AGENDA

COMMUNITY & CULTURE COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, 11 July 2017
Commencing at 1.00 pm

Tauranga City Council
Council Chambers, 91 Willow Street, Tauranga

Please note that this meeting will be audio recorded. The recording will be publicly available on Tauranga City Council's website: www.tauranga.govt.nz.

NOTICE OF MEETING

I hereby give notice that a meeting of the Community & Culture Committee will be held in the Tauranga City Council Chambers, 91 Willow Street (access off the Library Arcade), Tauranga to consider the business as set out herein.

G Poole
Chief Executive
Common Responsibilities and Delegations

The following common responsibilities and delegations apply to all standing committees.

Responsibilities of Standing Committees

- Establish priorities and guidance on programmes relevant to the Role and Scope of the committee.
- Provide guidance to staff on the development of investment options to inform the Long Term Plan and Annual Plans.
- Report to Council on matters of strategic importance.
- Recommend to Council investment priorities and lead Council considerations of relevant strategic and high significance decisions.
- Provide guidance to staff on levels of service relevant to the role and scope of the committee.
- Establish and participate in relevant task forces and working groups.
- Engage in dialogue with strategic partners, such as Smart Growth partners, to ensure alignment of objectives and implementation of agreed actions.
- Confirmation Committee minutes.

Delegations to Standing Committees

- To make recommendations to Council relevant to the Role and Scope of the Committee.
- To develop and consider, receive submissions on and adopt strategies, policies and plans relevant to the role and scope of the committee, except where these may only be legally adopted by Council.
- To consider, consult on, hear and make determinations on relevant strategies, policies and bylaws (including adoption of drafts), making recommendations to Council on adoption, rescinding and modification, where these must be legally adopted by Council.
- To approve relevant submissions to central government, its agencies and other bodies.
- To develop expectation documents and comment on Statement of Intents for CCOs (and alternative delivery models), where the activity that the CCO undertakes is relevant to the role and scope of the committee.
- Engage external parties as required.
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5
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**Role**

- To ensure social and cultural diversity and heritage are recognised and celebrated.
- To enable a socially inclusive, vibrant and happy city.
- To ensure Tauranga’s community assets and spaces can be enjoyed by everyone.
- To ensure Council is meeting the changing needs of our communities.

**Scope**

- Overseeing the provision and enhancement of community assets, facilities and spaces.
- Enhancing community development partnerships with social sector partners and Tangata Whenua.
- Engaging communities on issues of importance to Council, the community and the city.
- Participation in partnerships to address community issues and social inclusion.
- Supporting arts, heritage and community events.
- Developing recommendations on investment options for new community and cultural assets.
- Developing positions on the adoption, modification or rescinding of community bylaws and policies.

**Power to Act**

- To make all decisions necessary to fulfil the role and scope of the Committee subject to the limitations imposed.
- To establish subcommittees, working parties and forums as required.
- To evaluate and resolve applications to Stewart Trust and Carruthers Trust funds.
- To co-opt non-voting members, including one Tangata Whenua or other representatives, to the Committee.
Power to Recommend

- To Council and/or any standing committee as it deems appropriate.
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1. Apologies

2. Public Forum

2.1 Anna Larson - Welcome Bay Community Issues

2.2 Alan Northcote - Welcome Bay Supermarket

3. Chairperson’s Report

4. Lead Officer’s Report

The Lead Officer to provide a verbal update.

5. Acceptance of Late Items

6. Change to the Order of Business

7. Confirmation of Minutes, Matters Arising and Adoption of Recommendations

*Suggested Recommendation*

*That it be Resolved*

That the Community & Culture Committee:

Confirms the minutes of the Community & Culture Committee (M17/48) dated 13 June 2017 as a true and correct record (and the recommendations contained therein be adopted [if relevant]).
7.1 Minutes - Community & Culture Committee-Workshop - 13 June 2017 (M17_48) - Open
Members Present: Cr Terry Molloy (Chairperson)
Cr Leanne Brown (Deputy Chairperson)
Mayor Greg Brownless (ex officio)
Cr Kelvin Clout
Cr Bill Grainger
Cr Steve Morris
Cr Catherine Stewart

Also Present: Cr Larry Baldock
As listed in the minutes

In Attendance: Rebecca Perrett, General Manager: Environmental Services
Philip King, General Manager: Community Services
Meagan Holmes, Manager: Community Development
Rebecca Gallagher, Corporate and Policy Planner/Committee Lead
Sandra Des Forges, Corporate and Policy Planner
Alana Rapson, Safe City Co-ordinator
Ben Burmand, Strategic Advisor City Development
Dean Williams, Manager: City Development
Merinda Pansegrouw, Committee Advisor

M17/48.1 PUBLIC FORUM

(a) Criss Olsen – Welcome Bay Supermarket

Criss Olsen provided tabled item (1), outlining the following:

Key Points
- Represented ratepayers who were concerned about the proposal to put a supermarket in public open space
- Not against a supermarket per se, but having it in a park was not supported
- Community had an obligation to future generations to maintain green space
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- Council’s Open Space Strategy of 2006 – “protect, develop and enhance a network of open spaces”
- “Supermarket in a park” was against the plan outlined on every page of the Council’s Open Space Strategy
- With population growth and smaller sections, existing open space under pressure – greater need to protect existing spaces
- No alternative location to move sports games to – Sport Bay of Plenty stated that there were no surplus sport grounds – Parau Farms only available from 2023
- Shopping trends – online purchasing
- Supermarket would not ease traffic congestion – rush hour commuters were not travelling to supermarkets
- Wording of the questionnaire was misleading – people did not realise that they needed to respond to the questionnaire if they did not want a supermarket on park land
- Referred to Reserves Act 1977, Sections 41 and 17 – the Management Plan shall provide for and ensure the use, enjoyment, maintenance, protection and preservation of the reserve for the purpose it was classified
- Commended Council on their farsightedness thus far in providing beautiful open spaces for the health and enjoyment of the community

In Response to Questions
- Concerns applied not only to Waipuna Park, but also included Waitaha Reserve and Owens Park
- Received over 1200 responses from the community to date
- Report on the matter to be considered at the next meeting of the Community and Culture Committee scheduled for 11 July 2017.

1:21 p.m. Cr Baldock entered the meeting.

M1748.2

CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

Key Points
- Rebecca Gallagher, Corporate and Policy Planner/Committee Lead would be on maternity leave from 30 June 2017 – wished her all the best and thanked her for her continued dedication and hard work
- The Tauranga City Council to screen all three upcoming Lions tests against the All Blacks live at the Edgewater Fan area near the waterfront in the CBD, scheduled for 24 June, 1 July and 8 July 2017.

M1748.3

LEAD OFFICER’S REPORT

Key Points
- Update on Committee’s activities from July to September 2017
- Tsunami Siren/Alerting Systems scheduled for consideration at September 2017 meeting and information on Tsunami Siren/Alerting Systems would be available in time for inclusion in the Long Term Plan 2018-2028
A workshop on Bylaws would be scheduled within the next weeks - Liquor Free Zones and related Bylaws, as raised during the Annual Plan deliberations, to be addressed as part of this workshop.

**CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES, MATTERS ARISING AND ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

M17/48.4 **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

Moved Cr Clout/Seconded Cr Brown

*That it be Resolved*

*That the Community & Culture Committee:*

(a) Confirms the minutes of the Community & Culture Committee meeting and workshop (M17/34) dated 9 May 2017 as a true and correct record (and the recommendations contained therein be adopted [if relevant]).

*CARRIED* unanimously

**Matters arising**

- A feedback session between staff, Cr Molloy and Cr Grainger had been scheduled for 16 June 2017 on future options for the Gate Pa Bowls Club and the status of the Welcome Bay Tennis Club. All Elected Members were welcome to attend.
- Workshop to provide feedback on progress with the development of the Community Strategy scheduled for July 2017.

**PRESENTATIONS**

M17/48.5 **PRESENTATION – SOCIALINK**

Liz Davies, General Manager, SociaLink, provided *PowerPoint Presentation* [A] outlining the following:

**Key Points**

- Why Socialink existed
- Margaret Thatcher There is no such thing as society “We are all in this together”
- How did spontaneously organised volunteer efforts for the Rena occur?
- Why did we talk about ‘community’ as an entity, rather than a group of citizens
- Thatcher said people had a duty to take responsibility for themselves first, help those less fortunate and not look to government to solve problems

**THESE MINUTES ARE YET TO BE CONFIRMED**

Open Section

To be confirmed by the Community & Culture Committee on 11.7.17
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- Society was the people, businesses, the local/central government and social services – we are all in this together – for good and for bad
- Tauranga had an enviable natural environment, climate, growing population and thriving economy
- Tauranga also had income inequality, disadvantage, homelessness, violence, drug and alcohol abuse, unemployment, people very stressed living on very little
- The good and the bad were created from local, regional, national and international economic and social systems
- Many people had been able to take advantage of these systems
- Some not, due to intergenerational dysfunction fuelled by poverty, in turn fuelled by drug and alcohol abuse, discrimination, poor choices, illness, disability
- Social Issues in Tauranga:
  o Four indicators that were associated with having poor outcomes later in life:
    ß Having a child, youth and family (CYF) finding of abuse or neglect
    ß Being mostly supported by benefits since birth
    ß Having a parent with a prison or community sentence
    ß Having a mother with no formal qualifications
  o 2,736 0-24 year olds in Tauranga had two or more risk factors, comprising 14% of all 0-24 year olds
  o How did Tauranga compare - aligned exactly with areas with highest levels of deprivation
- What to do?
  o Social services established to work with individuals, families/whanau to address risk indicators
  o SociaLink worked with and supported social services to do a very hard job in a difficult working environment
  o Raison d’etre - To champion, connect and build the capability of groups, organisations and entities that supported social outcomes
  o How we did this? Supported crew for groups and batting for the people and groups who helped people
- Supporting communities: Chamber of Commerce, Creative Bay of Plenty, Tourism Bay of Plenty, Sport Bay of Plenty, Priority One
- Key initiatives
  o Central Government changes
    ò Charities Services reporting requirements
    ò Social investment approach
    ò Establishment of the Ministry for Vulnerable Children
    ò Changes in funding
    ò Information collection requirements
    ò Vulnerable Children’s Act 2014
  o What did this mean for community services?
    ò Lack of certainty and transparency about the implications of the changes
    ò Rationalisation of the sector i.e. fewer, larger providers
    ò Corporatisation of the sector
    ò Increased expectation for agencies to work together
    ò Changes to the types of services funded
    ò Lack of funding and focus on adults and older people
- Impact on community services
- Conclusion
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- SociaLink can support Council
- Agencies approaching Council to be referred to Socialink
- Can provide input on related policies/strategies.

In Response to Questions
- Information on how Tauranga compared with Rotorua and Hamilton with regard to levels of deprivation was available
- Funders: TECT, BayTrust and Acorn Foundation
- Close relationships in place with all agencies to avoid duplications
- Coordinating individual projects aimed at feeding the homeless could increase impact
- Three-year action plan was in place as enabler to deliver
- Urgent need to prioritise research to understand the levels/problems caused by P-use (methamphetamine) in Tauranga’s communities to empower agencies to assist
- Socialink supported the living wage
- “Closing the Gap – Join the Conversation” – Socialink, in collaboration with Closing the Gap, supported by Priority One, created an opportunity to discuss how to close the inequality gap
- Living wage debate required further contemplation: issue to be revisited to ensure robust consideration - to possibly be treated as part of Annual Plan deliberations.

Items for Staff Follow-up
- Provide Elected Members with a copy of SociaLink’s Three-year Action Plan
- Provide Elected Members with statistics on how Tauranga compared with Rotorua and Hamilton in terms of levels of deprivation
- “Closing the Gap – Join the Conversation” scheduled for Thursday 20th July 2017, 4pm – 6.30pm at Club Mount Maunganui to be diarised in Elected Members’ calendars.

BUSINESS

M17/48.6  TAUANGA WESTERN BAY SAFER COMMUNITIES STRATEGIC PLAN ADOPTION (DC 78)

Alana Rapson, Safer Communities Coordinator and Meagan Holmes, Manager: Community Development presented the report and responded to questions.

2:11 p.m. Mayor Brownless entered the meeting.

Points Raised by Elected Members
- Opportunity #4 on Page 41: “Support initiatives to address “P” use in our community” currently ranked as “Low” - needed to be reviewed as it was a matter of serious concern
- Safety Goal Three: Schedule focussed primarily on alcohol – needed to address non-alcohol drugs as well
- Central Government Funding could be sought for this initiative.

Objective ID: A7961612

THESE MINUTES ARE YET TO BE CONFIRMED

Open Section  To be confirmed by the Community & Culture Committee on 11.7.17
Moved Cr Brown/Seconded Cr Morris

**That it be Resolved**

**That the Community & Culture Committee:**

(a) Receive and adopt Tauranga Western Bay Safer Communities (TWBSC) final Strategic Plan 2016-2019.

(b) Receive and adopt Tauranga Western Bay Safe Communities Action Plan.

**CARRIED unanimously**

_________________________________
The meeting closed at 2.22 p.m.

_________________________________
Record of a meeting of an OPEN Workshop of the Community & Culture Committee held on 13 June 2017 at 2:23 p.m.

Members Present: Cr Terry Molloy (Chairperson)
Cr Leanne Brown (Deputy Chairperson)
Mayor Greg Brownless (ex officio)
Cr Kelvin Clout
Cr Bill Grainger
Cr Steve Morris
Cr Catherine Stewart

Also Present: Cr Larry Baldock

In Attendance: Philip King, General Manager: Community Services
Rebecca Perrett, General Manager: Environmental Services
Meagan Holmes, Manager: Community Development
Rebecca Gallagher, Corporate and Policy Planner/Committee Lead
Sandra Des Forges, Corporate and Policy Planner
Alana Rapson, Safe City Co-ordinator
Simone Cuers, Contractor: Community Development
Dani Jurgeleit, Community Development Partner
Anthony Campbell, Community Development Advisor (Graffiti & Youth)
Merinda Pansegrouw, Committee Advisor

1. WORKSHOP BRIEF – COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PRESENTATION (DCW 131)

Meagan Holmes, Manager: Community Development and Philip King, General Manager: Community Services presented PowerPoint Presentation (B) outlining the following, and responded to questions:

Key Points
- Areas of community need
  - Supporting older adults
  - Social infrastructure provision
  - Inequality – the gap between rich and poor
  - Affordable and social housing
  - Children and young people
  - Safer communities
- The numbers: aging population
  - 19.4% of population aged 65 years and above (14.3% NZ)
  - By 2033 this was expected to rise to 34% of total population
  - 27% of population lived with a disability (24% NZ)
  - For those reaching age 65 in 2016 (born in 1951) the cohort life tables indicated a life expectancy of 86.2 years for males and 88.9 years for females. That was, a further 20-22 and 23-25 years on average for males and females, respectively.
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- 27% of the Bay’s population lived with a disability; the second highest number in the country

- The Numbers: Inequality
  - Seven suburbs identified as being 9 or 10 on deprivation scale
  - (Greerton, Gate Pa, Kairua, Matapihi, Sulphur Point, Tauranga Hospital and Yatton Park)
  - Approx. 10% of population lived in these suburbs
  - No suburbs that were ranked as 1 on the deprivation scale
  - Based on national statistics up to 2,600 children under the age of 15 lived in poverty in Tauranga
  - Average household income was lower than national average - 56% of households had a household income of $70k or less

- The numbers: children and young people
  - 20.5% of population under the age of 15 years
  - Expected to drop to 15% by 2033

- The numbers: affordable and social housing
  - 86% of first home buyers and 71% of households renting find housing costs unaffordable in Tauranga
  - 90% of new housing stock (constructed in last 5 years) is greater than $400k
  - 56% of the population earned $70k or less – equated to $400k being an affordable house
  - Lack of affordable housing limited the ability to address homelessness successfully
  - Estimate of more than 350 homeless individuals and families in Tauranga

- The numbers: safer communities
  - Reported victimisation for assault by family member: Tauranga + WBOP = 24/10,000 (NZ National Average: 25/10,000) (NZ Police data).
  - Alcohol caused approximately 1000 premature deaths in NZ each year and many thousands more experience physical, emotional, social and economic harms from their alcohol use
  - Alcohol increased the likelihood of domestic violence including child abuse and neglect
  - Only 9% of sexual violence was reported
  - Reported victimisation for assault in community locations: Tauranga and WBOP: 25/10,000 (NZ National Average: 27/10,000). (NZ Police data)
  - At least one child (1.6) died from unintentional (or preventable) injuries a week in NZ.

- Our approach
  - community led development
  - facilitation and collaboration
  - capacity building
  - advocacy

- Who we worked with (older adults/disability/migrants/children & youth/housing and homelessness/inequality/social infrastructure/safer communities)

- What can we do? Show leadership – get people talking to each other/connect the dots and people.

- Successful community led development was about working with communities (geographic and communities of interest) to identify issues and then to identify and implement solutions

- Relationships are important in everything we do.
In Response to Questions
- The problem of homelessness was becoming increasingly difficult and needed to be addressed as a priority
- The Community Development Team was actively pursuing the homelessness challenge and would shortly be in a position to formally report on progress.

Items for Staff Follow-up
- Manager: Community Development to collaborate with Elected Members on the key performance indicators for the Community Development Team.

The meeting closed at 3.25 p.m.
## Executive summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>That Council:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Receive the S17A Review Report for Animal Services attached as Appendix A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Agree the preferred recommendation for the status quo service delivery model for Tauranga City Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of issue

2. The legislation requires the review to determine the cost effectiveness of different governance, funding and service delivery options for meeting the needs of communities.
3. Tauranga City (TCC) and Western Bay of Plenty (WBOPDC) councils opted to carry out their respective reviews together.
4. Four alternative delivery options are discussed in the review along with the status quo.
5. All alternative options present cost increases over and above the current model in both councils.
6. TCC and WBOPDC have identified future opportunities for collaboration and joint benefits between them to enable the preferred model.

### Broader benefit / impact

- Continuing to deliver animal services to the community in line with annual plan/long term plan expectations but with a more collaborative focus across the region with Western Bay Council.

### Strategic context

- Considering matters of cost effectiveness for service delivery models is key to being the best council in Australasia. Continuing to deliver services with a more collaborative focus across
boundaries with WBOPDC fits within an internationally competitive city framework.

| Next steps | a. If the recommendation is approved by each respective council then both Animal Services teams will focus their energies on continuing to implement stronger collaboration across the wider sub region. |

**Discussion**

1. TCC and WBOP councils have received the review report for Animal Services to meet s17A requirements from the company engaged to carry out the review - Spire Consulting Ltd.
2. TCC and WBOP councils opted to carry out their respective reviews together given the already close working relationship and geographical operation of the teams and that some of the delivery options related to another local authority.
3. The Bay of Plenty Local Authority Shared Services (BOPLASS) template, designed for member councils to use for their s17A reviews, has been followed for the purposes of this review.
4. Animal Service and Finance Staff from both councils have contributed to the review through participation in workshops, meetings, provision of data and review of the final report.
5. The intent of the legislation is to encourage cost efficiencies as well as collaboration between councils.
6. The review comprised three elements - a governance review, a funding review and various service delivery reviews.
7. For meeting the requirements of the s17A Review, broad cost estimates only for each model have been provided. For more detailed cost investigation and analysis, a business case would be required.
8. The review of the governance function (who is able to make decisions for the provision of the service and set the strategic objectives) considered the three BOPLASS options for delivery, governance by the council, by joint committee or through another type of shared governance arrangement, although the latter option was discounted as a viable option in respect of the Dog Control Act.
   a. The options were assessed for their advantages and disadvantages, concluding that governance by individual councils was the most favourable method. This is regardless of the preferred service delivery method chosen as it enables each council to ensure their individual community interests are best reflected in their policies, funding, bylaws and decisions at committees.
   b. Governance by joint committee was not preferred due to perceived loss of control by each council, difficulty of establishment and realisation of benefits that could be obtained through continued consultation and alignment between the parties.
9. The review of funding also considered the three options outlined in point eight. The favoured model is the current method of funding by which individual councils set their fees and funding policies appropriate to their communities and costs. An alternative delivery model would be far more complex requiring separate accountability for all funding and expenditure.
The current model does not prevent greater alignment in the future between the two organisations.

10. Five service delivery options were considered including the current model which was used as the base for comparison:

a. In-house service delivery was considered the preferred model and the most transparent model which could be easily aligned to suit community needs in each district. It was seen as the most cost effective model and as the one having the least complexity and risk and with the most ability to directly control levels of service and decision-making. It also provides for further opportunities for joint alignment across the two councils that will benefit the wider region e.g. education and dog exercise initiatives.

b. Single council and multi-party Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) models were considered. The overhead costs and complexity around running a single CCO by either TCC or WBOPDC are likely to be significantly higher in terms of greater audit and management costs than the status quo option. This model may be seen as a loss of direct control and decision making for animal service operations. Under this model it is estimated that there could be an increase of approximately $228,500 per annum in operating costs.

c. The multi-party CCO (owned by TCC and WBOPDC for joint delivery) has similar disadvantages to the above option and these could be further compounded if either council sought a different approach to managing dog control decisions than the other. Annual cost increases are similar to the single unit CCO option.

d. Another local authority delivery of animal services on behalf of another council most likely through a contract arrangement. Disadvantages are similar to the other joint delivery models reviewed, this would not be cost effective from a set up perspective, it is likely to be more complex to implement and administer, for example accountabilities around expenditure and bylaws, policies and processes would require alignment to ensure the benefits of consistency were maximised. It is likely that a number of in-house functions would need to be retained by each council irrespective of contracting out technical services e.g. prosecutions, hearing committee management. There are high risks around ensuring and maintaining transparency of costings and funding. Set up costs are estimated to be approximately $200,000. Any potential benefits of this model can largely be achieved through closer collaboration and cooperation between the two councils building on the existing strong relationship.

e. Contracting out or outsourcing to a private sector third party is expected to be difficult as there is a limited market of third party providers. There are no benefits in terms of customer service and higher risks associated with contracted performance management, for example related to the training and skill sets of potential providers compared to trained, dedicated in-house animal service staff. There are likely to be high set up costs (e.g. change management, training costs) ranging from $140,000 to $200,000 and increased ongoing costs of approximately $35,000.

11. Western Bay and Tauranga City already have a strong collaborative relationship. The preferred option notes further collaborative development opportunities for the two animal service teams including joint training initiatives and staff development; closer alignment
of policies and bylaws to reduce inconsistencies; the option of a single afterhours provider; joint education campaigns and use of each other’s dog facilities where possible.

12. Council may either approve the preferred option (Status Quo with increased collaboration and connection between the two councils) or request a more detailed business case on any one or more options.

Options

Option 1: In-House Option (Status Quo)

13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to change delivery priorities to reflect community views</td>
<td>• Some alignment may be limited by differing Council elected member wishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Most transparent, least complex model in terms of funding and costings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct control of risks and services by individual councils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allows for different bylaws and polices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No set up costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget – Additional Capex</th>
<th>$0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget – Additional Opex</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key risks: Communities may not overtly see the collaboration between council services

Recommended? Yes

Option 2: Alternative Service Delivery Models

14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Could deliver similar levels of service to the status quo</td>
<td>• May be seen as loss of direct control / decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Could be some cost savings with economies of scale</td>
<td>• Establishment costs significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unlikely to gain community support as animal service issues are highly emotive and service delivery may be less aligned to individual districts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Costs and complexity of running are higher than status quo
- Ultimate political accountability still rests with council
- Higher risks with some models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget – Additional Capex</th>
<th>differing amounts depending on the chosen model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget – Additional Opex</td>
<td>differing amounts depending on chosen model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key risks**
Less control over decision making; higher costs, less customer service focus and decisions may not reflect culture of individual council; higher complexity around revenue management and expenditure

**Recommended?**
No

**Significance and engagement**

15. (a) Receipt of the s17A Review Report – low significance as defined under the Significance and Engagement Policy

(b) Approving the recommended option or not, is of medium significance under the Significance and Engagement Policy. However there is no requirement to publicly engage on a decision that is not changing a service delivery model from the status quo.

**Next steps**

16. If the preferred recommendation is approved by Council, the s17A review process for Animal Services will be completed until the next review date in six years’ time. TCC and WBOPDC will commence work to further explore joint collaboration between the two councils. If Council wishes further work to be carried out on alternate service delivery option outlined in the report in Appendix A, a detailed business case will be required.
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1 Executive Summary

This report addresses Council’s requirements under Section 17A of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA). This requires that: “A local authority must review the cost-effectiveness of current arrangements for meeting the needs of communities within its district or region for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions.”

Essentially, the Council must assess various service delivery models and determine if they are delivering the right service at the most affordable cost or if there are more suitable arrangements. The intent of the legislation is to encourage cost efficiencies as well as collaboration between councils. Consideration has been given to the governance, funding and service delivery of council functions through the following options:

- In-house;
- Council CCO;
- Multi Party CCO;
- Another local authority; and
- Another person or agency.

Tauranga City Council and Western Bay of Plenty District Council have carried out their review together given their already close working relationship, the geographical operation of the teams, and that some delivery options relate to another local authority.

The current in-house delivery by each Council is the favoured option as this is the most cost effective of all the options considered. All other models indicated to varying degrees increased risks, complexity of management and little advantage over the status quo.

We considered carefully the option of one or other local authority delivering services for the whole region. Whilst our early thinking was that wider resource spread might enable the services to be more responsive regionally than currently, closer analysis showed that this was a costly option to implement and added increased complexity and risk. Difficulties were identified with the ability to align bylaws, dog policies, and operate under one fee and funding structure.

A positive outcome of the review has been that both councils have identified opportunities for closer co-ordination between the Councils. This includes alignment on projects such as the current campaign for high risk dogs, sharing dog exercise areas, food purchase etc. A Memorandum of Understanding could enhance the co-operation in this area in the future.

In terms of other service delivery options, a CCO either by a single council or jointly, would add unnecessary cost and complication with limited benefits. Contracting out (outsourcing) to an external third party would also be challenging as there are no specialist animal control companies in the NZ market. There would be considerable risk in procurement and in ongoing management of the quality of delivery.

This review found that each Council should retain their own Governance and Funding of their services. The major influences of service levels are the setting of dog fees and the funding policies (user pays/rates funding) as considered through the LTP/AP process, which are also limited by specific requirements for Councils under the Dog Control Act 1996. These influences still sit effectively with each Council. There are also some differences in the respective communities of interest, such as rural/urban character, which can be relevant when such matters as classification hearings are escalated to their respective Council Committees.
2 Background and Approach

S17A requirement

This report addresses the Council’s requirements under Section 17A of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA). Section 17A states that:

“A local authority must review the cost-effectiveness of current arrangements for meeting the needs of communities within its district or region for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions.”

What needs to be addressed

A Section 17A review must consider whether a number of alternate options would achieve better cost-effectiveness. Section 17A (4) of the LGA clearly sets out what a review must consider as a minimum, including consideration of various governance, funding and delivery methods. This report assesses the delivery against all the necessary options.

Scope

This review of Animal Services has been carried out for both Tauranga City Council (TCC) and Western Bay of Plenty District Council (WBOPDC) according to a defined project charter and the BOPLASS\(^1\) template. This joint council approach to the s17a has been undertaken due to:

- The geographic proximity of the Councils for the operational requirements of Animal Services. Other neighbouring Councils including those in the BOPLASS area were not considered as feasible for consideration of potential synergies.
- The close working relationship that already exists between the Councils for this service.

Approach

The report has been developed through:

- workshops with staff from both Councils;
- provision of background data;
- review and consideration of the industry and other Councils experiences with Animal Services.

Options to be considered

The options to be considered are:

(4) (a) responsibility for governance, funding, and delivery is exercised by the local authority:

(b) responsibility for governance and funding is exercised by the local authority, and responsibility for delivery is exercised by—

(i) a council-controlled organisation of the local authority; or

(ii) a council-controlled organisation in which the local authority is one of several shareholders; or

(iii) another local authority; or

(iv) another person or agency.

\(^1\) Bay of Plenty Local Authority Shared Services – a grouping of nine councils in the Bay of Plenty/Gisborne region. They have developed a joint template for s17A reviews.
(c) responsibility for governance and funding is delegated to a joint committee or other shared governance arrangement, and responsibility for delivery is exercised by an entity or a person listed in paragraph (b)(i) to (iv).

Cost-effectiveness

The s17a process is predicated on reviewing the “cost-effectiveness” of different service options. Cost effectiveness is not defined in the Act, but it clearly is not just about lowest cost, but the relationship between the outputs achieved for a given level of investment. In looking at cost effectiveness we have considered the following (in alignment with the BOPLASs template for s17A reviews):

- Cost (and incremental costs for changes).
- Feasibility.
- Community views and preferences (if any).
- Assessment of effectiveness.
- Risks.
3 About Animal Services

Definition
Within this review, Animal Services includes:

1. Dog Control activities including:
   a. Registration of dogs. All dogs must be registered with an annual renewal process.
   b. Compliance and investigation in respect of barking, roaming, attack complaints etc.
   c. Enforcement/prosecutions for serious/repeat offences.

2. Impounding and shelter management.

3. Education and outreach (proactive) activities. This includes providing facilities and services back to dog owners (e.g. provision of poo bags at recreation areas, and dog events).

4. Stock Control. This is carried out under the Impounding Act 1955.

5. Keeping of other animals, poultry, bees etc. (Limited services).

The regulatory framework
The regulatory framework for delivery includes:

- Dog Control Act 1996.
- Dog Control Bylaws enacted by each Council.
- Dog Control Policies established by each Council. These set specific policies for dogs and areas within the Council jurisdiction e.g. controls on beaches, off-lead rules etc.
- The Impounding Act 1955 in respect of Stock.
- Local Government Act 2002 and associated Council bylaws (e.g. Animals other than dogs).

Service Level Framework
Service levels relate to the outcomes sought. The Levels of Service (Los) and fees are determined through the Long Term Plan/Annual Plan process. Reporting includes reports under s10A for the Dog Control Act 1996 as well as Council quarterly and Annual Reports.

Upcoming Legislation and policy changes.
Dog control can be a contentious area. There is a National Action Plan (November 2016) focused on reducing the risk and harm of dog attacks, with stricter controls on high risk dogs. Legislative changes and a nationwide neutering programme for menacing dogs is currently being promoted.

With the new initiative from the DIA and proposed legislative changes there will be more focus on high risk dogs – with each Council estimating about 250 dogs would be in this category. The main impacts of these changes will be:

- Funding contribution available to promote de-sexing of high risk dogs. A joint programme between TCC and WBOPDC is underway to address this.
- Additional workload required in respect of high risk dogs including:
  o Property checks
  o Temperament checks
  o Dealing with recidivists and more escalation of consequence
  o Higher number of appeals to Council Hearing Committees to contest classifications of high risk dogs.
This additional workload will need to be resourced, and Councils may need to look at their funding sources (either increased fees or changes to funding policies).

TCC has an upcoming review of its bylaws and policies.

**Increasing Dog numbers**

There is considerable growth in both the human and dog population in the combined areas. Dog numbers having been growing at around 5% p.a. in TCC and while that rate of increase will probably not be sustained over the base level population forecasts of 1.72% per annum out to 2030, within the next 10 years the combined dog populations of TCC and WBOPDC could grow to 30,000.

There is a benchmark of around 1 ASO per 2500 dogs which would indicate that each council may need to either increase staff resourcing in future or find efficiencies e.g. greater use of online services.
4 Governance Review

Section 17A defines a review of the governance function must consider the relative advantages of (i) governance by a local authority, (ii) governance by a joint committee, or (iii) governance by another type of shared governance arrangement. Governance is about who has the right to (a) make binding decisions on the overall objectives for the provision of the service and (b) set the strategic framework in which the service operates.

Based on the requirements of a Section 17A review the following options have been investigated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance Functions</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance by the Council</td>
<td>When each Council is responsible for governance, they are accountable to their respective communities and in ensuring the communities interests are reflected in their policies, levels of service, funding etc. This includes the Dog Policy, Animal Bylaws and decisions at Hearings Committees.</td>
<td>If there was an alternative model that involved joint delivery, there still needs to be separate reporting to each Council to enable them to meet their planning / reporting requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Governance by Joint Committee² | This could mean:  
  - A single Dog Policy across both areas.  
  - Greater consistency of operational practices in the combined area. | The disadvantages would be:  
  - Hard to see what benefits the individual Councils would see in joint governance that couldn’t be achieved by consultation and alignment between them.  
  - Differing expectations in members and communities of interest. Perception of loss of control of each Council.  
  - Difficult to setup – would require significant backing from Councils as well as be acceptable through consultation processes.  
  - Bylaw and policy review by each Council is not subject to the same timing nor necessarily the same viewpoints in respect of priorities from decision makers. |

² There is the ability for territorial authorities to establish a joint committee under the Dog Control Act 1996. However this is an un-tested provision in the legislation not used by any other council in NZ.
Fees & rates policies may need to be aligned (see also under funding). This may take some time.

Governance by another type of shared governance arrangement

Not considered as we cannot envisage other governance arrangements that would be appropriate under the Dog Control Act or Local Government Act.

In summary:

Governance by each respective Council is the most favourable method to be adopted, regardless of the preferred service delivery method chosen. This approach enables each Council to set specific policies within their communities of interest. It does not exclude Councils co-ordinating aspects of their policies (e.g. dog neutering campaigns).
5 Funding Review

The legislation states that a review of funding must consider the relative advantages of (i) funding by the local authority, (ii) funding by a joint arrangement, or (iii) funding by another type of shared arrangement. Funding arrangements involve the manner in which financial resources are sourced and distributed to support the service.

For Animal Services, the majority of funding is obtained through registration fees. Each Council has discretion essentially in respect of the following:

1. Each Council’s respective funding policy for Animal Services.
2. Fees set under the Dog Control Act. The fees gathered under the Dog Control Act shall only be used for purposes of Dog Control. The Dog Control Act authorises variable fee schedules (e.g. lower rates for classes of dogs etc.). Fee Schedules for each council are noted in Appendix 1.
3. Revenue from infringements and fines are set via regulation under the Dog Control Act, Impounding Act etc.
4. Ancillary service revenues e.g. microchipping, impounds and adoptions.

Based on the requirements of a Section 17A review the following options have been investigated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Options</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding by the Council</td>
<td>This is the current method by which each Council sets its fees and funding policies. The advantages of this is each Council can determine the rates vs. user fees for specific services to be delivered and appropriate to their communities and costs.</td>
<td>Any alternative delivery model would need to separately account for each Council’s costs and expenditure – to ensure that Dog Control fees and the funding policies were being adhered to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Funding</td>
<td>Joint funding would only be possible by a Joint Committee under the Dog Control Act and/or the Councils having a separate funding agreement. This could lead to greater alignment of fees.</td>
<td>Any form of joint funding would be very complex and require a Joint Committee and/or separate funding agreements between the Councils. Each Council may still want to set different funding policies in their respective Long Term Plans or set different fees such as for working dogs, and this would nullify any advantage in a joint funding situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding by other type of shared arrangement</td>
<td>We have not identified other suitable funding arrangements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary:

Funding decisions by each respective Council is the most favourable method to be adopted, regardless of in-house delivery or an alternative delivery model. This enables each Council to set fee levels and funding policies within their communities of interest through the Annual Plan/Long Term Plan processes. Councils can still align and co-ordinate aspects of their funding. Any alternative
delivery model must ensure that Dog Control Fees and funding policies are consistent with the funding requirements for each Council.
# Service Delivery Review

## 6.1 In house Council Delivery

### Overview: In-house Council Delivery

This is the base case for comparison. Through workshops, advantages and disadvantages with the current delivery have been considered.

### Cost Expectations: In-house

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current budgets (simplified)</th>
<th>2017/18 AP Budget</th>
<th>Includes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>WBOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>-$1,124,000</td>
<td>-$622,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>$824,000</td>
<td>$462,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct overhead</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect overhead</td>
<td>$252,000</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$1,436,000</td>
<td>$775,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Rates Funding</td>
<td>$312,000</td>
<td>$153,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Delivery Assessment: In-House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>This is feasible – current position.</td>
<td>Not applicable – already established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community views and preferences</td>
<td>The community does not see an issue with traditional in-house delivery model although there is limited feedback seeking greater consistency between the councils. Able to change the delivery priorities to reflect community views.</td>
<td>Some customers have expressed the view that they would like dog recreation opportunities promoted across both councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Effectiveness</td>
<td>This is effective with ongoing scope for improvement.</td>
<td>Service delivery can be limited by resourcing at each council although this is only one element of this model in terms of effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This model is the most transparent and least complex. It provides most flexibility because no alignment or integration is needed with another entity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It includes the current joint working arrangements between the councils e.g. joint training exercises; education activities; sharing of pound facilities when needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Status quo presents the least risky option because of direct control of risks by individual councils.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary: In-house Council Delivery

The current services delivered by each council are based on the community expectations for the respective Districts and are fit for purpose and are cost effective. In house service delivery can be easily realigned to meet changing community expectations, and is the most flexible service solution.

While a s17a review is inherently about the current status quo, improvement opportunities can be identified when comparing and benchmarking with other Councils and providers. There are opportunities for the two councils to work closer together as with the current joint dog neutering programme. Further opportunities include education/communications, joint equipment purchasing, joint warranting to provide flexibility in across district compliance activities. Some formality around this, through a Memorandum of Understanding, could enhance dialogue and ongoing cooperation. Appendix 2 outlines the areas of potential collaboration.
### 6.2 Single Council CCO

#### Overview on Single Council CCO’s

A Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) is a company or entity in which 1 or more local authorities have control of 50% of the voting rights and directors/trustees of the entity (see Appendix 3 for more detail about CCO’s). In this context, TCC or WBOPDC could establish their own CCO to undertake their own delivery (a single CCO).

#### Cost Expectations – Single Council CCO

The following are the incremental cost expectations if either Council were to establish a single CCO to carry out their own functions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of setup and incremental costs</th>
<th>Single CCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setup Costs</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (additional = -ve)</td>
<td>-$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing (annual) Cost Increases</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Annual Change</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Cost (Based on setup costs amortised over 10 years + net annual change) $228,500

| % increase on current expenses | TCC 16%  | WBOPDC 29% |

#### Service Delivery Assessment Single CCO – Established by a Single Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>It is feasible to implement a single Council CCO if supported through the consultation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It would be difficult to establish a compelling case and consultation would be required to establish a CCO. It may be seen as a loss of direct control by the Council. The costs of establishing a CCO may also be considerable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community views and preferences</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It would be unlikely to find community views and preferences in favour of a CCO for this service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Effectiveness</td>
<td>A CCO will be able to generally deliver similar LoS. Potentially a CCO may be more innovative (e.g. offer other services) but there are probably limited opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any adjustments to delivery policies will have to be mediated through the Statement of Intent (SOI) and negotiation with the CCO. Council may still wish to retain control over prosecutions, other legal decisions e.g. hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs and complexity of running this model are likely to be significantly higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>In theory, some financial risk passes to the CCO but ultimate financial risk and political accountability reside with Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary Single CCO**

A Single CCO established by either Council would not be cost effective and would add considerable complexity and cost to the performance of the services.
6.3 Multi party CCO

Overview on Multi-party CCO

TCC and WBOPDC could jointly own and establish a CCO to undertake service delivery.

Cost Expectations – Multi-Party CCO

The following are the incremental cost expectations if the councils establish a jointly owned CCO to carry out their functions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of setup and incremental costs</th>
<th>Joint CCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setup Costs</td>
<td>$ 225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (additional = -ve)</td>
<td>-$ 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Increases</td>
<td>$ 310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>-$ 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Annual Change</td>
<td>$ 275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Cost Change (10 years) (Based on setup costs amortised over 10 years + net annual change)</td>
<td>$ 297,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% increase on current expenses</td>
<td>Combined 12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service Delivery Assessment Multi-Party CCO Delivery – both Councils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>A multi-party CCO could in theory be established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community views and preferences</td>
<td>Not known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Effectiveness</td>
<td>A CCO will be able to generally deliver similar LoS. Potentially a CCO may be more innovative (e.g. offer other services) but there are probably limited opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs and complexity of running this model are likely to be significantly higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Performance management risks - difficult to enforce if CCO is not meeting either Council’s expectations. Taxation risk (although aiming to be not-for profit). Higher risks with more complex and costlier model. Risk that revenue does not meet funding required Any additional services provided by CCO may be in conflict with local businesses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary Multi-party CCO**

A multi-party CCO would not be cost effective and would add considerable complexity and cost to the performance of the services.
6.4 Another Local Authority Delivery

Overview of Another Local Authority Delivery

Under this model, one council would deliver services on behalf of another Council/s. There would need to be a formal agreement for the services to be delivered and the appropriate transfer of powers (e.g. officer warrants). The council delivering the services would control the resources for the delivery of the services and make day to day decision making. Under this model, it has been assumed that the same level of operational capability would remain.

Cost Expectations – Another Local Authority

The following are the incremental cost expectations if one local authority carries out functions for both councils:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of setup and incremental costs (Detail in Appendix 4)</th>
<th>Delivery by another Local Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setup Costs</td>
<td>$ 230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (additional = -ve)</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Increases</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>-$ 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Annual Change</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Cost Change (10 years)</td>
<td>$ 38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% increase on current expenses</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service Delivery Assessment: Another Local Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility.</td>
<td>This would be complex to implement and administer. Setup would involve careful consideration of HR change management issues, funding and financial management, asset management, and accountabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be feasible to implement, but some parts of the operation would likely need to be retained in-house so there would be challenges.</td>
<td>Councils would have to determine LOS and the contract requirements to meet them and the process around contract escalations e.g. prosecutions, gathering evidence, witness statements and each council still has to retain legal advice, expertise, funding, separate bylaws/policy and policy support around these. etc Registrations, prosecution decisions, hearing committees, customer services likely to be retained in both councils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community views and preferences</td>
<td>Region-wide promotion and communication to dog owners on education and recreation opportunities is one area where feedback is likely to be positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Effectiveness</td>
<td>Region-wide approach to customers to inform them about dog responsibilities and opportunities. Increased scale for purchasing power. (Note that these benefits could also be achieved by greater coordination and alignment under the existing arrangements).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Larger resource pool to support service delivery demands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whilst there may appear to be a greater pool of resources to support regional demands, this is unlikely to occur as funding for staffing in each area has to be allocated back to that particular council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary: Another Local Authority Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is no benefit in terms of cost effectiveness to this model against the current status quo. There would be significant cost and risk in establishing a contracted local authority delivery. There would be ongoing challenges in ensuring funding transparency, accountability and alignment to each respective council. Any potential benefits can largely be achieved by closer co-operation of the two councils with the status quo model.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5 Another Entity or organisation (e.g. contracted out/outsourced)

Overview: Another entity or organisation (e.g. contracted out/outsourced)

This is basically an outsourcing option with ‘contracted out’ meaning the management responsibility for a group of functions has been transferred to another third party private sector entity. This is a step-change from engaging a contractor to perform some additional service, such as undertaken currently by both Councils where some dog pickups, after-hours, and stock work is performed by a contractor, but the council retains control of the service process and responsibility.

The potential entities or organisation that could be considered are:

- Specialist Animal Control firms. There have been two previous specialist firms delivering Animal Services on large scale contracts:
  - Animal Control Services ACS was contracted to undertake animal services in part of Auckland, and this service has now been superseded with Auckland Council taking this service in house.
  - DSS Animal Management Limited was contracted to undertake animal services in Wellington, Manukau, and Franklin, with the latter two now undertaken directly by Auckland Council.

  Basically, with these examples there were benefits in the economies of scale in training, a specialist contact centre, purchasing of equipment etc. However, neither firm is now in business, and there are no other identified specialists. It is unlikely that the scale of TCC & WBOPDC operations would tempt a new entrant into the market.

- A local contractor. Some smaller Councils also contract out the services. These are localised solutions, often for small scale demand where a contractor works part-time. Nelson City Council has an arrangement of essentially ex-staff members running a range of regulatory functions. As neither Council is a small-sized Animal Services operation, it would not be feasible to easily contract to a local contractor.

- A Security Company. Security companies often provide after-hours or ‘top-up resource’ to support Animal Services for a first-level response (and other regulatory functions such as noise). Both TCC and WBOPDC use security companies for after-hours. In theory, security companies would be the most likely option for outsourcing. However, there are clear risks and disadvantages to engaging a non-specialist entity to take on the full spectrum of technical animal services work including investigations, customer liaison, recommendations for enforcement etc.

- A Community Group or other organisation. An alternative to a third-party provider would be an alternative such as a community group or organisation. It is difficult to identify a community group that has an appropriate alignment of interests. For example, many years ago SPCA contracted to Wellington City Council for Animal Control. However, the purposes of animal welfare and animal control are not always aligned. It is unlikely that this would be a feasible option.

Cost Expectations – another Entity or Organisation

The following are the incremental cost expectations if one council or both councils contracted out (outsourced) to a third party:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of setup and incremental costs (Detail in Appendix 3)</th>
<th>Single Council - Outsourcing</th>
<th>Joint Council Outsourcing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setup Costs</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (additional = -ve)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Increases</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>-$20,000</td>
<td>-$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Annual Change</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Average Annual Cost Change (10 years)
(Based on setup costs amortised over 10 years + net annual change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ 57,000</th>
<th>$ 80,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% increase on current expenses</td>
<td>TCC...4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WBOPDC</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Delivery Assessment: Contracted Out/Outsourced to another entity or organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feasibility</strong></td>
<td>There is limited feasibility to contract out or outsource the substantial service delivery. Limited outsourcing could potentially be achieved for selected services e.g. after hours work or pound management.</td>
<td>Limited feasibility to procure this with a limited market for providers to outsource delivery to and no obvious community groups that could step into this space. Significant HR change management, would be required for existing staff. Councils would have to determine LOS, the model of service provision to meet contract requirements and the process around contract escalations and management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community views and preferences</strong></td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Not known although it is likely there would be community resistance to significant outsourcing with a perception of loss of control over the delivery of the services and concern that Council is no longer managing these services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Potential for flexibility in the deployment of increased/reduced resources (dependant on the contract) and whether the external provider had sufficient resources available when required.</td>
<td>Some functions e.g. registration would need to be retained by the Council. Oversight and major decision-making, such as decisions to enforce or prosecute, would be retained by Council. Training/skillsets and competency of the third party providers staff would be a challenge. Significant costs from set up and transition to this model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risks</strong></td>
<td>The community would not perceive that the accountability has shifted to the contractor.</td>
<td>There are significant risks including procurement, contract performance management, political, changing requirements etc. There is less control, less knowledge. There would be significant risks in ensuring enough staff training, skills and experience were deployed by the outsourced provider.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary: Another entity or organisation (e.g. contracted out)

Contracting out the services to a third party is not cost effective. The market for the services is limited. There would be significant risks associated with the contracting out, and ongoing management of the services.
7 Summary findings

Key findings

The findings of this review are:

a) The review has addressed the requirements of a s17A review for Animal Services for each council;

b) In all possible models of service delivery, it is recommended that each Council keeps its own separate governance (policy setting, committee structures etc.) and funding arrangement (fee-setting and user charges: rates funding);

c) Any alternative requiring a CCO (either singly or jointly) is not cost-effective due to the costs of setup and ongoing overheads associated with a CCO operation. A CCO is also complex and potentially contentious to set-up for what is expected to be a Council service;

d) Contracting out (i.e. outsourcing) is not expected to be cost-effective as there is a limited market of third party providers, high costs associated with setup and procurement, and no benefits in terms of customer delivery and ongoing risks associated with this alternative with uncertain, but unlikely to be wholly different costs;

f) Another local authority delivering services presents significant setup costs with no identified net benefit in terms of cost effectiveness;

f) An in-house model as per the current separate delivery by each Council is cost-effective in the sense that it is seen as sustainable with the least risks and least complexity;

g) There are opportunities for greater alignment under the current model of policies and working closer together such as on education, collaboration on new initiatives, cost savings on joint purchases etc. This could be enhanced with more formality such as a Memorandum of Understanding.
## Appendix 1 Background on Animal Services

### Snapshot of Animal Services at TCC and WBOP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Facts</th>
<th>TCC</th>
<th>WBOP</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct FTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WBOPDC</strong> includes an additional FTE from 1/7/2017. There are less Admin staff at WBOPDC because processes are more direct with ASO's receiving work directly and doing all correspondence. TCC are looking to implement similar processes and mobile technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ASO's</td>
<td>4 ASO's</td>
<td>1.4 Pound 5.9 Total (from 1/7/2017) + part time foster/adoptions officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 TL</td>
<td>0.5 Admin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Admin</td>
<td>0.6 Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5 Shelter Officer</td>
<td>7.6 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dogs</strong></td>
<td>11,721 Dogs</td>
<td>8,542 Dogs</td>
<td>Dog numbers are increasing in both jurisdictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4613 rural/ 3929 urban</td>
<td>4613 rural/ 3929 urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dogs Registered</strong></td>
<td>97.9%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>Both achieve reasonably high levels of registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rates Funding Policy</strong></td>
<td>90% fees: 10% rates for stock and other animals</td>
<td>80% fees :20% rates</td>
<td>TCC are intending to review their funding split for 2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registration</strong></td>
<td>Can't do online for new registrations 15% of payments online for renewals</td>
<td>New registrations online. 20% of payment online</td>
<td>Significant opportunity to make more transactions online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online payments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Complaints</strong></td>
<td>5414</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>Number of complaints higher in TCC due to being urban area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Impounds</strong></td>
<td>960</td>
<td>836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016/17 Fees</th>
<th>TCC</th>
<th>WBOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ontime</td>
<td>Late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Registration</td>
<td>$78.00</td>
<td>$109.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal (entire)</td>
<td>$67.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desexed</td>
<td>$67.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog registration – dog classified as dangerous*</td>
<td>$117.00</td>
<td>$162.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Working Dogs (solely for herding and driving stock)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Dogs (approved agencies), Assistance dogs etc</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption (incl. registration and microchip)</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$220.00 (also includes desexing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impound specific fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non Registered</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>Non Registered</th>
<th>Registered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Impound</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Impound</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third and subsequent Impound</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustenance fee (per day or part thereof)</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>$12.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microchipping for impounded dogs</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2- Possible Collaborative Development Areas

The following are areas the Councils have identified possible collaborative opportunities to be explored independent of the s17A review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Characteristics</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Implementation mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>Closer working across boundary issues – eg attack in one District, dog owner based in other District, or dog roaming from property in one District to another (Te Puna, Welcome Bay, Papamoa)</td>
<td>Joint warranting of Officers across both Districts. Standard operating procedure implemented about criteria for applying warrant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Training and development of staff regionally – consistency, cost savings</td>
<td>Regular Management team meetings to discuss regional training and development plans (e.g. Quarterly fixed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Reduce duplication of efforts and secure cost savings in advertising/notices etc. Noted that we are both progressing online payments.</td>
<td>Current working arrangement in place. No change required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-to-day complaints, operations and compliance</td>
<td>Closer alignment of Dog Policies and Bylaws – less differences would reduce customer feedback about inconsistency in requirements</td>
<td>Difficult to apply if community expectations differ by District. Timing of Policy and Bylaw reviews are set by respective Councils, and changing frequency to align incurs cost for Council. Still need to provide for individual differences, e.g. restrictions on reserves in respective District based on areas of conflict including other users of the reserve space.</td>
<td>Good communication between respective teams – e.g. regular management meetings No change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Hours service</td>
<td>Single contracted provider across the District, creating efficiencies in response, potential cost saving. Both Councils use contractors based in TCC area and travel through TCC District to attend WBOPDC calls potential for contractor to service both areas</td>
<td>A joint procurement process would be required that meets both Councils service needs. Existing contracts would need to be exited at same time.</td>
<td>Undertake contract review and agree joint procurement process. Both existing contractors keen to explore this opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Characteristics</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Implementation mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pound/Shelter Services Euthanising, adoption, de-sexing, med treatment (dogs under Council Control)</td>
<td>Flexibility of use of pounds for overflow care.</td>
<td>Transporting dogs is intensive Poor customer service to expect customers to pick-up from a shelter further away</td>
<td>Currently WBOPDC uses TCC shelter for overflow, shelter costs covered by WBOPDC for dogs in TCC shelter. No change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vet services have to travel to shelter facilities, so local providers needed for each shelter</td>
<td>Review current vet contracts for service opportunities regionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scale of service opportunities for preferred vet provider, and cost savings in service</td>
<td>Adoption process differs between Councils in what is provided, would need to align service and cost for adoptions. An increased focus on adoption quality and public expectations increases resource requirements.</td>
<td>Service assessment required to determine cost benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist adoption and fostering service regionally – greater reach in terms of finding suitable homes (based on reputation).</td>
<td>Purchasing of dog food supplies for shelter through scale of service contract/provider, reducing cost</td>
<td>Both Councils already purchase through Govt provider, may be no further cost savings for Councils based on increased scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School education on dog safety requirement in curriculum is minimal.</td>
<td>Service assessment required to determine cost benefit – market assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and Outreach - community and school, engagement, dog poo bags, playgrounds, dog recreation activities</td>
<td>Specialisation of school and workplace education delivery regionally. Consistency of messaging, and cost efficiency in resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More co-operation and alignment on outreach activities. The dog community is mobile and wants to know what they can do to recreate. Combined approach in terms of dog communication providing a region-wide perspective for dog owners on dog recreation opportunities and restrictions, best practice dog ownership etc. Region wide dog recreation events, e.g. partnering on community dog walks.</td>
<td>School education on dog safety requirement in curriculum is minimal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current co-operation existing for specific campaigns e.g. high-risk dog neutering campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Closer alignment of webpages – e.g. links to dog exercise areas in other District and own District, or subpage on dog exercise areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined dog walk event planned for July 2017 using combined advertising.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 Overview on CCO’s

A Council Controlled Organisation is a company or entity in which 1 or more local authorities have control of 50% of the voting rights and directors/trustees of the entity. If its purpose is to be profit making it is a CCTO (trading organisation), and the profits become taxable. Otherwise, if appropriately formed, they can be not-for-profit.

Establishment of a CCO requires consultation under the LGA – either through special consultation or as part of the LTP or similar. The benefits of establishing a CCO include commercial focus, independence, economies of scale (where this is possible), financial risk mitigation, and in some cases tax/funding benefits. The disadvantages include loss of direct accountability and control of risks, tension between profit and community outcomes, and ongoing costs. There are costs associated with the establishment and the ongoing costs of both the CCO (audit, board fees, independent systems etc.) and Council monitoring of the CCO.

The main use of CCO’s has been for Council services/functions where there is a strong emphasis on capital deployment and asset management or property e.g. 3 waters network management/ maintenance, roading, community leisure assets, venues etc.

---

Appendix 4 Detailed Cost Assumptions

In respect of costs, we are working off current in-house costs. For options other than status quo, incremental costs are presented to provide an indicative comparison of the change between the current and potential alternatives. Costs are only an estimate and not based on detailed analysis. When considering alternate service delivery models, and potential costs around these, there is a wide variation possible depending on the design of the model. Modest changes are included in the forecasts. There are a number of assumptions that will impact cost of service but have been excluded from the figures presented including:

- Changes in fees and funding policies will be matched by changes in resourcing (increase/decrease in service levels).
- Additional resourcing and costs may be required to meet the changing requirements of dog legislation, regulatory or policy changes. This would be common across all options.
- There are no identified differences in the capital required. Current investment plans would be required in any scenario
- A ten-year horizon for assessing the costs.
- Inflation is excluded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costing for Single CCO or Multi party CCO (see 6.2 &amp; 6.3)</th>
<th>Single CCO</th>
<th>Multi Party CCO</th>
<th>Comment/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setup Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Process</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Maybe included as part of LTP’s but still some additional PR, comms, and consultation costs would be incurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>Establishment of separate IT systems (and transition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR/Recruit</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Managing HR transition and recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Advisory for setup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comms/Brand</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Consider need to establish a new logo/brand/identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation/setup</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Assuming moving costs etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>Establishment of initial SOI etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Setup Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$135,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$225,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential revenue increase</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Assume that the CCO will be able to be enabled to identify 3rd party revenues such as private boarding, dog training etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Cost Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Other CCO’s around 20k in audit fees - but for joint need to also demonstrate adherence to dog fees and funding policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors Fees</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>4 Directors at $10k or 4 Directors at $15k for larger entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Admin</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Need ongoing finance admin support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader/Manager Role</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>Bigger role for Joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT costs</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Ongoing additional IT costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Ongoing Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$220,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$310,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume the same</td>
<td>Property overheads/lease charges are the same, charges to Council Call Centres, other overhead costs such as ongoing IT; Internal management costs and oversight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings on current</td>
<td>$ - $25,000 Assume that the joint operation will deliver on savings, particularly on administration resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Annual Change</td>
<td>$ 215,000 $ 275,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Costing for Another Local Authority Delivery (see 6.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Another Local authority delivery</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setup Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR/Transition</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>Assumes minimal staffing issues – would have to be addressed in detailed design how this could be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>IT linkages for common platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement/Legal</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comms/Brand</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>Need to establish new identity, update comms to stakeholders, rebrand vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation/setup</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
<td>Moving costs, office space will be expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>Rationalisation of equipment, cameras, GPS tracking etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Setup</strong></td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>Will need to be worked through in detailed design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>No additional revenue from this model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Costs</strong></td>
<td>-$30,000</td>
<td>Contract mgmt. costs. Greater complexity of arrangement means more finance/accounting costs, more HR cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assume the same** Property overheads/lease charges are the same, charges to Council Call Centres, other overhead costs such as ongoing IT; Internal management costs and oversight.

**Annual Savings** $15,000 There may be some savings in admin, minor purchases, vehicle usage etc. but needs further detailed design consideration.

**Net Annual Change** $15,000 i.e. ongoing cost increase.
### Costing for Another Entity or organisation (e.g. contracted out/outsourced) see 6.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Single Council Outsourcing</th>
<th>Joint Council Outsourcing</th>
<th>Comments/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setup Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>Cost of externally facilitate procurement - more complex for joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>Legal review of contract documents etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT integration/licensing</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Costs associated with provisioning contractor with access to Council systems etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR/transition</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>Potential HR costs associated with transition, potential redundancy etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comms</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Communications/PR costs to advertise changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Setup costs</strong></td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract management</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Internal costs to manage the contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Contractor Profit Margin</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>8% margin on estimated direct costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Ongoing Costs</strong></td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assume the same</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property overheads/lease charges are the same, charges to Council Call Centres, other overhead costs such as ongoing IT; Internal management costs and oversight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Savings</strong></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Assume that the outsourced operation such as a security service will employ at lower cost – approx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Annual Change</strong></td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2 Outcome from Welcome Bay community engagement regarding Council owned sites for development feasibility (DC 156)
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Community & Culture Committee
11 July 2017
Objective ID No: A7976303

CONFIDENTIAL ATTACHMENT D & E
Reason for Confidentiality
To protect information where the making available of the information –
(i) Would disclose a trade secret.
(ii) Would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information

Transfer to Open
Attachment D & E are to remain in the Confidential section to protect information where the making available of the information –
(i) Would disclose a trade secret.
(ii) Would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information

Executive summary

| Recommendation | That the Community & Culture Committee:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Endorses Option 1; progress with consideration of Waitaha Reserve and Owens Park, and remove Waipuna Park from further consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Retain associated Attachments D &amp; E in the confidential section to protect information where the making available of the information would disclose a trade secret and/or would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of issue
Following approval from report DC37, which was presented to the committee in March 17, community engagement was undertaken with the residents of Welcome Bay to obtain feedback and views on the potential use of Council owned land for the development of a supermarket. In response to the survey, 66.5% are in support of the potential development with 56.3% indicating preference for Waitaha Reserve, 25.3% indicating preference for Owens Park, and 18.4% indicating preference for Waipuna Park.
Broader benefit / impact

The endorsement of the recommendation will allow Council staff to further analyse the potential benefit/impact of a supermarket development upon two Council owned sites. This analysis will enable further community engagement on, for example, concept plans for the sites and their impact on existing facilities and amenity uses, along with potential solutions.

Strategic context

This project aligns with the purpose of the committee to ensure Council is meeting the changing needs of our communities. The project is also engaging communities on issues of importance to Council, the community and the city.

Next steps

Council staff will continue the analysis into the two preferred sites. Once sufficient material is obtained, the community will be engaged regarding how a potential development could occur and what the impact would be on existing facilities and amenity uses, along with how that impact can be managed to ensure no loss of existing service provision and usage.

Discussion

1. Report DC37 was presented to the Community and Culture Committee on 14 March 2017, which outlined the initial assessment of Council owned sites in Welcome Bay that could potentially provide for a supermarket development. Council owned land was considered because of the limited availability of suitably located and sized private land. This assessment was initiated on the basis of:
   
   (a) A long standing desire of much of the Welcome Bay community seeking the development of a supermarket.
   
   (b) The Welcome Bay community would be engaged and involved in the decision making process.
   
   (c) A commitment from Council that there would be no loss of service provision in terms of any existing community or sports facility.

2. The report concluded that there are three Council owned sites in Welcome Bay that have the potential to accommodate a supermarket development. The recommended next step was to commence community engagement to obtain community feedback upon whether the potential development of a supermarket upon a Council owned site is supported, and whether the community had a preferred site from the three options available. The Community and Culture Committee approved the recommendation to commence the community engagement.

3. This engagement took place between 10th April – 2nd June 2017. Two open days were also held and responses were received via online and hard copy survey forms. A blank survey form is attached to this report (Attachment A). Further information on the community engagement is outlined below.

Survey design

4. The survey was designed to ask the fundamental yes-no question: “Do you support a supermarket being built in Welcome Bay on Council-owned land?” The question was formed on the basis that the community had already expressed a long-standing desire for such a development, however, they had not been asked whether they would support this upon Council owned land given that suitable private land is not available.
5. An introductory paragraph explained the reason for the survey, advised that no decision had been made to build a supermarket and, at this stage, Council was only seeking community feedback on the potential development. Each of the three sites were listed, alongside site-specific detail, to allow the respondent to indicate their preference (if any). A text box section was provided to allow the respondent to make further comment (whether they were in support or against the potential development).

6. The survey was not locked down, which ensured that all individuals living at the same address were able to have their say. Informal, pre-engagement surveys are not treated in the same way as a formal consultation process.

Summary of community engagement

7. In total, 1937 survey responses were received as part of this community engagement. Figure 1 below depicts the response to the first question “Do you support a supermarket being built in Welcome Bay on Council-owned land?”

Figure 1 – Response to survey question 1

8. Figure 2 indicates the response in terms of a preference between the three locations if the respondent had indicated “Yes” at question 1.

Figure 2 – Response to location preference
9. Many survey responses included justification for the respondent’s selection. By analysing the responses, common themes and issues could be extracted. These have been tabulated below along with the percentage of responses within which they were highlighted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Percentage of No responses that contained the theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against use of green space / reserve land</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not see a requirement for a supermarket in the area</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Council being involved in commercial business</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns over further traffic issues in Welcome Bay</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No justification or answer provided</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns over impact on the existing retail centre / businesses</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Common themes from “No” responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Percentage of Yes responses that contained the theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly against the use of Waipuna Park and potential impact on the walnut grove if a sports field was realigned</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference to co-location with existing centre of Welcome Bay (Waitaha Reserve / Retail Centre)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No justification or answer provided</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would prefer redevelopment of existing centre before public land is considered</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Common themes from “Yes” responses

10. In terms of the breakdown across the different communication methods used for distributing and receiving survey responses, 83% of responses were received via the online survey.

Table 3 – Breakdown of communication methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format/Method</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard copy survey (from open days)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Waka magazine</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct feedback from key stakeholders

11. In addition to the surveys, key stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide direct feedback and opinion regarding the project at this stage. These stakeholders included:

(a) Welcome Bay Primary School
(b) Bay Venues Limited
(c) Welcome Bay Community Centre
(d) Sport Bay of Plenty
(e) NZ Royal Plunket Society (Plunket Room upon Waitaha Reserve)
(f) Toi te Ora – Public Health Service

12. The feedback from these key stakeholders is provided at Attachment B.
Summary of engagement with iwi/hapu

13. Council staff met with Ngai Te Ahi, Ngati He and Ngati Pukenga and requested formal feedback regarding the cultural view of the three sites and their significance. This feedback is provided at Attachment C.

14. The combined hapu has indicated that all three sites are significant waahi tapu to the whanau/hapu/iwi of Ngai Te Ahi, Ngati He and Ngati Pukenga. Full engagement and participation within Welcome Bay is required in the first instance for any potential development. However, they have provided initial comments and questions regarding the three sites based on the early engagement information. If any of the three open sites locations was to be used for a potential development, their preference would be Owens Park on the basis of the available space and current underutilisation.

15. Council staff will continue to engage with iwi/hapu if the investigation progresses to the next stage.

Community engagement outcome

16. It has become clear through this early engagement that there is majority support for investigating further a potential supermarket development in Welcome Bay upon Council owned land. However, there have been a number of responses that, whilst in support of the potential development, would prefer a redevelopment of the existing centre, prior to consideration of Council owned land. Waipuna Park is the least preferred site of the three feasible locations.

Council staff analysis of the locations

17. Initial analysis of the three sites was provided within report DC37. The community feedback substantiates one of the issues Council staff identified with Waipuna Park, in particular, that the park is fully utilised. The potential realignment of a sports field at Waipuna Park would impact on the 100+ year old walnut grove, which has been met with opposition from the community. Another alternative would be to relocate the sports field elsewhere in Welcome Bay or the wider city of Tauranga. This would have an impact on the clubs and organisations that use this site, as well as an impact on Tauranga being able to successfully hold and manage national sporting events that require a large amount of fields at one location such as the AIMS tournament. For these reasons and with Waipuna Park being least preferred via the community engagement, it is recommended that Waipuna Park be removed from any further consideration.

18. Waitaha Reserve presents issues in potential reconfiguration or relocation of amenity uses and community facilities. Owens Park is a challenging site for a potential development, however, it is underutilised due to its drainage issues. These two sites were highest in terms of their preference via the survey responses and therefore, it is recommended to investigate them further.

Private land opportunities

19. Council staff have continued to liaise with supermarket providers to assess private land opportunities within Welcome Bay for potential supermarket development. There has been no substantial progress with securing private landholdings for a potential supermarket development. The dialogue with supermarket providers can continue depending on the option that is endorsed by the Community and Culture Committee. Confidential Attachments D & E
contain letters from supermarket providers documenting their consideration of private land and issues in acquiring such land in Welcome Bay to date.

20. Furthermore, some survey responses identified and enquired about other private land opportunities in Welcome Bay and their potential for a supermarket development. These have been assessed with the following broad outcome:

(a) Landholdings further east of Owens Park reduce the potential for a medium sized supermarket due to the decrease in the anticipated number of customers. Whilst Welcome Bay is growing, the growth expected to the east of Welcome Bay is not of a scale to support a supermarket in this general location.

(b) Landholdings further south along the arterial roads leading from Welcome Bay are too far removed from the main catchment. From a market perspective these areas are more likely to be already serviced and will continue to be serviced, via retail opportunities that are already available such as Tauriko Crossing.

(c) There is no surplus land available from the development of the Hairini Link / Maungatapu underpass suitable for a supermarket development.

21. Council staff in the City Planning and Growth team will shortly be commencing a study into the future growth of Welcome Bay and Ohauiti. Whilst the expected growth in central Welcome Bay is not expected to increase significantly to alter the suitable locations for a supermarket development, the study will be beneficial for the potential supermarket development through the analysis of key issues such as land use and transportation.

### Options

**Option 1: Progress with consideration of Waitaha Reserve and Owens Park, and remove Waipuna Park from further consideration**

22. This option will entail further analysis of Waitaha Reserve and Owens Park. Council staff will work with our legal team and procurement team to understand and recommend how Council can obtain credible and accurate concept information from supermarket providers regarding how a potential development could look, along with the impact on any existing facilities and amenity uses. Council staff can then assess how any potential impact upon the levels of service can be managed. Council staff will then report back to the Community & Culture Committee in the first quarter of Financial Year 17/18 with the recommended approach to obtain this information.

23. There would still be no commitment from Council to dispose of any Council owned land for the potential development of a supermarket. Further analysis will still be required and presented to the Committee to understand the impact of a development prior to a decision to dispose or lease Council owned land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Progression of potential development of a supermarket in Welcome Bay which, at this stage, has majority support for further consideration.</td>
<td>- Recreation reserves, which have not been declared surplus, are considered further for a commercial purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Will allow for plans and visual interpretation for discussion with the community to understand how a development could be accommodated and what the impact could be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget - Capex</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget - Opex</td>
<td>No new budget sought. Representation from departments across Council to progress the consideration of the sites and assess their potential use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key risks</td>
<td>The risk that a supermarket provider may secure private land in the future for the purpose of a supermarket development whilst this work is ongoing still remains. We are unable to remove this risk in its entirety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended?</td>
<td>Yes. There is community support to investigate this option further. This option would allow for preparation of the next step of analysis, which will provide a more accurate picture regarding a potential development on two sites. More importantly, it will look to identify the impact on existing facilities and uses of the sites being further explored.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2: Council no longer progresses investigation into use of Council owned land and seeks to advocate and, where possible, facilitate the use of privately owned land for a supermarket development.

24. This option will entail Council taking on a facilitator role for private development but with a particular emphasis on potentially opening discussions with landowners of commercially zoned land to understand redevelopment options. Potential opportunities will be monitored with the City Planning & Growth team, and Council staff will continue dialogue with supermarket providers to assist where possible with advice on landholdings and planning rules and requirements. Having said this, we are aware that such opportunities are very limited.

25. Progress made via this option will be reported back to the Community and Culture Committee in the second quarter of Financial Year 17/18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reserve / open space Council owned land which has not been declared surplus, is not considered for potential supermarket development.</td>
<td>• Reduction in success of achieving the development of a supermarket in Welcome Bay since it will rely on private landowner appetite to sell or redevelop their land, which for a number of years, has not occurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May be able to provide facilitation between private landowners and supermarket providers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget - Capex</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget - Opex</td>
<td>No new budget sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key risks</td>
<td>There is a risk that this option will not lead to a desired supermarket development in Welcome Bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended?</td>
<td>No. The Welcome Bay community via the initial engagement has indicated a majority support for exploring the potential development of a supermarket on Council owned land further.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Option 3: Discontinue the investigation of Council owned sites for a potential supermarket development.

This option will entail Council discontinuing its investigation into assessing Council owned land opportunities in Welcome Bay for a potential supermarket development and will rely on private developers to acquire sufficient landholdings. Council would then continue to provide advice and guidance if, and when, approached with private proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reserve / open space Council owned land which has not been declared surplus, is not considered for potential supermarket development.</td>
<td>• Council will take no role in assisting with a potential development of a supermarket in Welcome Bay and therefore, does not explore and attempt to seek development opportunities that have been identified as being desired.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget - Capex</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget - Opex</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Key risks | There is a risk that the community expects further progress having carried out initial engagement which has indicated that further investigation in Welcome Bay is desired. If Council opts to discontinue the investigation, there could be a negative response from the community. |

| Recommended? | No. The Welcome Bay community via the initial engagement has indicated a majority support for exploring the potential development of a supermarket on Council owned land further. |

Significance and engagement

Under the Significance and Engagement Policy 2014, this decision is of high significance as it affects a suburb and subgroup of Tauranga’s population, it flows from a previous decision, and it will attract high public interest – especially within the Welcome Bay community.

Engagement will continue with key stakeholders for the sites that are taken forward. The engagement will include further consideration of the sites stated in Option 1 and will be based upon concept plans for a potential supermarket development and the impact upon existing facilities and amenity uses along with how that impact can be managed.

Next steps

If Council decides to progress with Option 1, Council staff will continue the analysis into the two sites identified. The first step will be to work with our legal team and procurement team to understand and recommend how Council can obtain the required concept information from supermarket providers and report back to the Committee in the first quarter of Financial Year 17/18. If the approach is approved, and concept information is obtained, the community will be engaged regarding how a potential development could occur and what the impact would be on existing facilities and amenity uses, along with how that impact can be managed to ensure no loss of existing service provision and usage.
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9.2.1 Attachment A - DC156 - Survey Form - Welcome Bay Supermarket
Do you want a supermarket in Welcome Bay?

What if it was on Waitaha Reserve, Waipuna Park or Owens Park?

Tauranga City Council wants to know if you support a supermarket being built on a public reserve, park or open space in Welcome Bay.

We know it’s a long-term goal to have a supermarket in Welcome Bay, so you have more choice and closer access to groceries. But with suitable, privately-owned land supply limited, would you be willing to give up open space for a supermarket?

To help the community achieve this goal, Council is considering the option of developing Council-owned land. While some of Welcome Bay’s community and sports facilities may be impacted, there would be a commitment from Council to ensure no loss of service.

At this stage, no decision has been made to build a supermarket. We’re simply seeking feedback from you, the community, to find out if you support a supermarket being built on Council-owned land.

The feedback received will be presented to Councillors at the Community & Culture Committee meeting on 11 July 2017, and will help Council decide if we should progress any further. This is just the first step. If the feedback received supports the development, additional public engagement will take place.

Council will be hosting two open days to give you the opportunity to speak to Council staff and elected members about a potential supermarket in Welcome Bay on Council-owned land.

**Open Days**
- **Wednesday, 3 May** – Welcome Bay Community Centre, 9am to 1pm and 4pm to 8pm
- **Saturday, 6 May** – Waipuna Park Pavilion, 9am to 1pm

More open days will follow as part of the community engagement.

This is your chance to have your say.

Do you support a supermarket being built in Welcome Bay on Council-owned land? [ ] Yes [ ] No

If “yes”, which of the three locations is your preferred option?

- **Waitaha Reserve** – potential for a full-service supermarket, but would require the relocation or redevelopment of existing community facilities on the site or elsewhere within Welcome Bay to ensure no loss of service.
- **Waipuna Park** – potential for a full-service supermarket, but would require the realignment of one sports field which may have an impact on the grove of walnut trees, or development of the sports field elsewhere in the city to ensure no loss of service.
- **Owens Park** – potential for a lower-service supermarket upon a currently under-utilised area of open space.

A lower-service supermarket may not provide a full bakery, butchery, or delicatessen.

Why do you prefer that location? -or- Tell us why you don’t support the development?

What suburb do you live in?

Post to (no stamp required):
Freepost Authority Number 370, Tauranga City Council, Private Bag 12022, Tauranga 3143 or drop off at the City, Mt Maunganui, Papamoa or Greerton libraries.
9.2.2 Attachment B - DC156 - Direct feedback from Key Stakeholders - Welcome Bay
## Direct Feedback from Key Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Potential impact</th>
<th>Direct feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Bay Venues Limited** | **Welcome Bay Hall** on **Waitaha Reserve** | - Would look to be in support of a potential development only if there is community support.  
- Maintains that there is (and still will be) a requirement for the provision of community centre facilities in the centre of Welcome Bay. |
| **Welcome Bay Primary School** | **Primary School adjacent to Owens Park** | - Safety implications at Owens Park at peak times around the school (drop-off and pick-up).  
- Whilst Owens Park is not used very often, a more suitable site would be one that is more central to the existing shopping centre to ensure there is a co-ordinated approach to the centre of Welcome Bay and therefore not leading to fragmented centres.  
- Owens Park could be better utilised as a community focus point for facilities and amenities which could then allow the site currently used by the shopping centre to be redeveloped/modernised and planned for with a longer scope in mind. |
| **Welcome Bay Community Centre (WBCC)** | **The centre is situated upon Waitaha Reserve** | - WBCC as an organisation is impartial and state that the community as individuals should have their say without any influence from WBCC, regardless of what the outcome might mean in terms of their tenancy upon the reserve. |
| **Plunket Society** | **Plunket room is situated upon Waitaha Reserve** | - Plunket are open to moving locations although further discussions would be necessary.  
- They see the benefit of a potential purpose built facility to further meet the needs of the community if that is required.  
- Accessibility is key as their clients are young mums with babies, prams and often toddlers too along with a requirement for car parking.  
- They assume that if they were required to move, it would be no cost to Plunket. |
| **Retail centre** | **Adjacent to Waitaha Reserve** | - There has been no direct feedback received as part of this community engagement. |
| **Sport Bay of Plenty** | **Utilise open space both active and passive recreation** | - Full feedback further below.  
- Concerns around the major impact on the limited greenspace in the area.  
- Sport Bay of Plenty advocates for More People, More Active, More Often and motivate the community to get active and keep active. Outdoor environments are a vital asset to assist with this. |
## ATTACHMENT B to DC156

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Potential impact</th>
<th>Direct feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Once green space is taken away, it will not be returned. All of the sites have users whether through formal sports recreation or through informal, local recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential issues of using open spaces, and in particular, Waipuna Park are documented within Attachment C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toi te Ora</td>
<td>Public health issues</td>
<td>- No position on the use of council owned land nor a preference in terms of location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A supermarket in Welcome Bay will lead to an increase in food access and availability for local residents, leading to increased food security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- If a supermarket proposal goes ahead a number of public health issues and considerations should be taken into account regarding access and availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Council is in a unique position (as a landowner) to influence a range of factors that can help contribute to a healthier community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Ben

RE: SPORT BAY OF PLENTY FEEDBACK REGARDING USE OF PUBLIC OPEN SPACE FOR WELCOME BAY SUPERMARKET.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback regarding use of Public Open Space for Welcome Bay Supermarket.

We acknowledge the need for Welcome Bay to have an accessible supermarket in the area but we have concerns around the proposed locations as any development will have a major impact on the limited greenspace in the area.

Sport of Plenty advocates for More People, More Active, More Often. For over 25 years we have supported our sporting community while also motivating our community to get active and keep active. Our outdoor environments are a vital asset to assist with people remaining active regularly. The most recent Active NZ survey data shows that Bay of Plenty people are choosing to recreate within outdoor spaces, more than any other region at 89%.

Our Tauranga and Western Bay populations have grown dramatically in the last decade. We need to remember that part of the attraction for people to move here is that there are opportunities to ‘Live, Work and Play’ in our amazing region. We are very conscious that once green space is taken away, it will not be returned. There are various users on the parks that have been highlighted as potential sites. Some of these are formal sports and others are informal local recreation users. We have highlighted some of the potential issues of using some of the spaces suggested, in particular, Waipuna Park.

Recreation

- Given the current obesity rates of 31% of adults and 11% of children, it is imperative that all community members have adequate access to green space for informal recreation and physical activity. Given our population is growing rapidly, the green spaces that we have are going to be utilised by more people. In addition, as many struggle to meet the Ministry of Health recommended physical activity levels (at least 2 ½ hours of moderate, or 1 ¼ hours of vigorous physical activity spread throughout the week) we are decreasing the chance of this percentage improving if we remove available open space. At present only 54% of adults meet the recommended guidelines.
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- It is difficult to present data regarding current informal use on these sites as no studies have been completed to capture this information. However, we have anecdotal evidence that many use these spaces for dog walking, family or friendly physical activity sessions or training for events, in particular Waipuna Park. In the case of Waipuna Park, if a supermarket was put on part of this site, although it may still leave room for recreational activity, many would not feel safe due to possible traffic hazards and busy carparks.

Sport

- Throughout the year, up to 15 different Sport Users utilise Waipuna Park for trainings and games. The park services a large number of Welcome Bay residents providing them with sports fields to train and play on locally within their own community. Something that Tauranga City Council has done very well throughout the city is providing each suburb with access to sporting lifestyles within their own community.
- Waipuna Park hosts many sporting events which require a large amount of fields at one location; the park is perfect for these events such as the AIMS tournament. If the park was to decrease in size it would not only directly impact the weekly users, but the city’s ability to cater for such events. There is only a small amount of parks elsewhere which can hold the same capacity resulting in the city potentially losing such events. These events bring significant economic benefits to the city.
- The park is used by many different groups for cross country events both on a regional and national level. The contour and size of the park is one of the only available to suit this activity in the city.
- With no loss of service being suggested, if Waipuna park was the location for the supermarket, there is no active reserves large enough in the Welcome Bay area and within Tauranga City boundaries to recreate the same level of service within the community.
- Waipuna Park is part of the network that have been analysed within the supply and demand studies, therefore, if this park was to be used or partly used, this would make those studies null and void.

Thanks again for the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the use of the proposed open spaces in Welcome Bay for development of a supermarket. If you require further clarification regarding any of our points outlined, we are happy to provide this.

Kind Regards,

Zane Jensen, Community Sport Advisor
Sonia Lynds, Recreation Team Leader
Catherine McCulloch, Community Manager
9.2.3 Attachment C - DC156 - Cultural Report from Combined Hapu for proposed Supermarket in Welcome Bay
COMBINED HAPU REPORT FOR POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF A SUPERMARKET IN WELCOME BAY

TO: Ben Burnard, Strategic Advisor of Tauranga City Council
    Community & Culture Committee

FROM: Ngai Te Ahi, Ngati He and Ngati Pukenga

DATE: Monday 19 June 2017

SUBJECT: Cultural Report regarding three (3) proposed sites of Kaitiaki, Waiorakei and Waitaha

Ko Mauao te Maunga
Ko Tauranga te Moana
Ko Ngati Ranginui, Ngai Te Rangi, Ngati Pukenga me Te Arawa nga iwi

The mountain is Mauao
The sea is Tauranga

The Iwi are Ngati Ranginui, Ngai Te Rangi, Ngati Pukenga and Te Arawa

Ngai Te Ahi has affiliations with Ngati Ranginui and Te Arawa, and close kinship ties to Ngai Te Rangi and Ngati Pukenga. The hapu is descended from Tamahika of Ngati Whakaue and Ngariunga of Ngati Ranginui, the founding tipuna of Ngai Te Ahi.

“Mai nga ngarehu o Whakapaukarakia, kei te ka tonu Te Ahi”

“From the embers of Whakapaukarakia, the fire burns on”

Our whakatauki captures our vision for the future; to ensure the survival, preservation and growth of Ngai Te Ahi, Ngati He and Ngati Pukenga for future generations. Newly laid pathways are constantly evolving to strengthen the cultural, social, economic and environmental well-being with the highest regard for each of the respective hapu.

For generations, Ngai Te Ahi has occupied the lands of Hairini, Ohauiti, Kaitiaki, Poike, Waoku and parts of the Waimapu and Taumata. We share these areas with neighbouring whanau and hapu of Ngati Ruahine, Ngai Tamarawaho, Ngati Pukenga and Ngati He.

Ngati He are predominantly settled within Kaitimako, Welcome Bay, Hairini and Maungatapu areas. Significant Ngati He Pa sites are Oruamataua, Te Ouwe and Te Auki.

Ngapeke is considered more in the rural area of Welcome Bay but retains the humble beating heart of Ngati Pukenga. Through major Crown land confiscations, Ngati Pukenga has suffered considerable land challenges, however, kaitiakitanga can never be extinguished. The combined links with many other hapu and Iwi have endured and remains strong to this day.

The boundaries extend from Nga Kuri a Wharei on the West Coast (Bowentown), inland to Te Aroha, along the rest of ranges south to Puwhenua, east to Otanewainuku, and out to sea at Wairakei.
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While you have provided a brief current impact assessment for the three proposed sites, this report presents the following:

1. Hapu Relationship with Kaitimako (Waipuna), Waiorakei (Owens Park) and Waitaha
2. Archaeological Surveys and Investigations
3. Ngai Te Ahi/Ngati He Cultural Sites of significance
4. Conclusion

Hapu Relationship with Kaitimako (Waipuna), Waiorakei (Owens Park) and Waitaha

The three proposed development sites are significant waahi tapu to the whanau/hapu/iwi o Ngai te Ahi, Ngati He and Ngati Pukenga.

In the first instant, Ngai Te Ahi, Ngati He and Ngati Pukenga shall not consider any development without full engagement and participation within Welcome Bay. However, the following are a list of concerns we have from your ‘Site information’ provided to us:

Kaitimako / Waipuna Park
- Kaitimako or Waipuna Park being referred to for this development, are settlements of whanau lands that were generationally farmed. Access to the Kaitimako Stream was pivotal, not only as a food source but an economic base for koha or trading with other hapu. Today, part of this land is being occupied as an urupa and now an approved, developing Papakainga Site for te whanau whanui o Ngai Te Ahi me Ngati He.
- The Waipapa block located within the same Waipuna area, is a strong shareholding of Ngati He and Ngai Te Ahi people. Te Pae-o-tu is adjacent to Kaitimako and remains today a thriving papakainga for the Reweti and Hika whanau o Ngai Te Ahi. These whanau are the ahikaa of this whenua and continue to maintain the traditional practises of kaitiakitanga o te waiti (fresh water) and the land.
- The aerial maps provided by Tauranga City Council clearly outline the proposed building sites however, we are limited to assume what mass area this will populate for either parking or an actual supermarket on any of the sites
- It is difficult to comprehend a full impact of how traffic can be determined with the Hairini Link Underpass only part way through its completion and each of the sites are bordering the only and main route in and out of Welcome Bay
- The bus changes are still an ongoing issue but it is very pleasing to note, students who attend Te Wharekura o Mauao that live within this rohe (region) supply & provide their own daily transport. There is already congested traffic along Welcome Bay Road adjoining Kaitimako Road whether school buses or public transport is changed.
- The transport infrastructure cannot cope with the people now, with what there is, the region will be saturated even more when the residential developments are finished let alone having a Supermarket in the same area.
Waitaha Reserve

- Waitaha is the original name of the hapu who occupied Maungatapu. He Iwi taketake (the originals). This whenua was the access way from Rangataua to the ranges and our sacred maunga o Otawa, on their journey to whanau in Te Puke/Otamarakau. Again, these lands were a rich and abundant food source, not only on the land but also the connection to the waita (salt waters) of Rangataua and its plentiful kaimoana.

- Welcome Bay is a multi-cultural community. The Welcome Bay Community Centre has established and maintained an excellent community gathering place for people of all ages, ethnicity, religion and gender to enjoy. Positive and proactive family events are undertaken and coordinated with minimal funding and all with volunteers, how and where can this be replicated or continued if the centre is demolished for the services of a supermarket.

- There are significant Pa sites already registered with New Zealand Archaeological

Waiorakei / Owens Park

- Waiorakei is another traditional site that Ngati He occupied to gather their food sources. Today, the wetlands and river has diminished from the development of homes.

- With the amount of available space and under-utilised reserve, this appears to be the most logical location

- The infrastructure cannot cope with the people now, what will happen when the residential developments are finished and even more people will be populating the roads?

- Why the assumption of limited growth in Kairua?
Archaeological Surveys and Investigations

Welcome Bay

Many archaeological surveys have been undertaken of Welcome Bay recently in response to road and pipeline rehabilitation and proposals; residential development proposals; and as part of wider Heritage Management programs, these include Keith (2001, 2012, 2013), Cable (2010), Campbell and Farley (2008), Hooker (2006), Phillips (2003), and Gumbley and Phillips (2000). The area has also been the subject of academic theses, for example O’Keefe’s (1990) *Prehistoric Settlement of the Western Bay of Plenty*. Others who have contributed to the NZAA site record database include John Coster, Kirsty Potts, Ray Hooker, Barnett McLean, Nick Cable, Cathleen Hauman, and Ken Phillips among others.

Keith (2013) carried out an archaeological assessment of a section of Welcome Bay Road, between the Welcome Bay township and Ngapeke, which found that the area was well-populated by shell midden, pa sites, terraces and pits. Cable (2010) reported on monitoring at Ohauiti (Waimapu Valley). This is an inland site that comprised ovens, storage pits and postholes, along with lithic and shell material. The site was interpreted as a multiple use temporary encampment that showed evidence of marine shell, that resources from both the Tauranga Harbour and Papamoa coast were being carried this far inland. The principal midden layer, identified as the third stage of occupation, was deposited at some time between 1490 and 1670 AD.

Campbell and Farley (2008) reported on excavations at Kaitimako, another inland Welcome Bay location. Midden, oven scoops and postholes were recorded, as were garden soils. Hooker (2006) surveyed an area of Kaitimako Road. The landscape was described as dominated by a ridge with knobs and spur ridges of gentle to moderate scope, with areas elevated to rolling county and several watercourses running northwards, a description no dissimilar to that of the area under consideration. A total of 13 archaeological site records were added to the NZAA database because of the 85ha ground survey and included midden, terraces, platforms and pa. It was concluded that the archaeological sites identified in the survey likely under-represented the true density of archaeology in the area.

We, as Ngai Te Ahi, Ngati He and Ngati Pukenga acknowledge this is only a ‘snapshot’ of Welcome Bay in its entirety, there is an extremely strong potential that buried and unknown archaeological sites will exist within all three (3) of the proposed project areas currently under consideration.

Therefore, it is reasonable to note, that all archaeological sites are protected by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, whether recorded or not. It is illegal to modify or destroy an archaeological site without an authority being granted under Section 42 of the HNZPTA and that consultation must be undertaken with the respective hapu or Iwi to support such an application.
Ngati Te Ahi/Ngati He/Ngati Pukenga

Sites of significance

Listed are only some of the locations and significant findings to support the kaitiakitanga role we as hapu and Iwi engage;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Titirua Kainga</td>
<td>Kaitimako</td>
<td>Kainga This is a traditional kainga that Ngai Te Ahi and Ngati He whanau have lived and worked on for generations through to today. Maori Freehold LandTCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungarangi</td>
<td>Kaitimako</td>
<td>Pa Maungarangi is located east of Titirua and was a landmark for Ngai Te Ahi and other hapū. The site is accessed from Roger Guy Place which is off Kaitimako Rd. Private OwnershipTCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Rimupoka</td>
<td>Waitaha</td>
<td>Kainga Te Rimupoka Hunting campsite and battle ground, Mahinga Kai. Eru Whakatana talks of his experience at Rimupoka (in March 1884) Rimupoka had not been cultivated since a time prior to the days of our fathers. They saw the marks of old cultivations there. It lies at some distance from the Houroa track – to the southwest of it. Ngati Rehu came from Te Awaroa (Rotorua) to Te Rimupoka. The area was known as a potato garden of the Ngai Te Ahi and pig hunting. Moiri had a tame pig left at Te Rimupoka. When Ngai Te Ahi returned to Te Rimupoka, they found the Ngati Rehu there and that the pig had been caught and killed. The Ngai Te Ahi captured a woman called Hinetane and carried her off in reprisal for this trespass. The area was located on the boundary between Ngai Te Ahi and Waitaha. South of the Te Rerenga Stream. Part of the TRW Regional Approach with other Iwi / Hapū groups to manage the conservation lands in Tauranga. WBOPDCNgai Te Ahi Whanau. Eruera Whakatana.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT C to DC156

Tauranga Moana Minute Book 1; Page 146. 20130704

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te Kokonui</td>
<td>Kaitimako Ngahere</td>
<td>This property was established and developed by the late Tane Wharemokai Heke Kaiawha as a native bush reserve for his whanau and other to appreciate the ngahere and the outdoors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Auhi Pa</td>
<td>Waitaha Pa</td>
<td>Te Auhi Pa is located on the upper ridge on Osprey Drive that looks predominately to the east to Ranginui and north over Rangataua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Onepu</td>
<td>Waipuna Puna</td>
<td>Te Onepu Puna. This is a natural spring that feeds the Otamarua Stream in the Waipuna Park Reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngai Te Ahi</td>
<td>Ohauti Pa</td>
<td>Pa Site located at Rowe Subdivision off Ohauti Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titirua Pa</td>
<td>Kaitimako Pa</td>
<td>Titirua Pa Site located 1.5 km on the eastern side of Kaitimako Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otamarua</td>
<td>Waiorakei Puna</td>
<td>Water source located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Pahou Urupa</td>
<td>Ohauti Urupa</td>
<td>Te Pahou Urupa is the main Ngai Te Ahi urupa that is located at the Welcome Bay traffic lights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipapa Pa</td>
<td>Kaitimako Pa</td>
<td>Waipapa Pa Site and Waahi Tapu on the eastern banks of the Kaitimako Stream and within the Waipapa block(15a2r24p) was granted to 13 individuals, ten of whom have been identified as Ngai Te Ahi. The Certificate of Title is dated 17 November 1885. Alienation restrictions were imposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngai Te Ahi</td>
<td>Ohauti Pa</td>
<td>Pa site located west of Kaimai Place off Ohauti Rd. A Ngai Te Ahi Pa was located on the western banks of the Kaitimako Stream.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### ATTACHMENT C to DC156

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waahi tapu Ohauiti Puna</strong></td>
<td>The Puna (spring) is located north of Pukepoto Pa below the puke. Water spring used by Pukepoto occupants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pukepoto Pa Ohauiti Pa</strong></td>
<td>Pa Site Golden heights area off Pukemapu Rd, Ngai Te Ahi Pa site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Rua o Korotangi Waipuna Pa</strong></td>
<td>Also a Waahi Tapu. This is the name of one of the smallest land blocks that was returned to Ngai Te Ahi and Ngati He whanau. The Block was located between the Waipapa and Tapuaeotu blocks on the western side of Kaitimako Rd and the Tutukeranga block on the adjacent side of the Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Otamarua Stream Waiorakei Puna</strong></td>
<td>Otamarua Stream Manga This is a Ngai Te Ahi and Ngati He waterway that is sourced from the upper Kaitimako land blocks. The stream was used to harvest tuna, water cress and harakeke. Part of the proposed Tauranga Moana Joint Governance &amp; Management Structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hairini Puna Hairini Puna</strong></td>
<td>Spring water Hairini 6D Traditional water spring in the Hairini area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Rangakahui Ohauiti Puna</strong></td>
<td>Greenwood Village Waahi. The name of the land between Ohauiti Road and the Kaitimako Stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tapuaeotu Waipuna Pa</strong></td>
<td>Tapuaeotu Papakāinga Whanau papakāinga area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaitimako Stream Kaitimako Puna</strong></td>
<td>Kaitimako Stream Awa This is a significant stream to Ngai Te Ahi as it starts from Maungatutu south of Hairini and flows into Te Tehe and Rangataua harbour. The Kaitimako Stream is also the boundary between the Kaitimako No 1 Block and Ohauiti No 2. The Kaitimako Stream was a traditional fishing resource for Ngai Te Ahi including tuna, mullet herrings and whitebait</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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CONCLUSION

In the days of old, occupation of the whenua (land) was signified by the Ahi Kaa (burning fires). When the seasons changed and time came to move to other kainga (homes) the pa fires were buried and lay smouldering beneath the earth. Upon their return, the ha ora (breath of life) would rekindle the smouldering ashes into a flame. The winds would then fan the flames, thus sustaining the people. Symbolic of a rekindling, a revitalisation of our values, our philosophies and practise and all that defines us, as Maori. For maori this is referred to as Te Ahi konau – the buried fires.

All through Kaitimako are ahi komau – fires that were buried in time of occupation especially in seasons when the whitebait was running, watercress in season and the tuna/eels are ready for harvesting. The hapu spent their time on the lands not only to gather food, replenish the supply for future seasons but we are also kaitiaki in ensuring the quality of conservation for the land and waterways are successfully maintained.

The land and waters of the proposed development sites within Welcome Bay are fertile and will always have a mauri (life force) of its own. It is the responsibility of Ngai Te Ahi, Ngati He and Ngati Pukenga to strengthen the cultural, social, economic and environmental well-being of our hapu. We have maintained kinship through marriage and will continue to protect and maintain our kaitiakitanga in the adversity of growth and development.

"Mai nga ngarehu o Whakapaukarakia, kei te ka tonu te Ahi"

From the embers of Whakapaukarakia the fire burns on

Our whakatauki captures our vision for the future; to ensure the survival, preservation and growth of Ngai Te Ahi, Ngati He and Ngati Pukenga for future generations. Newly laid pathways are constantly evolving to strengthen the cultural, social, economic and environmental well-being with the highest regard for each of the respective hapu.
10. Discussion of Late Items

11. Public Excluded Session

*Suggested Resolution*

*That it be Resolved*

*That Council:*

(a) Exclude the public from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting as set out below.

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 & Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Subject of Each Matter to be Considered</th>
<th>Reason for Passing this Resolution in Relation to Each Matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) Under Section 48(1) for the Passing of this Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments D and E (Confidential)</td>
<td>(i) Would disclose a trade secret; or</td>
<td>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TUESDAY, 11 JULY 2017
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