



Community Facilities Strategic Plan (2004)

Minute Number: CL/SEP/1677/04

MINUTE NO. CL/SEP/1677/04 Cr Len Brown/Cr Barry Keon

That the under mentioned recommendations (Minute No, 1638/04) made at a meeting of the Strategic Management Committee held on 14 September 2004 be adopted.

Minute No. 1638/04 THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES STRATEGIC PLAN 2004

1. That the Community Facilities Strategic Plan 2004 as set out in Appendix "B" be adopted.
2. That the current moratorium on any additional community tenancy facilities be extended to 30 June 2005.
3. That Council officers be given discretion in determining the extension of lease terms for clubs, taking cognisance of the intent of this Strategy.

Updated implementation priorities (2007)

STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES - 20 MARCH 2007

Minute SD/MAR/363/07

COMMUNITY FACILITIES STRATEGIC PLAN

2004



Draft 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	4
Section I – Background	5
1.1 Introduction	
1.2 Overview of the 1995 Community Facilities Plan	
1.3 The Urgency for ‘Review’	
1.4 Research Methodology	
1.5 Organisational Vision, Value and Goals	
1.6 Performance of the 1995 Community Facilities Plan	
1.7 Situational Analysis	
1.8 Environmental Scan	
Section II – Towards a Strategic Direction	16
2.1 Introduction	
2.2 Purpose	
2.3 Vision	
2.4 Scope	
2.5 Key Strategic Areas	
Section III – Strategic Goals	23
3.1 Introduction	
3.2 Strategic Goals	
Section IV – Monitoring and Evaluation	25
4.1 Introduction	
4.2 Performance Measures	
4.3 Review of Strategy	
Conclusion	26
References	
Appendices	
Appendix 1 - Key Goals and Actions advocated by Tomorrow’s Manukau (2001) in relation to Community Facility Development	
Appendix 2 - 1995 Community Facilities Plan – Weighting Factors Framework	
Appendix 3 - Manukau City Council Current 10-year Community Facility Development Programme (2003 – 2013)	
Appendix 4 - Modified Weighting Factors Framework for Prioritising Community Facility Developments - 2004	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 1995 Community Facilities Plan established community facility development priorities. An investigation of the performance of the 1995 Community Facilities Plan reveals that, even though many of the identified priorities have indeed been implemented, the plan quickly became defunct. Perhaps the most significant critique of the 1995 Community Facilities Plan is its omission of community managed facilities on Council Reserves.

With the demise of the 1995 Community Facilities Plan, together with further strategic direction required in community facility planning and development, matched by ever increasing limitations on Council's financial resources, the urgency for the development of a strategic community facilities plan is paramount.

The ensuing research methodology for the development of this strategy is characterised by a planning approach that is investigatory, marketing and futures based.

A situational analysis depicts current significant issues being faced by community managed facilities on Council reserves in particular. Related to changing socio-economic circumstances and residents activity patterns, many traditional clubs have experienced a substantial drop in club membership. Subsequently the health of these clubs has deteriorated, together with the predominantly mono-use facilities that they occupy. Most of these facilities were established through the now redundant Shared Responsibility Scheme (1967 and later revised in 1995) and its successor, the current Community Facilities Partnership Scheme (2001). Both policies relate to the planning and development of Council owned community facilities on reserve land that are established in partnership with community groups and organisations. With the ever increasing unsustainable network of these facilities, community opportunities are decreasing and Council's liability is increasing.

It is important to mention that the Shared Responsibility Scheme has over many years facilitated many viable developments across Manukau City. However, changing socio-economic patterns necessitates that a different approach to this and the current partnership scheme is required to ensure a sustainable future in community managed facility partnerships with Council.

The situational analysis also identifies concerns regarding the community tenancy network, as implemented through the Community Tenancy Policy (2000). This is characterised by a large number of ageing and inefficient facilities, with an ever increasing portfolio that is placing tremendous pressure on Council's limited resources. This pressure culminated in a Council decision in November 2003 to place a 12 month moratorium on additional facilities being added to the portfolio.

The difficulty for Council to fund the Community Facility Development Programme as portrayed in the current LTCCP is another concern.

Some lower level Council Policies are further found to be inhibiting the attainment of Council's current strategic direction, as advocated in higher level strategies such as Tomorrow's Manukau (2001).

The vision for this strategy is as follows:

- ♦ Timely provision of leisure, lifelong learning and social facilities that meet needs, are widely accessible, buzzing with activity and used to their capacity.
- ♦ Council moving to more creative and co-operative approaches with the community and other organisations in meeting needs.
- ♦ A wide range of sustainable opportunities in the community to meet people's changing activity needs.

To move away from the current situation and unsustainable future and towards this strategy's vision, there needs to be proactive Council led strategic intervention. Key strategic pursuits in this regard relate to partnerships, multi-use and multi-sport facilities, policy alignment and effective prioritisation of community facility developments.

The rhetoric pertaining to the need for partnerships has been captured in almost every significant Council document over the last ten years. The advantage of capital funding leveraging and the potential for improved operational sustainability have been raised as beneficial outcomes of such an approach. Ironically though there continues to be no comprehensive effective and strategic partnership policy. The current Community Facilities Partnership Scheme (2001) is inappropriate for forging meaningful partnerships aligned to Council's current vision. It is critical that a partnership policy is developed with a systematic framework for evaluating, fostering and supporting higher level projects on a city-wide strategic basis.

A community managed facility development programme in particular needs to move away from mono-use facilities and focus on multi-use and multi-sport endeavours. Research has shown that internationally, in New Zealand and Manukau City, many mono-use facilities are no longer functioning effectively. In many situations, particularly in relation to community managed facilities, multi-use and multi-sport approaches are the most effective long-term sustainable option.

As mentioned there are a number of lower-level Council policies that are actually curtailing Council's ability to effectively pursue its higher-level strategic goals, particularly in relation to community managed facility development. Relevant policies that need to be urgently reviewed and appropriately aligned include:

- ♦ Community Facilities Partnership Scheme (2001)
- ♦ Community Tenancy Policy (2000)
- ♦ The Policy for Assessing Clubs in Difficulty (2001)

The framework developed by the 1995 Community Facilities Plan for the prioritisation of community facility developments is considered of value for high level evaluations. There however needs to be a necessary adjustment and additional criteria added to capture the preferred strategic approach for community facility development. This framework should then be used for prioritising community facility developments into the future.

Taking cognisance of the preferred strategic direction the following strategic goals are identified:

Goal One: The establishment of a sustainable network of community managed and community tenancy facilities

Goal Two: Policy aligned and developed to achieve sustainable community facility development.

Goal Three: A sustainable LTCCP Community Facility Asset Development Programme.

Goal Four: A sustainable LTCCP Community Facility Operational Programme.

Goal Five: Prioritisation of community facility developments.

A number of objectives and actions are set to meet these goals. Performance measures and a monitoring and evaluation approach, together with a formal annual review of the strategy further ensures that progress is continually and actively assessed. Necessary adjustments to the strategy must be made. This should ensure that the strategy remains a 'live' and useful document.

INTRODUCTION

In 1995 a Community Facilities Plan was developed by Manukau City Council. The plan set out a framework approach to prioritise community facility developments across the city. Needs were identified, prioritised and depicted by the plan.

The 1995 Community Facilities Plan recommended that a review of the said plan be undertaken every five years. In this respect, together with the current distinct lack of direction of community facility development, as well as ever increasing pressure on Council's financial resources, the need for urgently developing a community facilities strategic plan is critical.

This strategy is comprised of four sections that simply address the following:

- ♦ Where are we now?
- ♦ Where are we heading?
- ♦ Where do we want to be?
- ♦ How do we get there?
- ♦ How do we measure progress?

Section I provides a background, depicting the urgent need for the research and development of a strategy. An overview of the 1995 CFP is provided and the performance thereof critiqued. The methodological approach is described and the Council's higher level strategic priorities are identified. A situational analysis is expanded upon, together with an environmental scan that analyses the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats facing the organisation, both internally and externally.

Section II establishes the purpose, vision and scope of this strategy. Key strategic priorities are noted and discussed, with the view to determining the most appropriate way forward.

Section III sets goals, objectives, strategies and performance measures to achieve the vision of the strategy.

Section IV emphasises the importance of continual monitoring and evaluation of the performance measures as well as the need for regular formal review of the strategy.

SECTION I - BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

This section primarily focuses on the current situation, with an overview of the 1995 Community Facilities Plan (CFP) and assessment of the performance thereof.

The urgent need for reviewing the 1995 CFP and the establishment of a strategic direction for the development, management and operation of Council's community facilities is determined. The research methodology is highlighted, depicting the preference for an investigatory, marketing and futures approach.

Council's higher level vision, values and goals are primarily identified through analysis of Tomorrow's Manukau – A Vision for Manukau into the Future 2001-2010 (2001). However, other pertinent Council policies, strategies, plans, position papers and reports, as well as 'outside' policy and legislation (such as the Local Government Act (2002) is also considered.

A situational analysis provides depiction of the key issues in relation to Council community facilities today. With the necessity for a desired future being very different from where Council is presently heading, an environmental scan is conducted. This comprises a SWOT analysis that reflects internal and external strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. These are important to consider when formulating appropriate strategies.

1.2 Overview of the 1995 CFP

The last comprehensive community facilities planning exercise was conducted in 1995. This was in response to a recommendation from Council's 1992 Recreation Strategy, in which Council recognised the need to effectively plan for community assets to make the best use of limited funds.

The purpose of the 1995 CFP was to:

- ♦ Provide a clear method for decision making with respect to community facility development
- ♦ Ensure that Council's resources are directed to communities 'most in need' of facilities

A definition of community facilities was established by the plan and goals set that relate to effectiveness, fairness, efficiency and achieving the city's strategic directions.

An innovative 'weighting factors' framework was formulated comprising of criteria that measured equity, effectiveness and Council's strategic goals. Within each criterion points were scored in relation to 'high', 'medium' and 'low'. An exciting aspect, but also difficult to achieve was the attempted 'measure' of both quantitative and qualitative attributers.

Community needs and demands were captured through existing information. A city-wide community needs and preferences study was also conducted in 1995. The needs identified were assessed through the above mentioned framework. Priorities are subsequently identified by the plan, together with timeframes and budgets.

The plan further emphasised that prior to constructing or redeveloping a building there should be a community needs assessment, a needs/options study and a feasibility study. Key requirements to be explored by these investigations are described by the plan as follows:

- ♦ Ensure optimal use of facilities prior to embarking on refurbishment or development projects.
- ♦ Developments should be multi-purpose.
- ♦ Partnerships should be used to leverage additional funding where appropriate. The plan notes that investigating community partnerships to facilitate the community accessing existing buildings should be a first step in meeting community needs.

1.3 The Urgency for ‘Review’

The 1995 CFP depicted that a review of the said plan be undertaken every five years. With this being well overdue, together with further strategic direction and integration required with respect to Council’s approach to community facility planning and development, the need for review is critical.

It also became apparent that possibly more than just a mere review of the 1995 CFP is required. Initial concerns raised relate to the appropriateness of the framework approach, the scope of the plan and the general lack of reference to the plan by Council documents since its inception.

1.4 Research Methodology

The planning approach to develop this strategy is investigatory and includes a marketing and futures approach. This approach should ensure that:

- ♦ The community is involved in the process
- ♦ Future trends are considered
- ♦ Efficient, effective and equitable provision of relevant opportunities eventuates

The key methodological components for the preparation and implementation of this strategic plan include pre-planning; background review; inventories and evaluations; an environmental scan; identification of key strategic areas; strategic plan development; community consultation and appraisal; implementation; and monitoring and evaluation.

1.5 Organisational Vision, Values and Goals

1.5.1 *Tomorrow's Manukau – A Vision for Manukau into the Future 2001-2010*

Council's vision, values and goals is essential in the compilation of this strategy. It establishes the direction that Council intends to head. Tomorrow's Manukau (2001) is the current principal Council Strategy into the future. The vision for Tomorrow's Manukau is progressive, proud and prosperous.

*"A **progressive** city of vibrant town centres, thriving rural areas, and abundant recreational spaces, connected by efficient transportation and communication systems. A well planned city with growth managed to provide for the needs of future generations.*

*People **proud** of their success and their good education – confident they can achieve their aspirations and enjoy a variety of lifestyles in harmony, good health and safety.*

***Prosperous** people enriched by the diversity of cultures, the beauty of the environment, the strong economy and the wealth of opportunity".*

(Tomorrow's Manukau, 2001, p14)

To achieve this vision, the following key foci are identified by the strategy:

- ♦ Educated and knowledgeable people
- ♦ Vibrant and strong communities
- ♦ A place that is easy to get around
- ♦ Healthy and economically secure people
- ♦ Sustainable Manukau

Within these areas of focus Tomorrow's Manukau sets goals, targets and actions. The key aspects that relate to community facility development are outlined in Appendix 1.

The Council values expressed by the strategy relate to diversity in cultural beliefs and lifestyles, excellence and success, people who act responsibly, honesty and working with others.

1.5.2 *Other Relevant Strategic Council Documents*

There are a number of other Council policies, strategies, plans, position papers and reports that influence the planning and development of community facilities. In developing this strategy cognisance was taken thereof.

Important higher level documents include the Community Development Framework (2000) and Developing Tomorrow's Manukau – A Property Strategy for the Manukau City Council (2003).

The Community Development Framework (2000) established Council's role in community development. Even though the framework is a little dated and in need of review, there are important elements that are of relevance and should be considered.

The framework suggested a shift in Council's focus from Council being a direct provider to an "enabler". Four ways were identified by the framework to achieve this:

- ♦ Building a sense of community by celebrating who we are.
- ♦ Building a sense of belonging through increased participation in community activities.

Creating opportunities for:

- ♦ Access to knowledge, information and resources
- ♦ Access to a safe and healthy lifestyle

An important theme of the framework portrays Council as a catalyst and facilitator of community partnerships.

The recently developed Council property strategy (Developing Tomorrow's Manukau – A Property Strategy for Manukau City Council (2003)) builds on Tomorrow's Manukau (2001). A core objective of the strategy in relation to social and community infrastructure is "to ensure the provision of adequate and appropriate facilities for the delivery of an optimum level and range of social and community services for the needs of the city and its citizens, both in the present and for the future". (p.13).

The strategy further mentions the need for greater creativity and flexibility to find the most appropriate and cost effective means to achieve the above objective.

Key issues identified by the property strategy are as follows:

- ♦ Maximising multi-use of community facilities wherever practicable.
- ♦ Alternatives to Council ownership should be explored.
- ♦ Opportunities should be sought to generate ancillary commercial activities to help reduce the cost of facilities to Council.
- ♦ Ongoing asset management plans should be prepared for each property.
- ♦ Council is committed to ensuring that affordable housing for the elderly is available. Opportunities to be pursued to improve the quality, choice and efficiency of housing options for the elderly through alternative approaches such as partnerships with Housing New Zealand, community organisations and the private sector.
- ♦ An investigation should be conducted on the possibility of using cash-in-lieu contributions to non-ownership models of providing community facilities.
- ♦ Combine existing multiple databases into a single comprehensive database of Council-owned property and classify accordingly.
- ♦ Identify opportunities to achieve cost savings by co-locating social and community service delivery functions with those of other Government and Non-Government agencies.

1.6 Performance of the 1995 CFP

The 1995 CFP is generally a well researched document, with an exciting framework approach that attempted to effectively prioritise community facility development across the city. It is unfortunate that the plan was not utilised operationally to its full potential. This is supported by the lack of referencing and consideration of the plan in subsequent Council documents. The plan rapidly became unused and was further superseded by other sector-based strategies, such as the Swimming Pool Strategy (1998) and the Library Strategy (1999).

Even with the rapid waning of the plan, a remarkable number of research and asset development projects identified by the plan were completed, albeit not to the envisaged timeframe. This was a result of the projects identified in the plan being put forward into the financial planning process on an ad hoc basis, contrary to the ambitions of the plan.

Council's requirement for improved strategic direction with respect to community facility development is, as mentioned earlier, also due to the review of the 1995 CFP being well over the recommended five years. In determining the review timeframes of future plans it is important to consider that many international facility plans and strategies recommend annual updates so as to ensure new community research and business opportunities are incorporated and remain current.

Perhaps the most significant critique of the 1995 CFP is its omission of Council's risk exposure to community managed facilities constructed predominantly under the Shared Responsibility Scheme (1967 and later revised in 1995) and its successor the Community Facilities Partnership Scheme (2001). Both policies relate to the planning and development of Council owned community facilities on reserve land that are established in partnership with community groups and organisations. The plan did not identify the significant financial, legal and community development risk in the form of the large number of facilities owned by Council, but managed by sports clubs and community organisations. These assets have not been considered strategically and do not appear on Council's Asset Management Plans.

The plan also emphasises the reusing of existing facilities prior to the development of new ones and only briefly and generally alludes to the need for community needs assessments, feasibility studies and the like. Superficially this may appear sound. However, it is vitally important to consider this holistically by carefully evaluating the costs and benefits of a refurbishment programme. For example – does the refurbishment offer Council good value for money – financially, operationally and in terms of community benefits? Is Council putting good money after bad?

The weighting factors framework developed as the integral part of 1995 CFP is considered sound for high level evaluation. The 1995 CFP framework is attached as Appendix 2. However, it is recommended that additional criteria be added to the framework, and certain measures removed, so that it is responsive to Council's current strategic direction. This is discussed further in Section II.

1.7 Situational Analysis

1.7.1 Core Facilities

The analysis of information related to existing community facilities, identified as traditional core facilities, such as swimming pools, libraries and recreation centres and the like reveals that they are generally well planned, developed, managed, maintained and monitored. Planning and operational staff are well aware of catchment, customer satisfaction and access barrier issues. Evidence also suggests that this information is being utilised well to ensure facilities are effectively meeting customer needs. Operational staff are also playing a more active role in facility design, which has assisted in the improved operational functionality of these facilities.

1.7.2 Community Managed Facilities

There are a large number of buildings on Council Reserves occupied and managed by a number of sporting, recreation, leisure and social clubs. Many of these club facilities have been established through the new defunct Shared Responsibility Scheme (1967 and later revised in 1995) and the current Community Facilities Partnership Scheme (2001). There are currently 190 facilities developed through both schemes.

In New Zealand and in Manukau City socio-economic and resident's activity patterns have changed since the inception of these schemes. Most notably there has been a movement away from traditional club membership and organisational structures, a significant drop in voluntarism, a rapid growth in seven day a week retail trading, a growth in new sports, the development of non-team sports, the growth of passive technology leisure activities such as video games, a trend towards pay for play activities and an increase in competition for the population's available leisure time (Visitor Solutions, 2004).

These factors have impacted dramatically on the viability of many traditional community organisations, particularly sporting clubs who manage the majority of the facilities developed under both schemes. Consequently the facilities and the organisations are facing the following challenges and issues:

- ♦ Many of the facilities are ageing and require significant maintenance.
- ♦ Many of the facilities lack accurate plans, making estimates for potential refurbishment difficult.
- ♦ The designs of many of the facilities do not meet current design standards or the operational needs of secondary community groups in particular.
- ♦ Most facilities were designed for mono use.
- ♦ The operational and maintenance costs of many of the facilities is high.
- ♦ Many facilities are not being maintained regularly.
- ♦ Anecdotal evidence suggests that qualified tradespeople are not being used to maintain some facilities.

- ♦ In many cases depreciation of facilities is not being carried out (organisations do not have the capital to complete large maintenance requirements).
- ♦ Many facility's core user has in cases not evolved with the surrounding community (a facility's use has been fixed in time, even though the surrounding community and its specific needs have changed).
- ♦ A number of facility users are not completing the required works required for the Building Warrant of Fitness purposes. (15 Clubs without Building Warrant of Fitness in April 2004).
- ♦ Most of the facilities were built prior to the 1991 Building Act. If any building works are carried out subsequent to the Act there is a requirement that the facility be brought up to full compliance (for example – full disabled access, services etc). Most clubs are not able to afford this.

Council is subsequently very likely to receive back a number of facilities in poor condition. Capital will be required to demolish or redevelop the facilities.

A condition of both the Shared Responsibility Scheme (1995) and the Community Facility Partnership Scheme (2001) is that the beneficiary organisation maintain the facility appropriately. Council has simply not had the human resources to effectively monitor adherence in this regard. Furthermore, there has been a reluctance to make recommendations that advise facilities should be rationalised or decommissioned.

It is important to mention that the Shared Responsibility Scheme has over many years facilitated many viable developments across Manukau City. However, changing socio-economic patterns necessitates that a different approach to this and the current partnership scheme is required to ensure a sustainable future in community managed facility partnerships with Council.

1.7.3 Community Tenancy Facilities

Tenancies are made available by Council to community groups with subsidised rents available through the Community Tenancy Policy (2000). This policy aims to support community 'not for profit' groups to lease Council facilities and is valuable in contributing towards Council's community outcomes. There are presently approximately 50 properties across the city with community tenancy buildings located thereon, with some containing multiple tenancies. There is also significant demand from community organisations for such facilities.

Many of the buildings allocated under the Community Tenancy Policy (2000) are very old, mono-use designed and in need of improvement. Some may need to be removed from the schedule as they are inadequate for occupation or fall outside the use envisaged by the Policy. Former depots for example have been inappropriate for use by community groups and considerable building improvements have been required.

The requirements for maintenance and upgrading of tenancy facilities is substantial. Council's Building and Maintenance section is currently conducting a condition survey to further quantify maintenance requirements on all tenancy buildings. However, recent experience shows that limited resources are available to effectively carry out the necessary performance checks on community tenancies.

At the November 2003 Corporate Business Committee a moratorium for 12 months was placed on any additional community tenancy facilities until the Community Facilities Strategic Plan (2004) is developed and the Community Tenancy Policy (2000) is reviewed. The Corporate Business Committee further resolved that 'in the longer term consideration be given to developing future options for the provision of premises for community groups occupation under multiple tenancies'. (Corporate Business Committee, Manukau City Council, November 2003).

1.7.4 Council's Difficulty to Fund the Community Facility Development Programme

Manukau City Council's current 10 year community facility development programme is depicted in Appendix 3. This has been established through extensive community consultation and sets the community facility asset development priorities over the next 10 years.

Council is currently struggling to fund this programme. Some of the budgets depicted, particularly for major facility developments (such as the City Centre Swimming Pool and the Flatbush Swimming Pool) are completely unrealistic if the traditional Council delivery method for such facilities, whereby Council is the sole funder thereof, is pursued.

1.7.5 Prohibitive Policies

There is a clear mismatch between higher level strategic Council documents, such as Tomorrow's Manukau (2000) and lower level implementation documents in particular. A variety of strategic Council documents identify that facility provision is best thought of in terms of communities of interest and catchments. A further explicit Council Policy theme is to work holistically and strategically. This is reflected by the following statement made by the Community Development Framework (2000):

"Activity in one area should not occur without considering the implications and trade-offs in others. The outcomes in each area form part of a continuum and Council is developing and refining this integrated approach....." (Community Development Framework, 2000)

Against this backdrop to work more holistically is the further desire of Council to devolve decision making back to the community:

"Strengthen mechanisms for high quality local decision-making, such as greater devolution of decision-making and resourcing of community organisations to run selected facilities and programmes." (Property Strategy, 2003)

"... greater devolution of decision making to the local level, such as Community Boards or resourcing of community organisations to run selected facilities/ programmes." (Community Development Framework, 2000)

There is also a strong focus on sustainability and multi-use achieved through partnerships:

"Providing high quality, adaptable, multi-use facilities that return efficient use through the sharing of resources." (Tomorrow's Manukau, 2001)

"Wherever possible, the use of facilities should be maximised through multiple user agreements." (A Property Strategy for Manukau City, 2003)

Of particular concern to effectively matching current higher level strategic outcomes is the Community Facilities Partnership Scheme (2001). The Community Tenancy Policy (2000) and the Policy for Assessing Clubs in Difficulty (2001) are also misaligned.

As mentioned earlier, the Community Facilities Partnership Scheme (2001) replaced the redundant Shared Responsibility Scheme (1995). The expressed purpose of the Community Facilities Partnership Scheme (2001) is "to provide transparent and consistent guidelines for the development of community facilities through community partnerships that maximise the use of resources and ensure accessible community facilities services and opportunities." The policy goal is "to facilitate the development of community facilities in a way that maximises the use of resources and ensures accessible facilities and opportunities for the Manukau community".

The scheme unfortunately fails to meet most higher order Council strategic objectives and in fact fails to meet its own purpose and goals. It is therefore not positioned well to maximise capital leveraging, develop higher-level capital-intensive projects and to seek the strongest partners. This is largely due to the following factors:

- ♦ A small budget (\$500,000 per financial year) which is prorated across the Council's seven wards. In today's construction market the sums granted are insufficient to undertake even moderately small projects.
- ♦ The lack of a city-wide focus. Ward based allocations hamper a strategic network focus.
- ♦ The restriction to development on Council Reserve Land.
- ♦ Limited focus and attention towards operational sustainability.

The evidence that these factors are having an impact include:

- ♦ Long project gestation periods where funds are carried over multiple financial years in an attempt to fund the project (for example, the proposed Howick Domain multi sport development).
- ♦ Small scale projects proceeding with insufficient long term planning or analysis of their holistic impacts on wider Council objectives and initiatives.
- ♦ A distinct lack of financially viable partners committing large sums of capital (for example the Ministry of Education).
- ♦ A number of organisations struggling to maintain existing facilities.

As mentioned in section 1.7.3 there are serious issues facing Community Tenancy Facilities, particularly in relation to the condition and design thereof and in some cases, the mismatch between intended and actual activities conducted therein. There is significant community pressure for such resources. The implementation of the current Community Tenancy Policy is perpetuating the leasing of inappropriate Council facilities to interest groups. Since the policy's inception, the portfolio of facilities allocated has increased substantially, requiring additional resources and significant development costs required by Council. This has led to the current 12

month moratorium on new tenancies until this policy is reviewed and the Community Facilities Strategic Plan is developed in 2004.

The Policy for Assessing Clubs in Difficulty (2001) is reactive rather than proactive. The damage is done by the time the clubs have been identified as being under financial pressure. In many cases facility maintenance has been neglected, the facility has been designed for mono-use and membership has declined. Besides the Policy's best intentions and assessment rigour the Policy is likely to perpetuate unsustainable clubs.

Furthermore this policy deals with clubs that have been defaulting on their financial commitments to Council. However, many clubs have difficulty with regard to funding maintenance, as well as outstanding financial commitments to organisations other than Council.

1.7.6 *Facilitator of Partnerships*

Most of Council's higher-level strategic documents identify partnerships as critical to realising the city's social, economic and environmental goals. These partnerships are important in both a development and operational sense. The following statements illustrate this commitment.

"In order to make the best use of limited resources, and to minimise duplication, a clear strategy is for Council to develop partnerships, both with community, and with the private sector and the Crown." (Leisure Policy, 1998)

"... in implementing the Library Strategy, Council may seek to collaborate with other agencies, public and private, to meet community needs." (Library Strategy, 1999)

"Council's future role catalyst and facilitator of community partnerships." (Community Development Framework, 2000)

"Providing high quality, adaptable, multi-use facilities that return efficient use through the sharing of resources." (Tomorrow's Manukau, 2001)

"It [Council's] will actively pursue non-ownership modes of service delivery wherever appropriate...." (A Property Strategy for Manukau City Council, 2003)

However, despite this stated commitment to partnerships there is currently no partnership document that sets up a systematic framework for evaluating, fostering and supporting higher level strategic projects, such as large multi-sport developments and multi-use community spaces. The existing Community Facilities Partnership Scheme (2001) does not address these types of projects.

1.8 **Environmental Scan**

An initial and external SWOT analysis was conducted, focusing on variables which had or have the potential to impact or influence community facility development. The internal analysis is important in considering the adjustments that have to be made to align Council from its current path to the desired future shaped by Council's vision and the determined community needs and preferences in relation to community facilities.

The external environmental scan is often overlooked, but is vitally important. A SWOT analysis of external factors was carried out. Issues and Trends likely to effect Council's performance are identified and considered.

The SWOT analysis is summarised in Table 1.

Table 1 – SWOT Analysis

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A willingness to spend on Community Facilities (I) • An existing network of facilities (I) • Key learnings in particular over last 5 years (I) • Facilities development concurrently to growth (I/E) • Free community facilities (I) • MCC – open minded, flexible (I) • Winning awards for buildings (I) • Good consultation practices (I/E) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holding onto old facility assets (I) • Not successful in partnerships at the strategic network level – MCC tends to do things alone (I) • Budgeting – 10yr plan – not taking account of increasing building costs (I) • Poor regional collaboration with other councils (F) • Free facilities – reduced revenue for reinvestment (I) • Deterioration of Town Centres (I/E) • Limited reserve land for facility development (I) • High levels of ill-health and low levels of socio-economic well-being (E) • Consultation – need continuous improvement (I/E) • Not enough resources – Planners etc (I) • Clubs weakening – capacity significantly reduced and declining (E) • Certain policies and schemes hinder the achievement of wider Council objectives – perpetuating existing problems (I) • Lack of holistic view at times (I)
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amalgamation of clubs (multi sport) (F) • Clubs weakening/capacity reduced – thus good time for facility changes (E) • Modern Design and Materials – multi-use more practical (E/I) • Manukau City is a fast growing city (E) • Urban renewal central government projects (E) • Activity friendly environments and linkages (I/E) • Support community organisations to develop more operationally sustainable environments (I/E) • The building is greater than the sum of the parts (multi-use/multi-sport) (I/E) • Iconic buildings – urban design (I/E) • Arts community contribution to architecture • Developers contribution to community facility developments – potential for increased budgets (I/E) • Partnerships with schools (I/E) • Look beyond the land that MCC owns – partnerships (I/E) • Different development models e.g. lease back, PPP's etc (I/E) • Philanthropy (F) • Rapid growth of population (E) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor or no planning and feasibility work (E) • External funding levels reducing (E) • Rapid growth of population (E) • ASB Trust funding thresholds – potential to change (F) • Development of unsustainable facilities (E) • The potential to establish facilities prior to optimal demand – sustainability issue (I/E) • External markets fluctuating – share markets and NZS impact on grants and construction costs (E) • Current buoyant construction market (E) • Increasing growing stock of old or unsustainable community facilities (I/E) • Cost of growth – available budget in LTCCP does not cover costs (I) • Political change (E/I)

Note: Developed at an MCC Workshop held in February 2004

Key: (E) = External Variable (I) – Internal Variable

SECTION II – TOWARDS A STRATEGIC DIRECTION

2.1 Introduction

Section I has primarily focused on the current situation with respect to community facilities. This section explores where Council should be heading and what needs to be done to move away from the current trajectory.

The purpose, vision and scope of this strategy is determined. These are built on the 1995 CFP, with the necessary changes reflecting this strategy's focus and Council's higher-level strategic direction. The situational analysis expressed in Section I is then further refined as key strategic areas of focus, with the view to establishing the most appropriate way forward for the planning, development, management and operation of community facilities across Manukau City.

2.2 Purpose

The purpose of the strategy is to:

- ♦ Provide a clear method for strategic decision-making with respect to Community facility asset development.
- ♦ Ensure that Council's resources are effectively directed to facility developments most needed.
- ♦ Ensure that community facilities are developed in an appropriate sustainable manner.

2.3 Vision

The vision of the strategy is as follows:

- ♦ Timely provision of leisure, lifelong learning and social facilities that meet needs are widely accessible, buzzing with activity and used to their capacity.
- ♦ Council moving to more creative and co-operative approaches with the community and other organisations in meeting needs.
- ♦ A wide range of sustainable opportunities in the community to meet people's changing activity needs.

2.4 Scope

Community facilities are buildings which house a range of leisure and community services, including:

- ♦ Recreation, arts and cultural services
- ♦ Community centres and community houses
- ♦ Information, advice and social services
- ♦ Lifelong learning opportunities
- ♦ Community managed and community tenancy facilities

2.5 Key Strategic Direction

The situational analysis depicted in Part I has identified the key issues facing community facility development, management, operation and maintenance today.

It is clear that a significant strategic issue relates to the many unsustainable community managed facilities situated on Council Reserves. Given the socio-economic and activity pattern changes portrayed, together with current Council partnership policy, it is likely that this unsustainable trend will increase into the future. When all these 'small' facilities are viewed holistically as a network, they take on a significant strategic importance in both financial and social terms.

Even though the now obsolete Shared Responsibility Scheme (1967, 1995) did positively facilitate the city's growth, it and its successor in particular, the Community Facilities Partnership Scheme (2001) are no longer appropriate. The Community Facilities Partnership Scheme (2001) is contributing towards inappropriately planned, ad hoc, unsustainable, unstrategic, predominantly mono-use community managed facilities on Council Reserves across the city. This is contrary to Council's higher level strategic direction, a significant risk to Council and is curtailing sustainable community development.

New Zealand and International trends are congruent to Council's higher order objectives with respect to pursuing partnerships and in the development of multi-sport/and multi-use facilities. This approach will be pursued to establish sustainable community managed facilities.

Although Council managed, Community Tenancy properties have been shown to be largely in a state of disrepair, with many inappropriate and perhaps poorly located mono-use facilities. Since its inception in 2000, the portfolio of tenancy facilities allocated increased substantially, placing pressure on limited Council human and financial resources.

As with community managed facilities on reserves there needs to be a focus on moving towards establishing partnerships and multi-use facilities in particular for community tenants. A key objective of any changes to the tenancy policy is to foster both Council's and the tenants ability to provide the community with the best possible service. This would include tenants in prime locations to service their client catchment and a functional facility that aids long-term operational sustainability.

A comprehensive review of each facility and tenant will need to be conducted. Each tenants' operational catchment, market and levels of service should further be provided. An informed analysis could then be made. A similar approach should also be taken with community managed facilities and reserves.

It is likely that the network of tenancy properties requires rationalisation. Purpose built (or Council leased) multi-use facilities in strategic locations are likely to significantly benefit Council, tenants and the wider community. Some existing facilities may be functional as they currently are well located and perhaps only require small refurbishment costs. The review process is also likely to identify non or under performing tenants that no longer warrant Council's support.

The difficulty in funding the community facility asset development programme is not unique to Manukau City Council and is a phenomenon experienced by other Councils in New Zealand and Internationally. Partnerships are a common solution to this issue, where capital can be leveraged and asset utilisation maximised. Another potential alleviation of this pressure is development levies. In terms of the Local Government Act (2002) development levies may be used for the construction of community facilities. The potential for this is currently being initiated by Manukau City Council. On the current LTCCP it is likely to have the most significant impact in the Flatbush community facility development initiatives.

Taking cognisance of the above and the situational analysis the following strategic initiatives are critical to ensure that the vision of this strategy and that of other higher level Council strategies eventuates.

- ♦ Partnerships
- ♦ Multi-Use and Multi-Sport Facilities
- ♦ Policy Alignment
- ♦ Prioritisation of Community Facility Developments

2.5.1 Partnerships

As depicted, most of Council's high level strategic documents identify partnerships as being critical to achieve sustainable social, economic and environmental development. The current Community Facilities Partnership Scheme (2001) has been shown to be ineffective in forging meaningful strategic partnerships aligned to Council's current vision.

As further mentioned, Council subsequently has no partnership document that sets up a systematic framework for evaluating, fostering and supporting higher level strategic projects. International and domestic best practice illustrates that an ad hoc approach to forming higher level strategic partnerships may not be effective. A structured approach is likely to deliver a greater range and quality of strategic projects within a shorter time period, whilst maximising capital leveraging.

It is important that an effective partnership policy with a strategic city-wide focus be urgently developed to facilitate the development of community facilities across Manukau City.

The following is important to consider in developing this policy.

- ♦ Public Private Partnerships (P3s) are often too quickly purported to be a viable solution in the development of public infrastructure and service delivery. They need to be very carefully considered with respect to Council's entertainment / leisure services and associated facility development and infrastructure. The form P3s can take are diverse and complex. They are not necessarily the most appropriate approach or panacea for public infrastructure development. They are better suited to specific types of projects such as roads, prisons, defence, schools and hospitals.

A number of factors need to be considered to evaluate the viability of a P3. Three key questions are:

- Should the proposed service be delivered by Council itself?
- Will the involvement of the private sector deliver value for money?
- Does the project satisfy public interest and have public buy-in?

Projects with the following attributes are more likely to succeed as P3s (Partnerships Victoria, 2001):

- Scale - \$10 million upwards (preferably even larger than this)
- Duration - service delivery of 30 years or more
- Service Focus - clearly definable and measurable output specifications suitable for payment on a 'services delivered' basis
- Risk Transfer - scope for significant allocation of risk to the private sector
- Complexity - sufficient complexity that will invite innovative solutions
- Market Capability and appetite - existence of a genuine business opportunity and sufficient capable private sector parties

Besides the scale of community facility projects, the vast majority are not income or profit generating enterprises. They are therefore unlikely to be viable to the private sector, without significant subsidisation from a public sector partner.

It is difficult to find suitable case studies, However, evidence does show that larger one-off strategic facilities, such as indoor arenas with potential diverse revenue streams offer more scope for P3 developments. Smaller city-wide community facilities such as swimming pools and recreation centres are not good candidates for P3s and are better served by other partnership models.

Research conducted by SGL Consulting Group in 2003 of New Zealand Local Authority aquatic facility developments reveals that 89.9% of the funding is provided by TLAs, 10.7% by community sector contributions, and only 2.2% from the Commercial sector. "Clearly, if Councils are looking to the private sector to contribute major funds to future aquatic centre developments, they had better think again." (Michael King, 2003).

However, Tauranga City Council's current aquatic facility development is an exception, where around 40 - 50% private sector funding has been attained. This project will need to be researched as a best practice, with the approach to be considered for future similar partnership aspirations in Manukau City.

- ♦ Public Community Partnerships (PCPs) has been established nationally and internationally as a method for developing community facilities. Partners in PCPs are more closely aligned with community objectives than with the private sector in P3s. The growth of philanthropic organisations or trusts has helped support the viability of this approach.

In a PCP two or more public sector and community organisations form a partnership. This enables further funding to be leveraged by ways of grants from philanthropic organisations and trusts.

There are a number of Councils in New Zealand that have entered into successful partnerships with schools. However, there are a number of pitfalls that need to be very carefully considered to ensure that the partnership will truly flourish. A successful partnership in this regard is the recently completed Tamaki College Community Recreation Centre in Auckland City.

- ♦ It is important to very carefully determine that a partnership is feasible. Capital development and operational development issues are of equal importance in this respect.

2.5.2 *Multi-use and Multi-sport Facilities*

Higher level Council strategic documents have portrayed the importance for the provision of multi-use and multi-sport facilities. The current unsustainable nature of community managed and community tenancy facilities in particular necessitates pursuing this approach.

Internationally and in New Zealand many mono-use facilities are no longer functioning effectively. In most situations multi-use facilities with appropriate design are the most effective long-term sustainable option for community facility development. Synergies are created between codes and there is a reduction in operational costs.

The following is important to consider to ensure that multi-use and multi-sport developments are successful. The emphasis is on multi-sport facility development. However, most of the issues are applicable to multi-use facilities.

- ♦ Developing successful multi-use facilities requires a high degree of pre-planning and design work. They cost more to develop (than mono-facilities) but this is recouped in the longer term by reduced operational costs and greater community functionality. Council is not currently positioned in a financial sense to appropriately achieve this. The Community Facilities Partnership Scheme (2001) has been shown not to be equipped to facilitate effective multi-use and multi-sport facilities as the:
 - Scheme grants are not large enough
 - Development timeframes are stretched out over so many years that the projects are forever playing “catch-up”
- ♦ Sometimes it is more cost effective to start from a clean slate when developing multi-sport facilities

- ♦ It is important that careful attention is given to operational sustainability issues. Groups often associate a larger size building with the ability to accommodate the needs of multiple users. However, operational sustainability can be further enhanced through good design. The following sustainability issues need to be considered:
 - Life-cycle modelling
 - Revenue streams
 - Succession planning
 - Governance and management issues should be negotiated and resolved prior to construction
 - Debt levels should be sustainable

- ♦ As mentioned, international and domestic research shows that it costs more to develop multi-sport and multi-use facilities than mono-use facilities. This is primarily due to:
 - An increased level of pre-planning
 - Greater emphasis on design quality
 - Use of higher quality and low maintenance materials
 - Succession planning. For example, modular sound proof walls that can be easily modified

Besides the need for increased cost, many multi-sport facilities have unrealistically low budgets.

2.5.3 Policy Alignment

It has been identified that there are various lower order documents in particular that are currently not appropriately aligned to Council's higher level strategic direction in relation to the development of community facilities across the City. The following policies should be urgently reviewed and be better aligned to this strategy and higher level Council documents:

- ♦ Community Facilities Partnership Scheme (2001) The impediment of small budgets spread across wards, together with the lack of a city-wide strategic focus through decentralised decision-making should be specifically addressed. A new city-wide Strategy Partnership Policy needs to be considered in this regard.
- ♦ Community Tenancy Policy (2000)
- ♦ The Policy for Assessing Clubs in Difficulty (2001)

2.5.4 Prioritisation of Community Facility Developments

The 1995 CFP framework for the prioritisation of community facility developments is considered valuable for high level evaluation.

It is however necessary to add the following criteria to the existing framework to align it to current Council direction and this strategy:

- ♦ Utilisation Levels - Is the facility able to be utilised for long periods of the day (e.g. 14 hours a day)? What is the facility's realistic level of community access (particularly important with partnerships)?
- ♦ Operational Sustainability - Is the facility operationally sustainable now and into the future?
- ♦ Succession Planning - Does the proposed facility have the potential to adapt and change as the catchment community changes?
- ♦ Partnerships - Is the proposed facility development characterised by a viable and sustainable partnership that maximises capital leveraging and operational optimisation?
- ♦ Multi-Use Facilities - Is the proposed facility development a viable multi-use or multi-sport initiative?

Under Public Commitment in the current framework (1995 CFP), reference is made to "volunteering labour to provide services". This is not considered a viable indicator of public commitment, given regulatory changes over the past ten years. Club members do not always possess the necessary formal training to undertake construction or building improvements up to the required standard. Any deficiencies in workmanship may leave organisations and potentially Council legally exposed. This indicator of public commitment to a project is therefore removed.

The modified weighting factors framework is depicted in Appendix 4. It is important that this framework is used to prioritise community facility developments.

SECTION III – STRATEGIC GOALS

3.1 Introduction

This section focuses on the strategic goals necessary to achieve the vision of this strategy and address the key issues curbing sustainable community facility development across Manukau City. Part I and II of this strategy has highlighted important issues and identified key areas of concern.

Five strategic goals are identified, together with objectives, actions and performance measures. The goals are the general ends towards which Council should direct its efforts. Objectives are clear targets for specific actions needed to meet the goals. Performance measures are indicators of the work performed and the results achieved.

3.2 Strategic Goals – Community Facilities Strategic Plan 2004

Goals	Objectives	Actions	When	Whom	Performance Measures	
1. <i>The establishment of a sustainable network of community managed and community tenancy facilities</i>	◆ Understand the viability of all existing community managed and community tenancy facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Conduct a review of all community managed facilities and associated organisations situated on Manukau Parks. ■ Conduct a review of all community tenancy facilities and associated organisations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> March 2005 March 2005 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCC MCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review completed 	
	◆ Increased rationalisation of community facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Establish a redevelopment and rationalisation plan (with the purpose of enhancing viable multi-use and multi-sport facilities). ■ Facilitate multi-use multi-sport pilot initiatives. For example (but not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Te Puru • Papatoetoe Reserve • Flatbush Multi-Sport Complex (Barry Curtis Park) • Mountfort Park initiative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 2005 June 2005 June 2006 June 2008-2010 June 2006 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCC Te Pahi Trust-MCC MCC MCC CCO? MCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redevelopment and rationalisation plan completed • Increase of viable multi-use multi sport community managed and tenancy facilities across Manukau City and a corresponding decrease of unsustainable mono-use facilities • Improved operational sustainability of Sports Clubs and organisations 	
	◆ Council suitability resourced to plan, manage and monitor community managed and community tenancy facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Resourcing need identified and in place within Council's structure ■ All community managed facilities appear on the Council Asset Management Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 2005 June 2006 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCC MCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resourcing need identified and actioned • More effective management and monitoring of community managed and community tenancy facilities by Council • All community managed facilities are placed on the Council Asset Management Plan 	
	◆ Review and alignment of policies (to achieve Goal 1).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Review of Community Facilities Partnership Scheme (2001). ■ Review of Community Tenancy Policy (2000) ■ Review of the Policy for Assessing Clubs in Difficulty (2001) ■ Review of the Swimming Pool Strategy (1998) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 2005 June 2005 June 2005 June 2006 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCC MCC MCC MCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies reviewed and aligned 	
2. <i>Policy alignment and development to achieve sustainable community facility development</i>	◆ Clear partnership framework and approach with a city-wide focus.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Review existing partnership frameworks approaches and develop a policy and guidelines for Council Community partnerships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 2005 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership Policy and guidelines developed • The establishment of viable and sustainable partnerships in the development and operation of community facilities 	
	3. <i>The achievement of a sustainable LTCCP Community Facility Asset Development Programme</i>	◆ Pursuit of partnerships and other opportunities in the development (and operation) of core community facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Investigate partnerships for the development of the Flatbush Swimming Pool and City Centre Swimming Pool. ■ Establishment of the developer's contribution for financial assistance in the development of community facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2004-2010 2004-2005 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCC MCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increase of viable partnerships in the development of community facilities. • Greater leveraging of capital funding for community facility development projects on the LTCCP.
		◆ Improved project delivery.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Establish a Project Management Office function in Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 2005 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New community facilities are delivered successfully.
4. <i>A sustainable LTCCP Community Facility Operational Programme</i>	◆ Additional operational partnerships developed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Opportunities for partnerships in existing Council facilities and associated services explored and implemented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increase in viable partnerships in Council managed, operated and maintained facilities. 	
	◆ Optimise the use of existing community operated facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Continued customer feedback and analysis. Identification of trends, needs and barriers. Necessary actions taken. ■ Implementation of business strategies for each community facility related operation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCC MCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing community facilities show an increase in usage and a wider spectrum of activities conducted therein. 	
	◆ Ensuring the optimisation of future facility operations when developing new community facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sector strategies are reviewed regularly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New community facilities are delivered successfully, are functional, optimally utilised, operationally efficient with low maintenance costs. 	
5. <i>Prioritisation of community facility developments.</i>	◆ Community facility developments are systematically prioritised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The high level community facility development framework is considered when prioritising projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic decision making. 	

SECTION IV – MONITORING AND EVALUATION

4.1 Introduction

It is vitally important that this strategy is continually monitored and evaluated. It is not the purpose of this strategy to establish an elaborate results-based outcome monitoring and evaluation system. What is important however, is that the performance measures identified as part of the strategic goals and objectives are monitored (tracked) from baseline conditions, together with a validation of what results were achieved and how and why they were or were not achieved (evaluation).

4.2 Performance Measures

Performance measures are identified for each objective and associated strategies under the five strategic goals listed in Part III of this strategy. It is important that these are continually monitored and evaluated.

4.3 Review of Strategy

International practice in relation to facility plans and strategies recommend annual updates to ensure that new community research and business opportunities are incorporated. As mentioned, the 1995 Community Facilities Plan recommended a review of the said plan every five years. It is very probable that this long delay was also a factor of the plans rather rapid demise.

It is therefore a recommendation that this strategy be formally reviewed annually.

CONCLUSION

This strategy has reviewed the 1995 Community Facilities Plan. A significant omission of that plan is the lack of attention to the community managed facility network on Council reserves in particular.

Through an investigatory, marketing and futures based approach, a situational analysis has revealed a number of critical issues and areas contributing towards unsustainable community facility development across Manukau City.

The purpose, scope and vision for this strategy is established. Key strategic initiatives that need to be considered are portrayed. Goals, objectives and actions are set to provide the framework for achieving this strategy's vision. Performance measures, continual monitoring and evaluation requirements, and a formal annual review is advocated to ensure that the strategy remains a 'live' and useful document.

REFERENCES

British Columbia Parks and Recreation Association (1996) *The Benefits Catalogue*, British Columbia, Canada

Hillary Commission for Recreation and Sport (early 1990's) *Recreation Planning – A Guide for Local Government*, Wellington, New Zealand

King, Michael (2003) *Who Pays*, Australian Leisure Management, December 2003/January 2004

Manukau City Council (2000) *Community Development Framework*, Manukau City, New Zealand

Manukau City Council (2000) *Community Tenancy Policy*, Manukau City, New Zealand

Manukau City Council (2001) *Community Facilities Partnership Scheme*, Manukau City, New Zealand

Manukau City Council (1995) *Community Facilities Plan – A Strategy and 10 year facility Development Programme for Manukau City*, Manukau City, New Zealand

Manukau City Council (2003) *Corporate Business Committee November 2003*, Manukau City, New Zealand

Manukau City Council (2003) *Developing Tomorrow's Manukau – A Property Strategy for Manukau City Council*, Manukau City New Zealand

Manukau City Council (2002) *Making Connections – A Strategy for Manukau's Parks into the future*. Manukau City New Zealand

Manukau City Council (2001) *Policy for Assessing Clubs in Difficulty*, Manukau City, New Zealand

Manukau City Council (2001) *Tomorrow's Manukau – A Vision for Manukau in the Future 2001 – 2010*, Manukau City, New Zealand

State of Victoria – Department of Treasury and Finance (2001) *Partnerships Victoria Overview*, Melbourne, Australia

Visitor Solutions (2004) *Community Facility Plan Assistance Study*, Manukau City, New Zealand

APPENDIX ONE - KEY GOALS AND ACTIONS ADVOCATED BY TOMORROW'S MANUKAU (2001) IN RELATION TO COMMUNITY FACILITY DEVELOPMENT

Healthy and Economically Secure People

- Goal:* *Fit and Active People*
- Target:* The rate of physical activity of young people and adults increases from 57% and 63% in 1997 to above the national rate of 69% and 67% by 2010.
- Action (inter alia):* Promote the innovative provision of leisure facilities which are suited to multiple uses.....
(Tomorrow's Manukau, 2001, p 37-38)

Educated and Knowledgeable People

- Goal:* *Tertiary learning is encouraged and the opportunities are more accessible.*
- Action (inter alia):* The provision of space in the city is facilitated so that a university campus exists in the city by 2010.
(Tomorrow's Manukau, 2001, p 22)
- Goal:* *All Manukau people have easy access to knowledge, information and resources.*
- Action (inter alia):* Provide more publicly available information and knowledge resources throughout Manukau.
(Tomorrow's Manukau, 2001, p 24)
- Goal:* *Organisations in Manukau work together to achieve results.*
- Action (inter alia):* Lead Manukau educational organisations to identify and pursue opportunities for co-operation at all levels to improve services, facilities and resources.
(Tomorrow's Manukau, 2001, p 24)

Vibrant and Strong Communities

- Goal:* *A City that people are proud to live in and call their own,*
- Action (inter alia):* Identify and preserve local heritage and local history and identities through projects in streets, parks and local facilities.
(Tomorrow's Manukau, 2001, p 26)
- Goal:* *Neighbourhoods where people can relate to each other.*
- Action (inter alia):* Complete the network for social facilities available within walking distance of local centres within connected streets and walkways.
(Tomorrow's Manukau, 2001, p 27)

- Goal:* *Places, spaces and occasions for people to express their culture.*
- Action (inter alia):*
- Implement a plan to encourage exhibition, performance, events, public art, multi media activity; fund and deliver features and projects which reflect Manukau's cultural and artistic flair...
 - Provide places and spaces for cultural and heritage expression in town centres, community buildings, reserves and other public places.
 - Profile Manukau's multicultural richness to visitors and create a high profile Manukau complex for sporting, cultural, visual and performing arts and community events.
- (Tomorrow's Manukau, 2001, p 27)
- Goal:* *City Centre and Town Centres with heart*
- Action:* Adopt a programme to make the city centre more dynamic and lively as a cultural and social centre by: inter alia, investing in a city library and a Council service centre located to support street life and foot traffic.
(Tomorrow's Manukau, 2001, p 27)
- Goal:* *People working together to achieve results*
- Action (inter alia):* Lead Manukau organisations to identify and pursue opportunities for co-operation at all levels to improve services, facilities and resources.
(Tomorrow's Manukau, 2001, p 31)

Sustainable Manukau

- Goal:* *A tourism and cultural centre*
- Action (inter alia):* Build a regional multi-purpose events centre for economic, cultural and sporting events.
(Tomorrow's Manukau, 2001, p 44)
- Goal:* *Quality living conditions*
- Action (inter alia):* Design greenfields projects to achieve developments that implement quality objectives and sustainable design principles.
(Tomorrow's Manukau, 2001, p 45)
- Goal:* *People working together to achieve results*
- Action (inter alia):* Lead Manukau organisations to identify and pursue opportunities for co-operation at all levels to improve services, facilities and resources.
(Tomorrow's Manukau, 2001, p 48)
- Goal:* *A greener City where people and the environment nurture each other*
- Action (inter alia):* Providing high quality, adaptable, multi-use facilities that return efficient use through the sharing of resources. (Tomorrow's Manukau 2001, p.45)

APPENDIX TWO – 1995 COMMUNITY FACILITIES PLAN – WEIGHTING FACTORS FRAMEWORK

Equity Goals

- Is the decision to build in this community fair? Does the proposed facility address the needs of those communities / groups who are missing out the most, or have least access to sources?**
1. Fair Distribution
Does the ward/community have a low number of facilities (of this type) compared to other wards/communities? Are there demands which cannot be met because existing facilities are used to capacity?
 2. Growing Demand
Is the population growing, or projected to grow rapidly?
 3. Disadvantaged Groups
Would the facility meet the needs of disadvantaged groups, as well as the broad community e.g. people with disabilities, people on benefits?
 4. Ability to meet own needs
Is this a ward/community which has less ability to meet its own needs, e.g. through fundraising, sponsorship, etc, or through travelling out of the community?

Effectiveness Goals

- Does the proposed facility address community needs and preferences?**
5. Unmet Needs
Are there a high number of people in this ward/community having unmet needs in relation to the proposed facility type? (Community Needs and Preference Study)
 6. Supporting Research
Is the need for the proposed facility supported by a range of research and public consultation or evidence of public support?
 7. Community Preference
How important is this type of facility to this ward/community? (Community Needs and Preference Study)
 8. Public Commitment
Is public commitment to the project demonstrated through community volunteer efforts, e.g. raising funds, volunteering labour to provide services, working partnership with Council?

Strategic Plan Goals

- Does the proposed facility support the directions of the City's Strategic Plan?**
9. City Identity
Does the proposed facility build City/community identity, sense of place?
 10. Treaty of Waitangi
Does the proposed facility enhance the sovereignty of tangata whenua and other Maori over their own culture?
 11. Cultural Diversity
Does the proposed facility help develop and strengthen the cultural identity of the City's diverse cultures?
 12. Economic Development
Does the proposed facility contribute to economic development, particularly permanent employment opportunities?
 13. Social Development
Does the proposed facility contribute to the social development areas of:
 - ♦ education, training, and lifelong learning;
 - ♦ leisure, recreation, and cultural expression;
 - ♦ health

**APPENDIX THREE – MANUKAU CITY COUNCIL CURRENT 10-YEAR
COMMUNITY FACILITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (2003-2013)**

Asset Development Type	Financial Year									
	03/04 (\$000's)	04/05 (\$000's)	05/06 (\$000's)	06/07 (\$000's)	07/08 (\$000's)	08/09 (\$000's)	09/10 (\$000's)	10/11 (\$000's)	11/12 (\$000's)	12/13 (\$000's)
Community Facilities Tenancy	0	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Allocation of Community Buildings for Community Use	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Community Houses	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
Minor Assets										
Community Development Services Total	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
3 Minor Asset Development	20	20	21	23	21	23	21	23	21	23
CAB Total	20	20	21	23	21	23	21	23	21	23
Beachlands Library Development	0	50	1,000	1,600	0	0	0	0	0	0
Botany Library Development	3,160	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Centre Library Development	0	0	0	0	4,000	0	0	0	0	0
Clendon Library Development	3,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Flat Bush Library Development	0	0	0	1,475	3,225	0	0	0	0	0
Otara Library Development	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clendon Library Learning Centre	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Highland Park Library Learning Centre	0	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howick Library Learning Centre	0	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mangere East Library Learning Centre	0	0	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mangere Bridge Library Extension Fitout (carry forward)	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mangere Library Learning Centre	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa Learning Centre	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Otara Library Learning Centre	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pakuranga Learning Centre	0	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tupu Learning Centre	0	0	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Library Information Technology	350	350	350	353	350	350	350	350	350	350
Library Collection Renewals	2,400	2,500	2,600	2,700	2,800	2,900	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Library Management System Renewal	0	1,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mobile Library Renewal	0	0	1,137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Safety Upgrades	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Asset Development Type	Financial Year									
	03/04 (\$000's)	04/05 (\$000's)	05/06 (\$000's)	06/07 (\$000's)	07/08 (\$000's)	08/09 (\$000's)	09/10 (\$000's)	10/11 (\$000's)	11/12 (\$000's)	12/13 (\$000's)
Libraries Minor Assets	185	165	165	165	165	165	165	165	165	165
Libraries and Learning Centres Total	6,672	5,262	5,471	6,290	10,540	3,415	3,515	3,515	3,515	3,515
Housing for the Elderly Renewals	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Social Housing Total	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Mangere Arts Centre Development	0	0	0	1,000	1,000	0	0	0	0	0
City Arts Collection Acquisitions	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arts Equipment Renewals	14	4	20	24	58	16	33	23	17	7
Arts Minor Assets	159	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arts Total	192	44	20	1,024	1,058	16	33	23	17	7
Community Halls Minor Assets	60	31	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Community Halls Total	60	31	25	5	25	25	25	25	25	25
City Centre Swimming Pool Development	0	0	0	0	5,000	500	0	0	0	0
Flat Bush Swimming Pool and Recreation Centre Development	0	0	0	0	500	9,450	50	0	0	0
Lloyd Elsmore Swimming Pool Upgrade	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa Swimming Pool Development	8,860	2,500	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norman Kirk Swimming Pool Development	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swimming Pools Equipment Renewals	38	30	25	60	96	62	25	81	69	61
Swimming Pools Minor Assets	42	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swimming Pools Total	9,045	2,572	65	60	5,596	10,012	75	81	69	61
Allan Brewster Recreation Centre Mobile Bleacher Seating	0	144	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa Fitness Centre Equipment	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recreation Centre Equipment Renewals	384	395	437	627	647	611	528	697	592	551
Recreation Centre Minor Assets	85	38	1	22	14	4	3	20	3	2
Recreation Centres Total	514	577	438	649	661	615	531	717	596	553

APPENDIX FOUR – MODIFIED WEIGHTING FACTORS FRAMEWORK FOR PRIORITISING COMMUNITY FACILITY DEVELOPMENTS - 2004

Equity

- Is the decision to build in this community fair? Does the proposed facility address the needs of those communities / groups who are missing out the most, or have least access to sources?**
1. Fair Distribution
Does the ward/community have a low number of facilities (of this type) compared to other wards/communities? Are there demands which cannot be met because existing facilities are used to capacity?
 2. Growing Demand
Is the population growing, or projected to grow rapidly?
 3. Disadvantaged Groups
Would the facility meet the needs of disadvantaged groups, as well as the broad community e.g. people with disabilities, people on benefits?
 4. Ability to meet own needs
Is this a ward/community which has less ability to meet its own needs, e.g. through fundraising, sponsorship, etc, or through travelling out of the community?

Effectiveness Goals

- Does the proposed facility address community needs and preferences?**
5. Unmet Needs
Are there a high number of people in this ward/community having unmet needs in relation to the proposed facility type? (Community Needs and Preference Study)
 6. Supporting Research
Is the need for the proposed facility supported by a range of research and public consultation or evidence of public support?
 7. Community Preference
How important is this type of facility to this ward/community? (Community Needs and Preference Study)
 8. Public Commitment
Is public commitment to the project demonstrated through community volunteer efforts, e.g. raising funds, working partnership with Council?
 9. Utilisation Levels
Is the facility able to be utilised for long periods of the day (e.g. 14 hours a day) - design and function issues. What is the facility's realistic level of community access (particularly important with partnerships/refurbishment)?
 10. Operational Sustainability
Is the facility operationally sustainable now and into the future? Does the level of available operational support enable the facility to run at 80-100% efficiency (e.g. make sure a facility is not just a "brick shell" it must deliver operationally, does the facility design push up operational costs)?

Strategic Plan Goals

- Does the proposed facility support the directions of the City's Strategic Plan?**
11. City Identity
Does the proposed facility build City/community identity, sense of place?
 12. Treaty of Waitangi
Does the proposed facility enhance the sovereignty of tangata whenua and other Maori over their own culture?

- | | |
|---|--|
| 13. Cultural Diversity | Does the proposed facility help develop and strengthen the cultural identity of the City's diverse cultures? |
| 14. Economic Development | Does the proposed facility contribute to economic development, particularly permanent employment opportunities? |
| 15. Social Development | Does the proposed facility contribute to the social development areas of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ education, training, and lifelong learning; ◆ leisure, recreation, and cultural expression; ◆ safety; ◆ health |
| 16. Does the proposed facility meet succession planning principles? | Does the proposed facility have the potential to adapt and change as the catchment community changes so as not to become 'temporally locked'? What degree of flexibility does the facility have to 'cost effectively' evolve? (These issues may also be linked to the site). |
| 17. Partnerships | Is the proposed facility development characterised by a viable and sustainable partnership that maximises capital leveraging and operational optimisation? |
| 18. Multi-use Facility | Is the proposed facility development a viable multi-use or multi-sport initiative? |

12. COMMUNITY FACILITIES STRATEGIC PLAN: IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE (see Appendix "C")

Purpose of Report : Strategy
 Significance of Decision : Medium/High
 Reporting Unit : Community Directorate, Community Policy & Planning Unit
 Reporting Officer : David Tucker, Manager Community Policy & Planning
 Ward : Citywide

MINUTE NO. SD/MAR/363/07 – COMMITTEE DECISION

1. That the following Implementation priorities be approved for action.

Goals	Objectives	Actions	When	
1. The establishment of a sustainable network of community managed and Council owned facilities	1.1 Consolidation of existing community facilities through shared buildings and development of multi use facilities	1.1.1 Assist with current and future shared clubroom projects, namely: Te Puru, Papatoetoe Reserve, Mountfort Park, and Mangere Foreshore and others as they arise.	On going	
		1.1.2 Adopt the consolidation guidelines proposed in section 5.1 to clarify Council's approach to future consolidation projects	March 2007	
		1.1.3 Buildings on reserves be considered for removal as club rooms become vacated on a case by case basis in consultation with Community Boards and the community.	On going	
	1.2 The achievement of a sustainable Community Facility Asset Development programme	1.2.1 Strategic Funding Advisor employed (from within existing FTE's)	April 2007	
		1.2.2 Funding Partnership Programme and Guidelines established	June 2008	
	1.3 The achievement of sustainable community facility operations	1.3.1 Establish Capacity building programmes in partnership with CMS, Manukau Leisure CCO and others	December 2007	
		1.3.1 All community managed facilities appear on Council's Asset management Plan	June 2007	
	2. Policy alignment to achieve sustainable community facility development	2.1 Review and alignment of policies and work streams to achieve Objectives	2.1.1 Review Community Facilities Partnership Scheme	December 2007
			2.1.2 Review Community Tenancy Policy	December 2008
2.1.3 Review Policy for Assessing Clubs in Difficulty (focus on amalgamation as a priority)			December 2009	

2. That Council adopts a strategic partnership funding approach with the view to achieving a sustainable Community Capital Development Programme.

3. That a Strategic Funding Co-ordinator be employed, from within existing resources, to develop and implement a Funding Partnership Model.

4. That the following Consolidation Guidelines be the subject of a Councillor Sounding Board:

Council as Proactive Facilitator

Council will prioritise and proactively facilitate "consolidation packages" whereby clubs are assisted to share new or existing facilities. These packages will take two forms, namely:

(i) Council as "Lead Developer" for Large scale pre planned Facilities (\$2M plus)

12. *Continued*

- (a) *Council may choose to act as lead developer for selected large scale shared facilities (e.g. Barry Curtis Park) where considered appropriate and where it can pre plan its funding through the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP).*
- (b) *Funding partnerships will be actively pursued for all large scale capital projects. Partners may vary according to the project (e.g. private, public, NGO's, philanthropic, national, international, banks).*
- (c) *The total capital development cost of the facility must be secured before any implementation commences. This particularly relates to external funding from clubs and other independent funding organisations (e.g. ASB Trust, Lotteries Commission). All risk with regard to the development of the facility must be identified along with which party carries that risk.*
- (d) *Council will pre determine its upper level of financial involvement in all capital projects (including larger projects). If partner funding does not reach overall targets, the project does not proceed.*
- (e) *There will be a flexible and innovative approach towards the mix of uses, (e.g. community, sports commercial such as restaurants, cafes, bars)*
- (f) *Dedicated strategic funding expertise will be made available in house to facilitate packages and develop a structured framework to secure funding from external organisations. The strategy for dealing with funding agencies needs to be developed and managed from a corporate level as opposed to the project level.*
- (g) *The operating costs of the facility must be robustly estimated along with how these costs will be met. A critical element is to develop a governance structure to manage these facilities in an equitable and responsible manner. This will ensure each party understands their respective financial commitments to the sustainable management of the facility.*
- (h) *Building lifecycle costs (refurbishment and renewal) must be considered in the funding proposals.*
- (i) *Council will consider its involvement on a case by case basis for projects in the region of \$150,000 - \$2M where they do not meet the criteria for a Council Grant under the Community Facilities Partnership Scheme or other such grants. In general these projects should be managed by the Clubs involved.*

(ii) *Council as a Reactive Facilitator**Smaller scale (up to \$150,000) Community Driven Projects*

- (a) *Council will change the Community Facilities Partnership Scheme Policy to fund small projects (e.g. under \$150,000) aimed at achieving consolidation of buildings. The primary focus of this fund will be to ensure higher level and more efficient usage of existing buildings. (For example, an extension to an existing building should be given priority where shared clubrooms are proposed).*
- (b) *If/when buildings on reserves become vacated through the consolidation process they will be considered for removal as club rooms become vacated on a case by case basis in consultation with Community Boards and the community to create public open space.*

12. *Continued*

5. ***Establish Management Capacity Building Programmes in partnership with others, in particular:***
- (i) ***Council will support and fund the involvement of partners such as Counties Manukau Sports, possibly the Manukau Leisure CCO and others, to assist with amalgamating and rationalising management structures and where possible professionalising them. Particular priorities include:***
- (a) ***Rationalisation of services and streamlining of volunteer effort around administrative duties to enable more and better coaching at sport clubs.***
- (b) ***Increased commercial, funding and sponsorship opportunities created from the "critical mass" of sports clubs.***
- (c) ***Active strengthening of the identity and brand of Manukau organisations.***
- (d) ***Funding for the above to be provided through the LTCCP and Annual Planning process.***
6. ***That the Community Facilities Partnership Scheme be reviewed by December 2007 with the view to reorienting it towards assisting clubs to share buildings.***

Cr Bob Wichman left the meeting at 6.04pm and re-entered at 6.06pm.

Cr Su'a William Sio left the meeting at 6.08pm.

Cr Noel Burnside left the meeting at 6.15pm and re-entered at 6.17pm.
