



NOTICE OF MEETING

RODNEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

TO: Penny Webster - Mayor (Chairperson)
Crs Ross Craig
Pat Delich
Michael Goudie
Gaye Harding
John Kirikiri
Dave Parker QSM
Grahame Powell
Zane Taylor
June Turner
Grev Walker
Wayne Walker
Suzanne Weld

The Rodney District Council will meet in the Council Chamber, Centreway Road, Orewa on Thursday, 15 April 2010, commencing at 9.00 a.m.

for: CHIEF EXECUTIVE
Rodger Kerr-Newell

OREWA
8 April 2010

* * * * *

PROGRAMME

<u>Time</u>		<u>Page</u>
9.00 a.m.	General Bylaw 1998: Review of Chapter 1: Trade Waste – Deliberation and Confirmation Report	3

INDEX

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1.	Apologies	1
2.	Confirmation of Minutes	1
3.	General Bylaw 1998: Review of Chapter 17: Trade Waste – Deliberation and Confirmation Report	3
4.	Significant Contracts Let over the Period 13 February – 26 March 2010	69
5.	Application for Remission of Rates for the ODC Rodney Girl Guides	73
6.	Update on Auckland Regional Governance	75
7.	ANZAC Day Ceremonies – 25 April 2010	83
8.	Economic Profile of Rodney District and Key Sectors	85
9.	Orewa West Walkway/Cycleway	141
10.	Council Support of Citizens' Advice Bureaux	145
11.	Kensington Park Pool House Café – Licence to Occupy Part of the Recreation Reserve	173
12.	Public Excluded	205

CONFIDENTIAL

13.	Possible Land Disposals	207
14.	Possible Agreement – Indicative Road	223

* * * * *

ITEM NO: 1

APOLOGIES

ITEM NO: 2

REPORT



TO Council
ON 14 April 2010
SUBJECT **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

- Notes:
1. Minutes for Council and Committee meetings are distributed through the month as they are published and are available for public inspection at Council offices and libraries.
 2. The purpose of the item is confirmation of correctness of the minutes only. Any recommendations to the Council from the Committees are shown as separate items in the next section of the agenda.
 3. Minutes produced after the publication of this agenda but prior to the meeting will be tabled as a supplementary item at the meeting.

RECOMMENDATION:

		Page Number
(a)	<u>District Plan and Regulatory Committee – 3 March 2010</u>	
	That the minutes of a meeting of the District Plan and Regulatory Committee held on 3 March 2010, as circulated, be received and adopted.	020923-020929 (White)
(b)	<u>Council – 4 March 2010</u>	
	That the minutes of a meeting of the Council held on 4 March 2010, as circulated, be received and confirmed.	020930-020941 (Blue)
(c)	<u>Extraordinary Council – 11 March 2010</u>	
	That the minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of the Council held on 11 March 2010, as circulated, be received and confirmed.	020943-020945 (Blue)
(d)	<u>District Plan and Regulatory Committee – 17 March 2010</u>	
	That the minutes of a meeting of the District Plan and Regulatory Committee held on 17 March 2010, as circulated, be received and adopted.	020946-020955 (White)

- (e) **Extraordinary Council – 10 March 2010**
- That the minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of the Council held on 10 March 2010, as circulated, be received and confirmed.
- 020956-020967
(Blue)
- (f) **Infrastructure and Environment Committee – 18 March 2010**
- That the minutes of a meeting of the Infrastructure and Environment Committee held on 18 March 2010, as circulated, be received and adopted.
- 020968-020974
(Pink)
- (g) **Extraordinary Council – 18 March 2010**
- That the minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of the Council held on 18 March 2010, as circulated, be received and confirmed.
- 020975-020976
(Blue)
- (h) **Resource Consents Hearings Panel – 11 December 2009 and 29 January 2010**
- That the minutes of a meeting of the Resource Consents Hearings Panel held on 11 December 2009 and 29 January 2010, as circulated, be received and adopted.
- 020977-021034
(White)
- (i) **District Plan and Regulatory Committee – 31 March 2010**
- That the minutes of a meeting of the District Plan and Regulatory Committee held on 31 March 2010, as circulated, be received and adopted.
- 021035-021041
(White)

9.00 A.M.

ITEM NO: 3

REPORT




TO Council

ON 15 April 2010

FROM Peter Vari - Manager: District Planning
Philip Du Plooy - Senior Wastewater Engineer

APPROVED BY Warren Maclennan - Assistant Chief Executive

SIGNATURE 

SUBJECT **GENERAL BYLAW 1998:
REVIEW OF CHAPTER 17-TRADE WASTE – DELIBERATION AND
CONFIRMATION REPORT**

FILE REF BC/1/4

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

<input type="checkbox"/> Information only	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy decision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Statutory process
<input type="checkbox"/> Community issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Contract decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Delegation	<input type="checkbox"/> Appointment
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative matter			

IMPLICATIONS:

(i)	Is this matter significant in terms of Council's Policy on Significance?
	No
(ii)	Implications in terms of Vision Rodney?
	Supports Outcome 6 'We will continue to value, protect and enjoy the natural environment'.
(iii)	Implications in terms of Long Term Council Community Plan / Annual Plan?
	No
(iv)	Implications in terms of other Council Strategic documents or Council Policy?
	No
(v)	Is a budget amendment required?
	No

(vi)	Have the views of affected or interested persons been obtained and is any further public consultation required?
	Pre consultation has occurred with Watercare Services Limited and the Auckland Regional Council. Notice of the Bylaw was circulated to all Trade Waste consent holders under s.148 and public consultation under s. 83 LGA has occurred.
(vii)	Does a decision on this matter require Auckland Transition Agency approval? (yes / no / advice being sought?)
	No

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Capital cost implications	Not applicable
Is it currently budgeted for?	Not applicable
Funding source of capital costs	Not applicable
Ongoing operational cost implications	Not applicable
Is it currently budgeted for?	Not applicable
Funding and rating impact (whether resulting from capital expenditure or arising directly)	Not applicable

SUMMARY:

On 17 December 2009 the Council adopted a reviewed Chapter 17:Trade Waste of its General Bylaw 1998 for public consultation.

Trade Waste is any liquid waste discharged into a Council wastewater or stormwater network from trade premises. The bylaw protects the Council's infrastructure assets and the environment from the discharge into the environment or wastewater network of any harmful or damaging wastewater. It also provides for a payment regime to meet the cost of treating and monitoring trade wastes.

Consultation on the bylaw was first invited by advertisement in the Rodney Times on 22 December 2009 and an extension of time was advised on 2 and 11 February 2010. A copy of the advertisement was sent to all trade waste customers in the district, to the Auckland Regional Council, Watercare Services Limited and circulated to all service centres and public libraries.

As required under section 148 of the Local Government Act 2002, a copy of the bylaw was sent to the Minister of Health for comment.

Section 148 requires a two month consultation period and because of the Christmas holiday break, this time was extended to 29 March 2010.

Whilst there have been a number of enquiries from trade waste customers, only one submission has been received on the reviewed bylaw. No comment has been received from the Minister of Health.

Watercare Services Ltd (WSL) takes over management of the Council's water services on 1 November 2010. For this reason detailed discussions have taken place with WSL Officers to make sure the bylaw is compatible with other parts of the region and the WSL charging regime. This bylaw will continue to provide the mechanism for trade waste management in the Rodney geographical district until replaced in due course by a regional bylaw.

The only recommended alterations to the reviewed Chapter 17: Trade Waste bylaw have been to clarify the position of WSL and ensure its charging mechanisms can be applied where trade waste from Rodney is discharged into the WSL network from 2010 .

The reviewed amended bylaw as attached as **Appendix 2** to this agenda report is recommended for confirmation.

It is also recommended that the opportunity be taken at this meeting to correct a minor numbering error in Chapter 25: Parking and Traffic Control of the Council's General Bylaw 1998.

RECOMMENDATION:

- (a) **Chapter 17: Trade Waste**
 - (i) That Chapter 17: Trade Waste of the Council's General Bylaw 1998, with amendments as shown by ~~single and double strikethrough~~ for deletions and single and double underlining for additions, as set out in Appendix 2 to the agenda report and subject to any changes the Council may wish to make, be confirmed;
 - (ii) That Chapter 17: Trade Waste of General Bylaw 1998 be publicly notified under section 157 of the Local Government Act 2002 and become operative on 27 April 2010.
- (b) **Chapter 25: Parking and Traffic Control**
 - (i) That the Council correct an error in the clause numbering in Section 21 Chapter 25: Parking and Traffic Control of its General Bylaw 1998 by amending clause '20.1' to read clause '21.1', as enabled under section 156 (2) of the Local Government Act 2002;
 - (ii) That the amendment in (b)(i) be publicly notified.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 Chapter 17: Trade Waste of the Council's General Bylaw 1998 was introduced in 2004 and under section 158 of the Local Government Act (LGA) 2002, is required to be reviewed after five years. This review has updated the bylaw in line with NZS 1902 and taken account of the impending governance role of Watercare Services Limited in November 2010.

Public consultation has been carried out under section 83 LGA 2002, as noted in the report Summary. One submission was received from Kevin Smith, Proprietor of Dad's Pies, Silverdale.

1.2 Trade Waste Discharges into the Public Wastewater Network

Trade Waste is any liquid waste discharged into a Council wastewater or stormwater network from trade premises. These discharges can present an environmental, economic and health and safety risk for the community and have the potential to damage the Council's wastewater assets.

Chapter 17: Trade Waste Bylaw has proved to be useful and effective and since its introduction in 2004 no trade waste discharge accidents have occurred. The bylaw and its system of charging trade waste producers for the management and treatment of their trade wastes has been accepted by the business community, including the 258 customers holding consent to discharge into the Council's wastewater networks.

2.0 Public Submission Kevin Smith, Dad's Pies, Silverdale

The submission from Dad's Pies is attached as **Appendix 1**. Mr Kevin Smith, its Proprietor, will be present at the meeting and wishes to be heard by the Council.

In terms of Chapter 17, trade waste is:

any liquid, with or without matter in suspension or solution, that is or may be discharged from trade premises to a wastewater system in the course of any trade or industrial process or operation, or in the course of any activity or operation of a like nature but does not include stormwater, condensing water or cooling water.

The wash-down of mixing and cooking vessels, cleaning/sterilizing of benches, work areas, floors, refrigerators and boiler blow-down at Dad's Pies is therefore trade waste.

Dad's Pies has had a Trade Waste Consent with the Council since 30 June 2006. It pays a uniform annual charge of \$270 including GST and also pays a volumetric charge of 80% of the water volume used.

The removal of solid waste off-site is not relevant to the Trade Waste Bylaw.

This submission is not related to the reviewed Chapter 17: Trade Waste; it appears to be concerned with volumetric wastewater charges.

Mr Smith has had several discussions with Council staff at a number of levels and has been advised to have an audit of his water usage undertaken.

No changes to the draft Chapter 17: Trade Waste are recommended.

3.0 Watercare Services Ltd

On 1 November 2010 Watercare Services Ltd (WSL) will take over management of all the Council's water services. Chapter 17: Trade Waste of the General Bylaw 1998 will continue to provide the mechanism for trade waste management in the Rodney geographical district until replaced in due course by a regional bylaw.

Chapter 17: Trade Waste makes it clear that all provisions of the bylaw apply to WSL at that time and ensures that its charging regimes may be used for trade waste customers in the Kumeu-Huapai-Riverhead areas when trade waste is discharged into its networks from 2011. However, a number of minor amendments are needed to the bylaw to make this absolutely clear.

The following additional amendments to make this so and other minor corrections to the bylaw are shown as ~~double strikethrough~~ and double underlining in the reviewed amended bylaw attached to the agenda report as **Appendix 2**:

- (i) Section 1.0 makes clear that all references to 'Council' also mean WSL;
- (ii) Makes it clear Chapter 17: Trade Waste is to be read in conjunction with Chapter 1: Bylaw Administration of General Bylaw 1998;
- (iii) Section 2 includes a definition of Watercare Services Limited;
- (iv) Clause 4.5.2 corrects a numbering error, altering '3.9' to '9.5' in the text;
- (v) Clause 10.5 includes swimming pools in the requirements for dechlorination
- (vi) Schedule 7 involves deletion of the paragraph headed 'Unit Charges';
- (vii) Schedule 7 includes a new last paragraph making clear trade waste discharges into WSL networks are subject to its charging regimes and provides a reference to where these may be found.

4.0 Chapter 25: Parking and Traffic Control

At its meeting on 5 November 2009 the Council agreed to amend a minor numbering error in Chapter 25: Parking and Traffic Control General Bylaw 1998 under clause 156(2) of the Local Government Act 2002. This has yet to be done and for legal certainty is re-stated in the recommendation to be actioned after this meeting.

5.0 Conclusion

This report concludes the statutory review of Chapter 17: Trade Waste of General Bylaw 1998. The resulting updated bylaw will continue to serve the district well and forms a sound basis for the new governance to manage trade waste discharges into public wastewater networks.

The review process has also been useful in engaging WSL staff in discussions and giving them an opportunity to meet with Council officers and become familiar with wastewater networks and work practices in the district.

Chapter 17: Trade Waste may now be confirmed.

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 2

REPORT



TO Council
 ON 15 April 2010
 FROM Kevin Ramsay – Director: Corporate Services
 APPROVED BY Rodger Kerr-Newell – Chief Executive
 SIGNATURE

SUBJECT **SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTS LET OVER THE PERIOD 13 FEBRUARY – 26 MARCH 2010**
 FILE REF CE/1/1

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information only	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Statutory process
<input type="checkbox"/> Community issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Contract decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Delegation	<input type="checkbox"/> Appointment
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative matter			

IMPLICATIONS:

(i)	Is this matter significant in terms of Council's Policy on Significance? No
(ii)	Implications in terms of Vision Rodney? No
(iii)	Implications in terms of Long Term Council Community Plan / Annual Plan? No
(iv)	Implications in terms of other Council Strategic documents or Council Policy? No
(v)	Is a budget amendment required? No
(vi)	Have the views of affected or interested persons been obtained and is any further public consultation required? Not applicable

(vii)	Does a decision on this matter require Auckland Transition Agency approval? (yes / no / advice being sought?)
	No

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Capital cost implications	Not applicable
Is it currently budgeted for?	Not applicable
Funding source of capital costs	Not applicable
Ongoing operational cost implications	Not applicable
Is it currently budgeted for?	Not applicable
Funding & rating impact (whether resulting from capital expenditure or arising directly)	Not applicable

SUMMARY:

The Council has resolved that:

A list of all significant contracts is to be tabled at the next Council meeting.

Attached as **Appendix 1** is a list of all significant contracts let over the period 13 February – 26 March 2010.

Note: *Councillors should raise any queries they may have with the relevant director prior to the day of the meeting so that these may be responded to on the day.*

RECOMMENDATION:

That the information be received.

APPENDIX 1

REPORT



TO Council
 ON 15 April 2010
 FROM David Low – Manager: Revenue
 APPROVED BY Kevin Ramsay – Director: Corporate Services
 SIGNATURE

SUBJECT APPLICATION FOR REMISSION OF RATES BY THE ODC RODNEY GIRL GUIDES
 FILE REF RB/1/1; RB/9/1

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

<input type="checkbox"/> Information only	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Statutory process
<input type="checkbox"/> Community issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Contract decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Delegation	<input type="checkbox"/> Appointment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Administrative matter			

IMPLICATIONS:

(i)	Is this matter significant in terms of Council's Policy on Significance? No
(ii)	Implications in terms of Vision Rodney? No
(iii)	Implications in terms of Long Term Council Community Plan / Annual Plan? Nil
(iv)	Implications in terms of other Council Strategic documents or Council Policy? Nil
(v)	Is a budget amendment required? No
(vi)	Have the views of affected or interested persons been obtained and is any further public consultation required? No
(vii)	Does a decision on this matter require Auckland Transition Agency approval? (yes / no / advice being sought?) No

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Capital cost implications	Nil
Is it currently budgeted for?	Not applicable
Funding source of capital costs	Not applicable
Ongoing operational cost implications	Nil
Is it currently budgeted for?	No
Funding & rating impact (whether resulting from capital expenditure or arising directly)	Minor

SUMMARY:

An application for a rate remission has been received from the ODC Rodney Girl Guides, for its property at 224 Centreway Road, Orewa. Guides are a charitable community organisation which provides service, life skills and recreation activities for girls aged from 5 to 18 years. The hall at 244 Centreway Road is the venue for Guides, Pippins and Brownies in the District. The Orewa branch has 30 girls meeting regularly and in addition, this venue is the focal point for the district with girls from Dairy Flat and Coatesville (hence the name Orewa Dairy Flat Coatesville - ODC Rodney) also making use of this building. The Girl Guides' statement of purpose is: We enable girls and young women to reach their full potential and make a difference in the world.

RECOMMENDATION:

- (a) **That the Council approve a 100% remission of the 2009/2010 rates of \$1,412.71 (excluding water and sewerage charges) for the ODC Rodney Girl Guides' property 224 Centreway Road, Orewa.**
- (b) **That the property be included on future annual remission schedules.**

The objective of the Council's remission policy for...*organisations which by their existence in the district directly benefit the residents of the district is...to encourage certain sport, recreation and welfare organisations in the district which directly benefit the residents of the district.*

Clause 1 of the policy states that...applicant organisations must benefit residents of the district.

Clause 5 of the policy states that the organisations must be those...whose principal objective is to promote education and health...and that...subject to clause 1, organisations whose principal objective is to promote education or health, the members of such organisations deriving no pecuniary gain, be granted 100% remission of all rates, - with the exception of water and sewerage charges.

Rates on the ODC Rodney Girl Guides' property at 224 Centreway Road, Orewa for the 2009/2010 year total \$1,844.36 (including water and sewerage charges of \$431.65) and a 100% remission excluding water and sewerage would total \$1,412.71. Council currently provides 100% remission (excluding water and sewerage) for other similar organisations in the district where the organisation is not situated on Council reserve land and therefore non-rateable.

REPORT



TO Council
 ON 15 April 2010
 FROM Kevin Ramsay – Director: Corporate Services
 APPROVED BY Kevin Ramsay – Director: Corporate Services
 SIGNATURE

SUBJECT UPDATE ON AUCKLAND REGIONAL GOVERNANCE
 FILE REF CF/1/1

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information only	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Statutory process
<input type="checkbox"/> Community issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Contract decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Delegation	<input type="checkbox"/> Appointment
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative matter			

IMPLICATIONS:

(i)	Is this matter significant in terms of Council’s Policy on Significance? No
(ii)	Implications in terms of Vision Rodney? No
(iii)	Implications in terms of Long Term Council Community Plan / Annual Plan? No
(iv)	Implications in terms of other Council Strategic documents or Council Policy? No
(v)	Is a budget amendment required? No
(vi)	Have the views of affected or interested persons been obtained and is any further public consultation required? Not applicable
(vii)	Does a decision on this matter require Auckland Transition Agency approval? No

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Capital cost implications	Nil
Is it currently budgeted for?	Not applicable
Funding source of capital costs	Not applicable
Ongoing operational cost implications	Nil
Is it currently budgeted for?	Not applicable
Funding and rating impact (whether resulting from capital expenditure or arising directly)	Not applicable

SUMMARY:

A submission has been made by the Council to the Third Bill, as well as feedback provided on discussions documents prepared by the Auckland Transition Agency on Watercare's structure, Local Boards and CCOs.

The Auckland Transition Agency continues to coordinate a series of workstreams to implement the transition to a new Auckland Council, with a substantial amount of work now being undertaken on the organisational structure.

Rodney District Council is involved through officer participation in the workstreams, secondment of staff to projects, and reviews of legislation and discussion documents.

The purpose of this report is to update the Council on the current situation, to outline the approach being taken by the Transition Agency in implementing the legislation and outline the level of involvement of RDC staff to date.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the update on Auckland Regional Governance be received.

1.0 Background

The Local Government (Tamaki Makaurau Reorganisation) Act 2009 came into force on 24 May 2009. The Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 came into force on 22 September 2009, after a select committee process involving several thousand submissions.

Both of these Acts are proposed to be substantially amended by a third piece of legislation, the Local Government (Auckland Law Reform) Bill, which has been introduced to Parliament and is proceeding through the select committee process.

2.0 Issues

2.1 Legislation

The Local Government (Tamaki Makaurau Reorganisation) Act 2009 (First Act) established the Auckland Transition Agency (ATA), placed some restrictions around the decision making powers of the existing councils, and outlined the disestablishment of existing councils and establishment of a new Auckland Council as of 1 Nov 2010.

The Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 (Second Act) advised that all of Rodney district would be included in the new Super-City, more formally established the Auckland Council, described the governance arrangements, including Mayor, councillors and local boards, and stated obligations around annual plans and annual reports.

The third piece of legislation, the Local Government (Auckland Law Reform) Bill, was introduced to Parliament on 15 December 2009 and is currently going through a submission process. Rodney District Council has made a submission and is now waiting for the select committee to complete its process with an expected report back date to Parliament of 4 May 2010.

The Bill goes into much more detail than previous legislation around the roles and functions of various organisations and the processes to be followed. In preparing Council's submission consideration was given to the following fifteen main areas covered by the Bill:

1. Role of Auckland Transition Agency
2. Local Boards
3. Elections
4. Rating
5. Council-Controlled Organisations
6. Auckland Transport
7. Water Supply & Wastewater Services
8. Spatial plan
9. Maori
10. Development Contributions
11. Property
12. Employment Provisions
13. Bylaws
14. Transitional Provisions
15. Repeals and Amendments

The Third Bill is a somewhat cumbersome piece of legislation to work through as so much of it relates to the amendment of existing legislation. To give a sense of the scale involved, of its total 194 pages 34 pages outline amendments to the First Act, 59 pages outline amendments to the Second Act, and another 28 pages are amendments to other Acts. In other words, around 121 pages of the 194 are amendments to other pieces of legislation.

2.2 Local Government Commission

The Local Government Commission received more than 700 submissions on its proposal for the lines for the northern and southern boundaries of the Auckland Council, as well as internal boundaries for local boards and electoral wards. It has now produced a final determination, which has resulted in an additional ward and a further two local boards from what was originally proposed.

Of relevance to Rodney District is that the northern boundary has been confirmed, as have the electoral wards (there will be a Rodney Ward and an Albany Ward, which includes the Hibiscus Coast). However, the proposed Hibiscus-Albany-East Coast Bays Local Board has now been spit into two, namely the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board and the Upper Harbour Local Board.

Attached as **Appendix 1** is a chart extracted for the Local Government Commission's final determination which summarises the electoral ward and local board structure.

2.3 Auckland Transition Agency (ATA) Actions

Work continues within the sixteen workstreams that ATA has identified as making up the overall transition programme:

- Governance
- Workforce & Human Resources
- Community Services
- Customer Services
- Finance & Treasury
- Communications & Public Affairs
- CCOs, Trusts, Investments & Infrastructure
- Business Processes & Systems
- Legal
- Planning & Environment – Environment
- Planning & Environment – Policy & Planning
- Planning & Environment – Regulatory

- Property & Assets
- Economic Development
- Transport
- Watercare.

These sixteen workstreams are broken down into 98 sub-streams, each with attached project teams that have been tasked with meeting key milestones and deliverables.

As well as the ongoing work to identify the systems and processes that Auckland will need in place to operate from 1 November 2010, there has been a substantial amount of work undertaken on developing detailed designs for the operational structures.

2.4 Structure for New Auckland Organisations

As well as the new single Auckland Council, which will be a unitary authority having the powers of both a regional and local Council, there are to be a set of Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs) to undertake various functions.

To date, the following seven CCOs have been mentioned:

- Watercare Services Limited – existing organisation with functions and powers to be extended as outlined in First Act
- Auckland Transport – established as part of Third Bill
- Waterfront Development Agency – instruction to establish within the Third Bill
- Property Holdings & Development – outlined in ATA discussion document
- Economic Development, Tourism & Events Agency – outlined in ATA discussion document
- Major Regional Facilities – outlined in ATA discussion document
- Council Investments – outlined in ATA discussion document.

2.5 Service Delivery Model

ATA has announced a service delivery model which outlines the principles to be used in determining how services will be delivered under the new structure and where service centres are intended to be located for Day One (1 November 2010).

A key concept identified within the principles is that existing service levels will be maintained or possibly enhanced.

The Head Office of the Auckland Council will be located in the Auckland CBD, and there will be four types of service centres.

Full Service Centres: There will be four of these located in the North (Takapuna), the West (Henderson), the Central/East (Central Auckland) and the South (Manukau). These are to deliver all Auckland Council and some CCO services

Local Service Centres: There will be four of these located at Orewa, Waiheke, Papakura and Pukekohe. These will generally provide the services that are currently delivered out of them.

Neighbourhood Service Centres: There will be five of these located at Warkworth, Huapai, Helensville, Great Barrier and Waiuku and they will continue to provide the services currently provided.

Specialist Service Centres: These will be identified and provided as required, including Auckland CBD (for resource and building consents), Botany (for building consents), Newmarket (for Watercare) and an as yet unconfirmed location for Transport.

There is still some uncertainty as to what services these centres will actually provide but the model starts to identify the intentions behind a structure of offices.

2.6 Recruitment within the New Structure

Recruitment is currently proceeding for the top three levels of Auckland Council, Auckland Transport and Watercare Services Limited.

Appointments to date are Ian Parton to the position of Watercare Transition Chief Executive (appointed 11 Dec 2009), and Doug McKay to the position of Interim Chief Executive for Auckland Council.

Work continues on the structure beneath these levels with a 'mapping' process just completed to identify the functions that fit within each reporting area. Following this a 'matching' process will be undertaken to determine which existing individual positions match positions in the new structure, meaning that those employees can immediately be offered a role. Those not immediately matched will then most likely have an opportunity to apply for the remaining unmatched jobs.

2.7 RDC Involvement

Work on the various workstreams established by the ATA continues, with RDC staff continuing to be involved.

Of the 98 sub-streams officially recognised by ATA, RDC has representation on approximately 68 of these, with around 40 staff having official roles on the project teams. Additionally there are other staff providing administrative and technical support to RDC representatives.

From Rodney District Council's transition time recording system there are now over 120 staff with time recorded against the various workstreams or transition work in general (e.g. review of legislation), with a total of over 15,000 hours recorded to the end of March 2010.

The following table shows the number of hours entered into the Council's time recording up to 21 Mar 2010 against each of the identified workstreams or against 'Transition' in general. A calculation is then made using average bands of salaries to assess an estimated cost of those hours.

Workstream	Data	
	Sum of Hours	Sum of Cost \$
Business Processes & Systems	2189.0	\$ 105,070
CCOs	43.0	\$ 2,080
Communications & Public Affairs	120.0	\$ 7,110
Community Services	1603.0	\$ 69,860
Customer Services	543.0	\$ 28,925
Economic Development	222.5	\$ 13,185
Finance & Treasury	1822.0	\$ 101,220
Governance	464.5	\$ 26,185
Legal	54.0	\$ 3,090
P&E: Environment	539.5	\$ 26,245
P&E: Policy & Planning	422.0	\$ 25,870
P&E: Regulatory	1195.5	\$ 57,195
Property & Assets	99.5	\$ 4,510
Transition	2960.5	\$ 186,960
Transport	916.5	\$ 56,108
Watercare	1021.5	\$ 48,300
Workforce/HR	1014.0	\$ 48,095
Grand Total	15230.0	\$ 810,008

On top of these direct hours worked there are associated overhead costs (e.g. office, electricity, parking, travel) and some external costs where extra resourcing has had to be contracted. The following table identifies the estimated total costs including these additional factors, bringing the total cost to 21 Jan 2010 to around \$2.0M.

Data as at 21 Mar 2010		
Staff costs	15230 Hours	\$810,008
Overheads	(double staff costs)	\$810,008
External Costs		\$378,292
Grand Total	Indicative	\$1,998,308

For information, the most significant work demands to date have been around the following elements:

- Watercare due diligence (Aug 09)
- forming of Auckland Council Workstreams (mid Sept 09)
- Auckland Council Discovery Information Requests (Sept 09)
- Development of Candidate Projects (Sept/Oct 09 to date)
- Continued Information Requests (Jan/Feb)
- Mapping of Staff to the Council Organisations (Mar 10)
- Business Scenario Reviews (Mar 10).

Communication remains a key focus for the organisation with staff forums being held, a series of intranet pages being made available and regular updates as new information comes to light.

A project office has been established from existing resources to provide overall coordination and advice on issues such as decision confirmations, time recording and information requests.

2.8 Decision Making

A requirement of the First Act is for certain decisions to have to go to ATA for confirmation. To date this Council has forwarded 25 requests for confirmation (which has so far received over 400 such requests from all of the Councils) and none from RDC have been rejected.

3.0 **Option**

Not applicable

4.0 **Conclusion**

The current update should be received.

APPENDIX 1

Extract from Local Government Commission's Final Determination

The following are extracts from the Local Government Commission's final determination for ward and local board boundaries. The full report, both Volume One in written form and Volume Two showing all relevant maps are available on the Local Government Commission's web-site at http://www.lgc.govt.nz/lgcwebsite.nsf/wpg_URL/Auckland-Governance-Index!OpenDocument

Summary of ward arrangements

In summary, we have determined Auckland wards as follows:

Ward	Population estimate*	No. of councillors per ward	Population per councillor	Deviation from average population per councillor**	% deviation from average population per councillor**
Rodney	54,100	1	54,100	-17,825	-24.8
Albany	137,800	2	68,900	-3,025	-4.2
North Shore	143,200	2	71,600	-325	-0.5
Waitakere	158,700	2	79,350	+7,425	+10.3
Whau	76,400	1	76,400	+4,475	+6.2
Albert-Eden-Roskill	154,900	2	77,450	+5,525	+7.7
Waitemata and Gulf	79,300	1	79,300	+7,375	+10.2
Ōrākei	81,100	1	81,100	+9,175	+12.8
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	73,000	1	73,000	+1,075	+1.5
Te Irirangi	128,100	2	64,050	-7,875	-10.9
Manukau	156,200	2	78,100	+6,175	+8.6
Manurewa-Papakura	131,500	2	65,750	-6,175	-8.6
Franklin	64,200	1	64,200	-7,725	-10.7
Total	1,438,500	20	71,925		

Summary of local board arrangements

As a result of our deliberations on issues raised in submissions and the legislative requirements, we have determined the following local board arrangements for Auckland, including the need for subdivisions.

Ward	Local board	Population estimate*	Subdivisions	Population estimate*	Number of members (% deviation from average population per member**)
Rodney	Rodney	54,100	Wellsford Warkworth Dairy Flat Kumeu	5,550 16,700 6,470 25,400	1 (-7.7%) 3 (-7.4%) 1 (+7.6%) 4 (+5.6%)
Albany	Hibiscus and Bays	88,800	Hibiscus Coast East Coast Bays	42,500 46,300	4 (-4.3%) 4 (+4.3%)
	Upper Harbour	49,000	None		6
North Shore	Kaipatiki	85,900	None		8
	Devonport-Takapuna	57,300	None		6
Waitakere	Henderson-Massey	109,600	None		8
	Waitakere Ranges	49,000	None		6
Whau	Whau	76,400	None		7
Albert-Eden-Roskill	Albert-Eden	98,800	Owairaka Maungawhau	48,900 49,900	4 (-1.0%) 4 (+1.0%)
	Puketapapa	56,100	None		6
Waitemata and Gulf	Waitemata	70,000	None		7
	Waiheke	8,420	None		5
	Great Barrier	820	None		5
Ōrākei	Ōrākei	81,100	None		7
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	73,000	Maungakiekie Tāmaki	28,500 44,400	3 (-8.8%) 4 (+6.6%)
	Manukau	75,900	None		7
Manukau	Mangere-Otahuhu	80,300	Otara Papatoetoe	34,200 46,100	3 (-0.6%) 4 (+0.5%)
	Te Irirangi	128,100	Howick Pakuranga Botany	42,700 41,900 43,600	3 (-0.1%) 3 (-1.9%) 3 (+2.0%)
Manurewa-Papakura	Manurewa	86,600	None		8
	Papakura	44,900	None		6
Franklin	Franklin	64,200	Wairoa Pukekohe Waiuku	20,200 30,300 13,750	3 (-5.7%) 4 (+6.1%) 2 (-3.7%)

REPORT



TO Council
ON 15 April 2010
FROM Ellen Barrett – Democracy Services Manager
APPROVED BY Kevin Ramsay – Director: Corporate Services
SIGNATURE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kevin Ramsay".

SUBJECT ANZAC DAY CEREMONIES – 25 APRIL 2010
FILE REF AK/1/1

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

<input type="checkbox"/> Information only	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Statutory process
<input type="checkbox"/> Community issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Contract decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Delegation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appointment
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative matter			

IMPLICATIONS:

(i)	Is this matter significant in terms of Council's Policy on Significance?
	No
(ii)	Implications in terms of Vision Rodney?
	No
(iii)	Implications in terms of Long Term Council Community Plan / Annual Plan?
	No
(iv)	Implications in terms of other Council Strategic documents or Council Policy?
	No
(v)	Is a budget amendment required?
	No
(vi)	Have the views of affected or interested persons been obtained and is any further public consultation required?
	Not applicable
(vii)	Does a decision on this matter require Auckland Transition Agency approval? (yes / no / advice being sought?)
	No

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Capital cost implications	Not applicable
Is it currently budgeted for?	Not applicable
Funding source of capital costs	Not applicable
Ongoing operational cost implications	Not applicable
Is it currently budgeted for?	Not applicable
Funding & rating impact (whether resulting from capital expenditure or arising directly)	Not applicable

SUMMARY:

There is a long tradition of the Council being represented by councillors at the various Anzac Day ceremonies around the district.

In order for staff to make arrangements for wreaths to be available, it is necessary to decide which Council members will be representing the Council.

Staff will make arrangements with councillors for delivery of the wreaths to their homes or local Service Centres on Saturday, 24 April, the day before the ceremonies.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the following arrangements be made for ANZAC Day Ceremonies to be held on Sunday, 25 April 2010:

Note: Times shown are expected times but will be confirmed prior to ANZAC Day.

Helensville (10.45 a.m.)	Cr G Walker to represent the Council
Parakai (5.45 a.m.)	Cr G Walker to represent the Council
Leigh (11.00 a.m.)	Cr Parker to represent the Council
Orewa Remembrance Reserve (12.40 p.m.)	Cr Goudie to represent the Council
Riverhead (9.00 a.m.)	Cr Delich to represent the Council
Silverdale (12.15 p.m.)	Cr W Walker to represent the Council
Vipond Road (11.00 a.m. but representative should be there by 10.30 a.m.)	Cr KiriKiri to represent the Council
Waimauku (11.00 a.m.)	Cr Delich to represent the Council
Warkworth (6.00 a.m.)	Cr Parker to represent the Council
Warkworth (10.30 a.m.)	Cr Turner to represent the Council
Wellsford (5.45 a.m.)	Cr Powell to represent the Council
Upper Waiwera Cenotaph Weranui Road (2.30 p.m.)	Cr Craig to represent the Council

REPORT



TO Council
ON 15 April 2010
FROM Rory Palmer – General Manager: Strategy
APPROVED BY Warren Maclennan – Assistant Chief Executive
SIGNATURE

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Warren Maclennan".

SUBJECT **ECONOMIC PROFILE OF RODNEY DISTRICT AND KEY SECTORS**
FILE REF DG/7/1

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information only	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Statutory process
<input type="checkbox"/> Community issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Contract decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Delegation	<input type="checkbox"/> Appointment
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative matter			

IMPLICATIONS:

(i)	Is this matter significant in terms of Council's Policy on Significance?
	No
(ii)	Implications in terms of Vision Rodney?
	The report provides up to date information on the economic well-being of the district.
(iii)	Implications in terms of Long Term Council Community Plan / Annual Plan?
	None
(iv)	Implications in terms of other Council Strategic documents or Council Policy?
	The information in the Business Economics Ltd (BERL) report forms the basis for assessing performance against an LTCCP performance measure.
(v)	Is a budget amendment required?
	No
(vi)	Have the views of affected or interested persons been obtained and is any further public consultation required?
	Not applicable.
(vii)	Does a decision on this matter require Auckland Transition Agency approval? (yes / no / advice being sought?)
	No

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Capital cost implications	None
Is it currently budgeted for?	Not applicable
Funding source of capital costs	Not applicable
Ongoing operational cost implications	\$8,500 (+ GST)
Is it currently budgeted for?	Yes
Funding and rating impact (whether resulting from capital expenditure or arising directly)	Funded from general rates.

SUMMARY:

This report tables the report from BERL on the 'Profile Of Rodney District and Key Sectors' (attached as **Appendix 1**).

The format of the report is essentially the same as previous reports with the exception of additional tourism data so that Rodney district tourism performance can now be compared with the Far North district and not only Coromandel.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the report be received.

1.0 Background

The BERL report is used to monitor the development of the Rodney district economy. Its analysis is prepared using standard Statistics New Zealand data and methodologies. The report looks at past performance and does not forecast the future performance of or prospects for the Rodney economy.

2.0 Issues

2.1 Performance

The Rodney economy has been affected more by the recession than has the Auckland region, or New Zealand as a whole. District economic activity fell, in real terms, by 5.4% between 2008 and 2009, whereas it fell by 2.5% and 1.1% respectively in the Auckland region and New Zealand as a whole over the same period. To place this in perspective, the Rodney economy is now estimated to be about the size it was at the end of 2005, but it is still 28% larger in real terms than it was in 2000.

Likewise employment fell by 3.6% between 2008 and 2009. In the Auckland region, it fell by 0.7%, whereas in New Zealand as a whole it grew by 0.7% over the same period.

2.2 Methodology

The BERL report looks at economic activity within Rodney's borders. It does not capture all of the economic activity of all Rodney's citizens as approximately 40% of our workforce works outside of the district. It is estimated that between 20 and 25% of all income earned by Rodney's citizens is earned outside of the district.

This is important in that it reveals that it is not only important to attract high value businesses to Rodney, it is also important to attract high value residents and make it easy for them to travel to other parts of the region, country and planet.

Statistics New Zealand collects employment data by location down to meshblock level (smaller than planning area units or council wards). Employment is categorised by standardised industry definitions called Australia New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification (ANZSIC). BERL applies the numbers of people employed in each industry classification in Rodney to what is known about how much that industry contributes to the gross domestic product (GDP) in New Zealand as a whole. This works in the following way:

Construction industry contribution to New Zealand's GDP is 8.3 billion. 149,000 people work in the New Zealand construction industry. Construction therefore adds \$55,700 to GDP per person employed in that industry.

Rodney District has 5,270 people working in the construction industry. This number multiplied by \$55,700 is \$294 million contribution to the Rodney District economy.

This data is monitored over time and is used to reveal changes in the structure of the Rodney District economy and its performance overall and by sector.

3.0 Options

No further action is required.

4.0 Conclusion

That this report be received.

APPENDIX 1

REPORT



TO Council
 ON 15 April 2010
 FROM Ahmed Khaled – Manager: Transport Assets and Programmes
 APPROVED BY Murray Noone – Director: Infrastructure
 SIGNATURE

SUBJECT **OREWA WEST WALKWAY/CYCLEWAY**
 FILE REF RF/219/1; Project No. 1071

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

<input type="checkbox"/> Information only	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Statutory process
<input type="checkbox"/> Community issue	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Delegation	<input type="checkbox"/> Appointment
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative matter			

IMPLICATIONS:

(i)	Is this matter significant in terms of Council’s Policy on Significance? No
(ii)	Implications in terms of Vision Rodney? No
(iii)	Implications in terms of Long Term Council Community Plan / Annual Plan? Yes, involves transfer of funds between approved projects.
(iv)	Implications in terms of other Council Strategic documents or Council Policy? No
(v)	Is a budget amendment required? Yes, involves transfer of funds between approved projects.
(vi)	Have the views of affected or interested persons been obtained and is any further public consultation required? No, not required.
(vii)	Does a decision on this matter require Auckland Transition Agency approval? (yes / no / advice being sought?) No

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Capital cost implications	Nil
Is it currently budgeted for?	Yes
Funding source of capital costs	No, new fund to be raised.
Ongoing operational cost implications	Accounted for in LTCCP 2009/19.
Is it currently budgeted for?	Yes
Funding and rating impact (whether resulting from capital expenditure or arising directly)	No additional impact beyond LTCCP 2009/19 provision.

SUMMARY:

The tender for Stage 4 of the Orewa West Walkway/Cycleway (OWWC) project has closed with the lowest complying tender (\$938,380.50) received being 33% below the engineer's estimate. However, funds available in 2009/10 (\$68,000 including NZTA subsidy) are not adequate to enable the contract to be awarded. It is proposed that savings from other projects amounting to \$275,778 be transferred to this flagship project to make use of the favourable market conditions.

New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) financial assistance has been approved in advance for the entire project. NZTA has also indicated a very favourable response to advance cash flow provided the Council applies early.

It is however to be noted that the overall project cost will remain within the budgeted amount of \$4.1 million.

RECOMMENDATION:

- (a) That the proposed savings listed below be transferred to the Orewa West Walkway/Cycleway project:

(i) Savings from Transport projects deferred due to subsidy being declined	\$175,778
(ii) Savings from Parks & Coastal projects	\$100,000
Total	\$275,778

- (b) That Contract C2010.024 – Orewa Estuary Cycleway – Southern Link Shared Paths 1, 4 & 5 be awarded to Opie Contractors Ltd for the tendered sum of \$938,380.50 (excluding GST).

- (c) That the funds for this project be made up as follows:

Savings from other projects (as detailed above)	\$275,778.00
Subsidy this year	\$380,836.00
Remaining budget this year	\$68,000.00
Balance from next year's budget	\$213,766.50
Total	\$938,380.50

1.0 Background

1.1 Flagship Project

The Orewa West Walkway/Cycleway (OWWC) is a flagship project of the Council and the third largest walking/cycling project funded by the NZTA. The project comprises 3.9 km of shared walk/cycle path, including five bridges which will link up with 1.1km of existing and another 2.5 km of walkway/cycleway to be built by Millwater Properties in Silverdale North to form a 7.5 km walkway/cycleway around the Orewa River Estuary.

It is expected that by 2016 the Orewa West Walkway/Cycleway will serve:

- (a) A population of 12,000 in Silverdale North, Maygrove and Orewa West residential areas.
- (b) Seven schools with a total roll of 5,300.
- (c) Commercial/retail businesses covering some 50,000 square metres.
- (d) Some 3,000 employees in Silverdale North commercial/retail precincts.
- (e) Metro Park in Silverdale North.

1.2 Patronage and Benefits

It is estimated that when the proposed residential and commercial developments in Silverdale North and Orewa West are completed and all the schools are built and operating to capacity, some 727 pedestrians and 246 cyclists will use the route daily. Based on the NZTA's criteria for benefit computation, the forecast patronage will generate health benefits equivalent to \$22 million in 30 years.

1.3 Tender for Stage 4

The Stage 4 construction phase of the Orewa West Cycleway subsidy project involves construction of a 2.5-3.0m wide concrete path on the Esplanade Reserve from Jelas Rd to Moffat Rd and Pohutukawa Ave to Pohutukawa Reserve, construction of timber retaining walls, minor earthworks, sub-soil drainage, culvert removal and replacement, and removal of a large grove of old macrocarpa trees and replacement pohutukawa tree planting. The tender for the project closed with a total of nine (9) conforming tenders being received as follows:

Tenderer	Tendered Price
Opie Contractors Ltd	\$938,380.50
Infrastructure & Civil Works Ltd	\$984,002.08
Hawkins Open Spaces	\$1,012,435.06
Hibiscus Contractors Ltd	\$1,030,696.89
Gideon Contractors Ltd	\$1,056,275.00
HEB Construction	\$1,115,246.66
TEBO	\$1,129,566.72
H & H Contractors Ltd	\$1,188,732.00
J Alexander Civil Ltd	\$1,277,068.69
Engineers Estimate	\$1,392,548.00

The lowest complying tender (\$938,380.50) is 33% below the engineer's estimate. However, funds available in 2009/10 (\$68,000 including NZTA subsidy) are not adequate to enable the award of the contract. The reasons for the tender price and available funds mismatch are:

- (a) Some works originally programmed for implementation in 2010/11 and 2011/12 have been included in this tender to take advantage of the prevailing very favourable market conditions.
- (b) Additional retaining walls due to steep terrain.

- (c) Almost all professional services for design and resource consent processes have been completed in advance to enable processing of consents for the whole project and to stay within budget.

A transfer of savings (local share) to the Orewa West Walkway/Cycleway Project is now proposed as below to enable award of the contract for Stage 4 of the project:

(a)	Savings from Transport projects deferred due to subsidy being declined	\$175,778
(b)	Savings from Parks & Coastal projects	\$100,000
(c)	Total transfer of savings proposed (excluding NZTA subsidy)	\$275,778
(d)	Total including NZTA subsidy	\$656,614
(e)	Add balance of fund available under Orewa West Walkway/Cycleway in Year 1 of LTCCP 2009/19 (including NZTA subsidy)	\$68,000
Total fund that will be available for the Stage 4 contract [(d) + (e)]		\$724,614

If this proposal is approved, works costing \$724,614 will be carried out in 2009/10 and the remaining works costing \$213,766.50 will be completed in 2010/11 and funded from the Long Term Council Community Plan allocation of \$520,000 for that year.

2.0 Issues

NZTA has approved financial assistance for the entire project in advance at a rate of 58%. However, this financial assistance only applies to the budgeted project cost of \$4.1 million. It is therefore necessary to make use of the current favourable tender prices and award the contract. The proposal to transfer savings/unused funds from other projects, if approved, will enable the contract for Stage 4 to be awarded and help keep the overall project on schedule and within budget.

3.0 Options

Option	Implication
(a) Approve the transfer of funds as proposed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract for Stage 4 can be awarded and the very favourable tender prices can be made use of. Project can be implemented on schedule and within budget.
(b) Not approve the transfer of funds as proposed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract for Stage 4 cannot be awarded. Implementation of the project will be delayed. Project cost may rise as the economy gathers momentum. Cost overruns, if any, may have to be fully funded by the Council.

4.0 Conclusion

It is proposed that savings of \$275,778 from various Transport and Parks & Coastal projects listed above be transferred to the Orewa West Walkway/Cycleway project to enable the awarding of the contract for construction of Stage 4 to begin before the onset of the winter months.

REPORT



TO Council
 ON 15 April 2010
 FROM Paul Green – Manager: Community Development
 APPROVED BY Lloyd Barton – Director: Customer Service
 SIGNATURE

SUBJECT **COUNCIL SUPPORT OF CITIZENS' ADVICE BUREAUX**
 FILE REF GA/1/1

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

<input type="checkbox"/> Information only	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Statutory process
<input type="checkbox"/> Community issue	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Delegation	<input type="checkbox"/> Appointment
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative matter			

IMPLICATIONS:

(i)	Is this matter significant in terms of Council's Policy on Significance? No
(ii)	Implications in terms of Vision Rodney? Yes – supports local and district wide delivery of community outcomes.
(iii)	Implications in terms of Long Term Council Community Plan / Annual Plan? None
(iv)	Implications in terms of other Council Strategic documents or Council Policy? No
(v)	Is a budget amendment required? No
(vi)	Have the views of affected or interested persons been obtained and is any further public consultation required? Yes, the Chairperson from each of the Citizens' Advice Bureaux has previously been consulted and has agreed to the draft Service Level Agreements.
(vii)	Does a decision on this matter require Auckland Transition Agency approval? (yes / no / advice being sought?) No

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Capital cost implications	None
Is it currently budgeted for?	Not applicable
Funding source of capital costs	Not applicable
Ongoing operational cost implications	\$44,412
Is it currently budgeted for?	Yes
Funding and rating impact (whether resulting from capital expenditure or arising directly)	Not applicable

SUMMARY:

On 1 April the Strategy and Community Committee approved the Community Support Grants Policy and the distribution of contestable funds for the 2010/2011 financial year, subject to final annual budget confirmation, by the 31 October 2010.

A decision on the following recommendation was deferred to the 15 April Council meeting:

- (c) That the Service Level Agreements for the Hibiscus Coast, Helensville and Wellsford Citizens' Advice Bureaux, attached as Appendix 2 to the agenda report, be approved, subject to final annual budget confirmation.*

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Service Level Agreements for the Hibiscus Coast, Helensville and Wellsford Citizens' Advice Bureaux as presented at the 1 April Strategy and Community Committee meeting, attached as Appendix 1 to the agenda report, be approved subject to final annual budget confirmation.

1.0 Background

The Council has previously provided financial support to Rodney's three Citizens' Advice Bureaux through the Annual and Long Term Council Community Plan processes. In order to provide certainty of funding for the period to 30 June 2012; when the first Long Term Council Community Plan of the Auckland Council will be adopted, Service Level Agreements have been drafted between the Council and the Helensville, Wellsford and Hibiscus Coast Citizens' Advice Bureaux.

The Service Level Agreements attached as **Appendix 1**, including the performance targets, have been discussed and agreed with the Chairpersons of each of the three Bureaux. The level of funding set in each Service Level agreement has been determined by the value approved by the Council in 2009/10 with an adjustment of 4% made for inflation.

Following the 1 April Strategy and Community Committee meeting further analysis of the current levels of funding provided to each of the Citizens' Advice Bureaux has been undertaken.

The analysis has included previous levels of funding, submissions made to the Annual and Long Term Council Community Plan processes, additional support or financial assistance provided such as lease payments, and current performance targets set within the Service level agreements.

2.0 Issues

2.1 History of submissions to Annual Plans / Long Term Council Community Plans

The table below summarises the year to year levels of financial support provided by the Council to each of the Citizens' Advice Bureaux over the past 10 years.

Year	HBC CAB			Helensville CAB			Wellsford CAB		
	Submit	Requested:	Granted:	Submit	Requested:	Granted:	Submit	Requested:	Granted:
1999/2000	Yes	\$18,000	\$10,000			\$6,000	Yes	\$10,000	\$6,000
2000/01	Yes	\$17,500	\$12,000			\$6,000	Yes	\$6,000	\$6,000
2001/02	Yes	\$14,500	\$14,500			\$6,000			
2002/03	Yes	\$17,000	\$15,000			\$6,000	Yes	\$10,000	\$10,000
2003/04	Yes	\$17,000	\$15,000			\$6,000	Yes	\$10,000	\$10,000
2004/05	Yes	\$21,240	\$15,000			\$8,000	Yes	\$15,000	\$12,000
2005/06	Yes	\$23,920	\$16,000			\$8,000	Yes	\$12,000	\$12,000
2006/07	Yes	\$23,920	\$16,576			\$8,288	Yes	\$14,000	\$12,445
2007/08	Yes	\$24,336	\$18,280			\$8,630	Yes	\$13,800	\$13,000
2008/09	Yes	\$26,000	\$19,000	Yes	\$8,630	\$8,900	Yes	\$14,000	\$13,400
2009/10	Yes	\$27,910	\$19,646	Yes	\$8,900+ inf	\$9,203	Yes	\$16,000	\$13,856

2.1.1 Hibiscus Coast Citizens' Advice Bureau

A submission has been received by the Council each year for the past 10 years. The Hibiscus Coast Citizens' Advice Bureau has been consistent each year in requesting additional funding.

2.1.2 Wellsford Citizens' Advice Bureau

Wellsford Citizens' Advice Bureau has been consistent each year with the exception of 2001/02 in either requesting that funding be continued into the following year or that additional funding be granted from that received the previous year.

2.1.3 Helensville Citizens' Advice Bureau

The first submission to the Council's Annual Plan received from the Helensville Citizens' Advice Bureau since 1999/2000 was in 2008/09 and requested that funding be continued at the level received the previous year. A submission in 2009/10 requested that the same level of funding be received with an adjustment made for inflation.

2.1.4 Timeline of Key Council decisions

2000/01

Following submissions made by the Hibiscus Coast and Wellsford Citizens' Advice Bureaux the Council made a commitment that the Bureaux would not receive less than their current levels of funding for the next 3 years.

2003/04

The Council was directed to consider equity of funding across the Citizens' Advice Bureaux and Hibiscus Coast Community House; as a result the Helensville and Wellsford Citizens' Advice Bureaux received a \$2000 per year increase

2004/05

Helensville Citizens' Advice Bureau received a further increase as a result of a submission made by the Wellsford Citizens' Advice Bureau and following consideration of equity of funding support.

2006/07

The Council introduced adjustments for inflation across all three Citizens' Advice Bureaux.

2.2 Analysis of funding paid per service level agreement enquiry targets

The number of enquiries set within the performance target schedule of the service level agreement has been made in consultation with each of the Bureaux and is based on historical figures.

During performance target negotiations between the Council and the Helensville Citizens' Advice Bureau it was noted that the total number of enquiries for 2008/09 was 1752. The Helensville Citizens' Advice Bureau Chairperson was reluctant to use the 2008/09 figures as a benchmark as it was felt that they were falsely inflated due to the impact of the recession. As a result it was suggested that an enquiry figure in the range of 1475-1500 would be reasonable. Subsequent negotiations resulted in the figure of 1525 being agreed upon.

The chart below shows that the current levels of funding on a per enquiry basis for Helensville and Wellsford are comparable. The Hibiscus Coast Bureau has the highest number of enquiries.

	Proposed level of 10/11 Funding	Number of enquiries required in to meet service level agreement performance targets	Number of Volunteers required to maintain service level agreement performance targets	Proposed level of funding per enquiry.
Helensville	\$9,571	1525	16	\$6.28
Wellsford	\$14,410	2300	15	\$6.27
Hibiscus Coast	\$20,431	6600	30	\$3.10

2.3 Support with accommodation / property costs

2.3.1 Hibiscus Coast

Located within Council-owned property – no associated costs borne by the Bureau.

2.3.2 Wellsford

Located within Council-owned property – no associated costs borne by the Bureau. Wellsford also receives approximately \$400 per year to cover administrative costs associated with managing room bookings and hall inspections.

2.3.3 Helensville

Located at Shop 2-27 Commercial Road, Helensville. Rental costs, rates, building insurance and other related costs in the order of \$14,000 per year are borne by the Council, with no associated costs borne by the Bureau.

3.0 **Options**

Service Level Agreement values are maintained as per the agreements attached as **Appendix 1**

4.0 **Conclusion**

The analysis of the funding being received by each of the Citizens' Advice Bureaux shows no justification for an increase in the levels of funding currently being received by Helensville or Wellsford.

APPENDIX 1

REPORT



TO Council
ON 15 April 2010
SUBJECT **KENSINGTON PARK POOL HOUSE CAFÉ – LICENCE TO OCCUPY
PART OF RECREATION RESERVE**
FILE REF RC/1/1

The following recommendation is from the Infrastructure and Environment Committee meeting held on 18 March 2010:

That it be recommended to the Council:

- (a) That a Licence agreement be granted to Kensington Park Holdings Limited to construct a deck over part of the recreation reserve (Lot 1 DP404630) at Parkside Drive, Orewa for use by the adjacent café at Kensington Park. The agreement will be for a term of five plus five years, with an initial annual rent of \$5,000 plus GST, effective from 1 July 2010.
- (b) That the proposed Licence, attached as Appendix 1 to the Agenda report, amended to include negotiated toilet arrangements, be publicly notified in accordance with the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977.

*Note: The proposed Licence referred to in paragraph (b) above is attached as **Appendix 1**.*

APPENDIX 1

SUBJECT PUBLIC EXCLUDED**Recommendation:**

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

Agenda Item No(s) 13 and 14

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

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Grounds under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
Possible Land Disposals	The disclosure of information would not be in the public interest because of the greater need to enable the council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities (section 7(2)(h) Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987).	That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist, under section 6 or section 7 (except section 7(2)(f)(i) of the Act). (section 48(1)(a) Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.)
Possible Agreement – Indicative Road	The disclosure of information would not be in the public interest because of the greater need to enable the council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities (section 7(2)(h) Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987).	That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist, under section 6 or section 7 (except section 7(2)(f)(i) of the Act). (section 48(1)(a) Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.)
	The disclosure of information would not be in the public interest because of the greater need to enable the council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations) (section 7(2)(i) Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987).	That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist, under section 6 or section 7 (except section 7(2)(f)(i) of the Act). (section 48(1)(a) Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.)

CONFIDENTIAL