with community organisations on partnership projects. Council officers are able to provide a lot of advice and guidance in the development of a successful community facility, especially in the early stages of development.

AUCKLAND COUNCIL TRANSITION ISSUES

36. 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: Paul Edwards, Recreation Partnership Projects Leader.



6 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY FACILITY IN GLENDENE AND KELSTON

GLOSSARY

Culture and Community Committee (the Committee)
Kelston and Glendene People, Places and Communities Study (the Study)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to present the Kelston and Glendene People, Places and Communities Study (the Study) to the Culture and Community Committee (the Committee) and seek the approval of the Committee to implement the recommendations of that Study.

The Study outlines community issues, needs and priorities in Kelston and Glendene and investigates the need for the provision of additional community resourcing in these areas.

The key finding is that both Kelston and Glendene are areas of significant deprivation with high needs and little in the way of existing community facilities. The Study recommends the provision of a neighbourhood hub in each of the Kelston and Glendene areas.

This report seeks the approval of the Committee for Council to purchase two existing houses, one in Glendene and one in Kelston, to be used for the purpose of establishing neighbourhood hubs in these areas.

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. **Receive** the Recommendations for Developing a Community Facility in Glendene and Kelston report.
2. **Agree** in principle to the establishment of a neighbourhood hub in each of the Kelston and Glendene areas.

3. **Direct** the Chief Executive Officer to investigate the availability of suitable properties for purchase and retrofitting, one in Glendene and one in Kelston, for the purpose of establishing neighbourhood hubs, and report to the Finance and Operational Performance Committee seeking approval to specific purchases for this purpose.

BACKGROUND

1. The Council has been involved in facilitating and supporting place based community development projects in a number of areas. These include the Ranui Action Project, the McLaren Park/Henderson South Initiative and the Massey Matters Project. There is also a well established network of community houses which provide neighbourhood based hubs for community interaction and activities in most parts of Waitakere. Kelston and Glendene have not been involved in a Council supported community development project and do not have a community house.
2. Residents of Kelston and Glendene and members of the Kelston Community Trust have approached the Council on a number of occasions requesting support for the development of new community facilities in Kelston.
3. The Council's Annual Plan 2007/2008 allocated resourcing of \$40,000 for assessing community needs in the Span Farm and Glendene areas and \$30,000 for undertaking a feasibility study in Kelston. After discussion with relevant Councillors and Community Board members, a decision was made to combine the resourcing and undertake a community study that would look thoroughly at a whole range of needs and priorities across this area of the City.
4. In May 2009, the Council employed a community development worker on a 12-month fixed term contract to work in the Kelston, Glendene and Span Farm communities. One of the primary roles was to collect information on community needs and priorities in these areas, examine the adequacy of existing community facilities and make recommendations on the provision of a new community facility.
- A7-A41 5. The Study, attached at pages A7 to A41, details the information gathered from the community on their needs and priorities. It outlines the community facilities and resources currently available in these communities and makes recommendations for additional resourcing that has the potential to considerably improve community wellbeing in these areas. The Study has taken a Quadruple Bottom Line approach as required to meet the Council's decision making protocols.
6. The Council's Long Term Council Community Plan 2006-2016 allocated resourcing of \$1,120,000 for the provision of a new community facility in the Kelston, Glendene, Span Farm areas of the City. This was originally scheduled to be built in 2013/2014 however, the Long Term Council Community Plan 2009-2019 provided for this project to occur in the 2009/2010 financial year.

DECISION MAKING

Issues

Methodology

7. The Study used a combination of tools to explore the current provision of community resources in Kelston and in Glendene. It looked at what could be enhanced, what the community would like to see and best practice literature on the role of neighbourhood facilities in community building.

8. The goals of the Study were to:
 - Collect and understand demographic data relating to Kelston and Glendene;
 - Gather community perspectives on the assets, strengths, needs and gaps of the Kelston and Glendene communities;
 - Review and analyse information collected to identify promising practices and options for the Kelston and Glendene communities;
 - Discuss recommendations with the community; and
 - Review community input and develop recommendations for Council.
9. The communities of Kelston and Glendene were invited to participate in the Study through a creative workshop process and a survey that was conducted in both areas (800 surveys distributed, 177 completed). A Stakeholder Advisory Group was established to seek guidance for the Study and interviews were held with key leaders and stakeholders in the Kelston and Glendene communities. The results of the initial consultation were collated and analysed and a variety of alternatives for the provision of a community facility were identified. These alternatives were examined by Council officers and a preferred option was identified. Further consultation was undertaken with each community on the preferred option (300 responses received).

Demographic Profile

10. The Kelston and Glendene areas comprise a very diverse cross-section of the population in terms of age, ethnicity, household composition and wealth. Whilst there are residents doing well, there are also significant numbers of people who are not.
11. Both Kelston and Glendene have a high proportion of people on low personal incomes, with approximately half the working age population in each area earning less than \$20,000 per year. This is spread across all ethnicities but is highest for Asian, followed by Maori and Pacific then European.
12. Glendene is home to 6,807 people. The population of Glendene is 49% European (3,207 people) with the next largest population groups being Asian 21% (1,359 people) and Pacific Peoples 21% (1,392 people). In Glendene, Maori make up 13% of the population (825 people).
13. Kelston has a population of 4,254 people. It has a different ethnic make up to Glendene with the highest number of people being Pacific Peoples 34% (1,380 people), European 33% (1,332 people), Asian 27% (1,083 people) and Maori 15% of the population (597 people).
14. The demographic profile of both communities highlights the need for community resources that are able to target disadvantaged people and connect with the many different ethnic communities. Services and activities must be tailored to meet the different needs of these communities.

Facilities and Programmes Available

15. Overall, both areas do not have many community resources available, although Kelston is in a better position than Glendene in terms of facilities, programmes and activities currently being offered locally.

16. In Kelston, there are a number of facilities which the community has varying degrees of access to including eight schools, four churches, and a scout hall. Only some of these facilities are available for public hire, with the main groups using them being sports clubs, church congregations and children's groups.
17. In contrast to Kelston, the Glendene area has the Glendene Primary School Community Hall which is used for after school programmes, church group activities and a karate class. The West City Christian Centre in Glendene also has a hall and some meeting rooms for hire, but there are restrictions on its use.
18. The Kelston Community Centre is currently the only facility readily available for the general public to hire. It is used regularly by a mixture of faith based groups, recreational groups, health providers and community organisations. The Kelston Community Centre is not in Kelston or Glendene and is not viewed by either area as particularly accessible or belonging to their community. It serves a broader catchment comprising Sunnyvale, Henderson, Glen Eden, and Glendene and provides a base for a variety of interest groups to run activities and programmes.

What do the Community Want?

19. The study engaged with a range of stakeholders representing a variety of disparate views but some clear messages emerged. Across the demographic groups represented in the survey responses, most people expressed a need for more community space. Many also commented on the need for 'non-physical' community development, i.e. a person to co-ordinate the communities and to get things happening, as well as a physical space to host community events.
20. Four key themes dominated the results from the different phases of the community engagement processes held in Kelston and Glendene. These were: the state of the immediate neighbourhood environment, including the Whau River and its catchments, an absence of community development, a need for a place or space residents can call their own, and a need for activities and community gatherings to occur in their immediate environment.
21. In both Glendene and Kelston, the vast majority of people surveyed and spoken to described a lack of connection to their community. They said there needed to be more pride in their communities and many of them wanted more opportunities to participate in their communities.
22. Although the Study was asking about programmes and activities that might be provided in a facility, people were equally concerned with the neighbourhoods that they lived in. They talked about the safety of their streets and the way they looked. They wanted them cleaned up and they wanted better access to parks and natural resources such as the Whau River.
23. Study participants across all the demographic groups spoke of the significance of the Whau River. People in both Glendene and Kelston are very keen to see the Whau and its banks cleaned up so that people can use it as a recreational space. They talked of having picnics there, enjoying the surrounds and using it to swim and play in.

Key Findings

24. Kelston and Glendene are both areas of equally high need. Kelston has a higher percentage of its population living in socio-economic deprivation, whilst Glendene has more people overall and has just as many people struggling with deprivation. Glendene has almost nothing in the way of existing community infrastructure and while Kelston has more, it is not sufficient to meet the very high needs of this community. Clearly both suburbs are in need of additional community resources and facilities.

25. Any new community resources in Glendene or Kelston should include a focus on building community cohesion and safer neighbourhoods by working alongside local people to improve their neighbourhoods and the natural environment. Further work will need to be undertaken to assess the most effective ways of doing this in these two areas.
26. A key theme that has emerged is the need for effective and relevant community development that is focused on building community cohesion at a neighbourhood level. This is supported by international and national best practice which has identified that the most successful ways of developing strong, active and resilient communities is to engage people in activities that will enhance connections and relationships. Effective community building activities can increase people's sense of belonging, feelings of safety, acceptance of diversity, liking for the local community and reduce antisocial behaviour and community disharmony.

Options Identified

Option 1 - (Recommended Option) Two Neighbourhood Hubs with Community Workers

27. The recommended option is to provide a neighbourhood hub in each of the Glendene and Kelston areas. This would involve the purchase of two existing houses, one in each suburb which can be used as a base for community building and community development activities. Resourcing should also be provided for a community development worker in each of these neighbourhood hubs.
28. The main advantage is that a hub in each community will meet the needs of both of these quite seriously disadvantaged areas. Each can be very local and neighbourhood-based and it should be possible to locate each one right in the heart of the target areas in each community. This will hopefully encourage ownership of, and use by, hard to reach target groups.
29. Purchasing and refitting existing houses will leave some resourcing to assist with paying for a community worker in each hub. There is a great need in both these communities for community development and community building work. The hubs will provide a base for community workers.
30. Another advantage is that this option can be actioned immediately.
31. The cost of purchasing a house in each area, refitting and refurbishing them and paying the salary of a community worker in each one for a year, would be approximately \$1,100,000.00.
32. The main disadvantage of this option is that the size of the neighbourhood hub will be smaller than a purpose built facility and this will limit the range of activities and programmes offered. This can be offset to some extent by the community worker using other venues and sites in the community for events and activities.

Option 2 - Build one new facility in either Glendene or Kelston or between the two areas

33. The main disadvantage of this option is that the size of the two communities and the geographical spread would make one facility inaccessible to many. In addition, both Glendene and Kelston see themselves as very different and separate communities and would not have any sense of ownership or connection to a community resource in the other suburb.

34. There is currently not sufficient funding to build a facility that would be able to serve both communities and any decisions about additional resourcing would have to be made by the Auckland Transition Agency or the Auckland Council.

Option 3 - Refit the Kelston Community Centre

35. The community does not support this option. Residents of Kelston and Glendene do not see this facility as a part of their community and it is not physically located in either suburb.

Consideration of Community Views

36. The Study was initially undertaken in response to community views and concerns. A wide variety of people from a broad cross section of the community have been involved and there has been a particular emphasis on trying to reach groups who may be marginalised and don't normally engage with the Council.

Preferred Option

37. The preferred option is that the Council provides a neighbourhood hub in each of Glendene and Kelston. The Study recommends the purchase of two existing houses, one in each suburb, which can be used as a base for community building and community development activities. The houses would need to be modified to suit the needs of a neighbourhood hub and should include sufficient area for outdoor use (e.g. community gardens, barbeque area, climbing wall, children's play area).
38. It is important that resourcing is also provided for a community development worker in each of these neighbourhood hubs. They would coordinate the activities and programmes run from the hubs and in the wider community and help build capacity and capability within the community. Part of the role of the community workers will be to develop some initiatives to clean up the physical environments of Kelston and Glendene.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

39. The Council's Social Strategy is directly relevant to this study with its clear community based strategic outcomes and action areas focused on building strong resilient communities. The Pathways and Guiding Principles of the Social Strategy have been used as a basis for the recommendations in the Study and to provide guidance on effective community building practice. The Social Strategy emphasises the importance of local place based neighbourhood level initiatives for building strong healthy and resilient communities.
40. It is vital that everyone living in Kelston and Glendene has the opportunity to feel valued and connected to their communities, neighbourhoods and the natural environment and that everyone is able to access the facilities, activities and services they need to achieve optimal health and wellbeing. The provision of neighbourhood hubs that are locally based and provide relevant, quality community development, will strengthen social outcomes in Kelston and Glendene.

CONSULTATION

41. A project team of Council officers from Community Wellbeing and Leisure Services has overseen the development of the Study. There has been a high level of support for and interest in this work. The findings have also been discussed with Councillors and Community Board members with an interest in this part of the City. Members of the Kelston Community Trust have been consulted and the recommendations have been discussed with the Trustees.

RESOURCES

42. The Long Term Council Community Plan 2009-2019 has allocated resourcing of \$1,120,000 for the provision of a community facility in the Kelston/Glendene areas in 2009/2010. There are also funds available in Social and Cultural Strategy budgets to assist with cost of employing community development workers.

AUCKLAND COUNCIL TRANSITION ISSUES

43. 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: Sue Dodds, Social Development Team Leader.



7 WAITAKERE WELLBEING COLLABORATION PROJECT UPDATE

GLOSSARY

Waitakere Wellbeing Collaboration Project	(WWCP)
Collaboration Strategy Group	(CSG)
Ministry of Education	(MoE)
Early Childhood Education	(ECE)
Memorandum of Understanding	(MoU)
Long Term Council Community Plan	(LTCCP)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide an update to the Culture and Community Committee on the Waitakere Wellbeing Collaboration Project (WWCP) and the current status of the Calls to Action under its umbrella.

It reports on successes of the project over the past 12 months, the beginning of a new direction for the project and future opportunities for the WWCP in the context of the Auckland Council.

RECOMMENDATION

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

Receive the Waitakere Wellbeing Collaboration Project Update report.

BACKGROUND

1. The WWCP facilitates government agencies, community organisations and the Council to collectively identify and plan collaborative focus areas and work together on these. The WWCP was initiated in 2002 for an initial three-year period.
2. A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was signed in October 2002 based on partnership principles between five funding agencies, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Social Development, the Housing New Zealand Corporation, the Community Employment Group and the Department of Child Youth and Family, and the Council and the Collaboration Strategy Group (CSG). The 2002 MoU underpinned the first three years of collaborative practice and funding for the WWCP.
3. A series of summits over the past five years provided the opportunity to update on progress and identify and mandate future directions. At the October 2005 Wellbeing Summit, there was general agreement that the process, now into its third year, was operating well. Positive impacts were occurring in many Calls to Action areas and it was recommended that the WWCP continue.
4. However Auckland governance issues arising during this period have meant further developments for a Social Plan for the City are now in abeyance, pending decisions and further detail on the roles of the new Auckland Council, the local boards and the new regional Social Issues Forum.
5. Since the appointment of a new project role of Strategic Planner: Wellbeing and Collaboration in August 2009 the project has continued to be productive in addressing key social wellbeing issues. Work has continued with the community and the three remaining Calls to Action, Housing, Early Childhood Education (ECE) and Active Waitakere; are achieving some great results. A report on process and future directions has also been produced by the Maori Social Wellbeing group. The report has been presented to Te Taumata Runanga and is pending release.
6. A key challenge for 2010 will be to remain engaged with the Auckland local government reorganisation and the establishment of the Auckland Council while continuing to be well connected with the communities of Waitakere and supporting community development. The WWCP and the CSG has a strong role to play in ensuring social wellbeing is kept at the forefront of people's minds while the new Auckland Council structure and various roles are being determined.

DECISION MAKING

7. This report is presented for information only. There are no decisions to be made in this report.

Issues

Calls to Action

8. There are three current Calls to Action. These are:
 - Everyone in Waitakere has access to affordable, appropriate housing;
 - Every family in Waitakere values the importance of ECE and knows how to access it for their children; and
 - Everyone in Waitakere is more active, more often.

9. The WWCP is now at a phase where a new model of working is being considered which will allow for additional Calls to Action to be mandated by the community through a Community Summit which is planned for June 2010. It is hoped that all key collaborative projects planned for and underway in Waitakere will be connected in a valuable way so that learnings can be shared across networks.
10. The 2010 Community Summit will reflect the new aims and objectives of the WWCP, in order to build resilience within the community sector and help them through the next two years. The focus of the summit will be on the effects of the recession and best practice examples of supportive initiatives and actions along with building resilience and building community leadership. The 2010 Community Summit will also be used to review the existing Calls to Action and mandate any new Calls to Action developed at the 2010 Community Summit.

Housing Call to Action

11. The Housing Call to Action continues to be a major player in the social housing arena with the consolidation of its affordable sustainable housing platform. There have been a number of key activities over the past 12 months.
12. Successful engagement with the community that live in the Western Park Village, Ranui has resulted in the establishment of a community hub in the caravan park which provides a space and the provision of community services to those living in the caravan park. The purpose of the hub is for community organisations to provide more appropriate on-site services to meet outcomes for the residents of the caravan park, to ensure the health of the residents is better managed, to identify services that are not provided but are required and to help identify community initiatives such as a community garden. Council is supporting this initiative by leasing the space for the hub and by providing a community development worker for 10 hours per week to be based at the hub. A number of other community agencies have been fully supportive of the hub concept and have agreed to roster on staff to work from the hub.
13. Planning is underway for a 'Spotlight on Housing Week' to be held in August 2010 in Waitakere. This week will focus on all aspects of housing and will bring attention to work that is currently being undertaken in relation to housing in Waitakere, tenancy issues, the lives of the homeless in Waitakere and various initiatives that have been successful in addressing housing issues in Waitakere.
14. A Waitakere Housing Needs Assessment has commenced which will provide a 2010 benchmark for the City and highlight potential areas for focus and housing priorities for Waitakere. It is expected that the Housing Needs Assessment will provide a reference point for Waitakere moving into the new Auckland Council and a draft will be completed by June 2010.
15. Through the Housing Call to Action, two initiatives were supported by the CSG for 2010 funding from the Collaborative Funding Pool. The two initiatives are: a School Uniform and Curtain Bank to provide free school uniforms and curtains to vulnerable families; and a Building Maintenance Pilot Programme. The Building Maintenance Pilot Programme will provide a cost effective property maintenance service to lower income families in the community who are living in poorly maintained homes due to a lack of skills and/or finance. Both initiatives are being coordinated by the Friendship Centre Trust in Glen Eden and were granted funding of \$22,000 in total.

Active Waitakere Call to Action

16. Active Waitakere and the actions are guided by Sport Waitakere's Physical Activity and Sport Strategy - *Te Waka Ki Mua Move it Waitakere*. Each of the action areas, identified in the strategy, developed and presented activity plans for the following 12 months to the governance group to ensure each area remains focused. The action areas are continuing to provide a platform for information, expertise and resource sharing.
17. Active Waitakere provides a solid platform that stakeholders can use to establish or align new and existing projects. The placed based community development project, *Neighbourhood Move It*, continues its focus on Kelston/Glendene and with the appointment of a new community broker has expanded to also support Parrs Park/McLaren Park.
18. Active Waitakere has enabled a number of initiatives to be addressed or implemented. These include increasing the capability and capacity of the community through programmes such as Community Leaders and Onua Ola and the implementation of a large number of diverse local initiatives which cater for the diversity of our communities including activities in parks and new walking school bus routes.

Early Childhood Education Call to Action

19. Planning is underway to begin the 'HomePlay' Project in selected neighbourhoods in Waitakere. 'HomePlay' is a street-based learning opportunity for families in Massey and Ranui that will complement existing street based initiatives. Through the provision of a 'Play Day' once a week in a local street, these families could begin to engage in a group based early childhood learning experience which will benefit both the adults engaged and their children/grandchildren. This is a partnership between the Ministry of Education (MoE), the Council and community. MoE will provide funding for equipment and training. Council will identify potential partners that can support this project and resourcing for a neighbourhood co-ordinator.
20. On 7 March 2010, the Toddler Day Out event was held at The Trusts Stadium. The event was a huge success with 18,000 people attending the free event. Attendance at the event was the most culturally diverse yet with activities and resources available aimed at supporting parents and providing help in a non-threatening environment. Hundreds of children received immunisations at Toddler Day Out and families accessed budgeting, counselling and prevention support services.
21. The ECE Call to Action has developed a website for Waitakere which provides locality based ECE details and provides guidance and advice on everything families need to know about accessing ECE in Waitakere. The website provides photos and personal comments from families involved in each centre and also has an events calendar for ECE activities in the West.

Moving Forward

22. Even though there will be a new phase of governance in Auckland with the Auckland Council coming into being on 1 November 2010, the communities of Waitakere will not change. Communities will still require the same support and potentially more, with a stronger connection needed between the community and those representing the views of the west in the Auckland Council.

23. The WWCP has a compelling history and an equally exciting future. It is time to once again engage the wider community through a summit and to take on new challenges in the form of new Calls to Action, as outlined by the community of Waitakere. The WWCP is well placed to lead the way in outcome focussed collaborative working both within Waitakere and across the wider region.
24. The CSG has recently met to review and refocus the aims and objectives of the project in light of the changing local government environment and also changing pressures that the community are facing.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

25. Central to the Council's Social Strategy vision is the aim of improving the level of wellbeing of residents. Council has taken a facilitative role, brokering relationships between service providers and the community and encouraging communities to take greater responsibility for their own health and wellbeing. This role is a key element of Agenda 21 and has been developed through establishing a range of collaborative partnerships with government agencies and community organisations.
26. The WWCP is closely aligned with the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) 2006-2016 and Community Outcomes process. Existing focus areas of partnering have been integrated into the Community Outcomes process. The LTCCP will provide an ongoing mechanism for consultation with community organisations and government agencies on social wellbeing issues that can be fed into the implementation of the Social Strategy, Community Outcomes and the LTCCP process for the Auckland Council. The relevant Community Outcomes areas in the social wellbeing domain are:
 - Strong communities;
 - Working together;
 - Healthy lifestyles; and
 - Urban and rural villages.

CONSULTATION

27. Consultation is ongoing with the WWCP, with key partners and the community involved at all levels in the project including, the CSG, the various calls to Action groups and networks and the upcoming 2010 Community Summit. Internal Council consultation has involved areas of Council where a Call to Action is supported, for example Leisure Services who support the Active Waitakere Call to Action.

RESOURCES

28. The annual Council funding allocation is \$50,000 for coordination, \$25,000 for the Collaboration Funding Pool and \$10,000 for project expenses for 2009/2010. The financial contribution to the WWCP from other Government agencies during 2009 was in kind rather than direct financial support.
29. The WWCP, on the strength of its reputation, has continued to be a focal point for the development of key, cutting edge projects within the Calls to Action (as outlined) which attract both funding and staff time resources. Calls to Action currently access considerable funding for individual projects from multiple sources totalling over \$1,000,000 annually. This includes government funding from sources including the Housing Innovation Fund and non-government funding from the Non Government Organisation sector.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

30. The implementation of this new direction will require cooperation from the major stakeholders involved in the project and wider buy in from the communities of Waitakere and other key partners.

AUCKLAND COUNCIL TRANSITION ISSUES

31. 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: Louise Lennane, Strategic Planner, Wellbeing and Collaboration.

