

6. ARTWORKS IN PUBLIC PLACES - PLANNING

Officer responsible Leisure Manager	Author Alan Bywater, Team Leader Leisure Planning, DDI 941-6430 and Erin Eyles, Leisure Planning Projects Officer, DDI 941-8455
---	--

The purpose of this report is to:

- Determine the allocation of the artworks in public places budget in 2003/04 and 2004/05.
- Determine the process to allocate the top-up fund for integrated, functional artworks.
- Determine the prioritisation process for artworks opportunities identified for the five-year artworks in public places plan.

INTRODUCTION

Work has been ongoing to develop a five-year artworks in public places plan for the City. During the Annual Plan process the budget for artworks in public places was increased to \$250,000 per annum for the 2003/04, 2004/05 and 2005/06 years.

A need was identified to determine a programme of artworks in public places projects for 2003/04 as a matter of urgency to enable as much time as possible during the year for these projects to be implemented. A seminar of the Committee was held on 26 August 2003 to consider projects for 2003/04 and 2004/05.

PROJECTS IDENTIFIED AT THE SEMINAR

The programme of artworks in public places identified for 2003/04 and 2004/05 at the seminar are attached as Appendix 1.

In addition to these projects those identified through the Five-Year Artworks in Public Places planning process that have significant capital programmes attached to them that take place in 2003/04 or 2004/05 are listed in Appendix 2. In determining the allocation of the artworks in public places budget as indicated in Appendix 1, the Committee is effectively forgoing the opportunity to fund those listed in Appendix 2.

It should be noted that by allocating so fully the 2004/05 budget at this stage, little room has been left to consider other projects or to respond to initiatives from outside organisations.

It will be made clear to those involved in implementing the projects that the budget allocations include such things as brief development, project management, selection of artist and artworks, obtaining necessary consents and permits, fabrication of work and its installation. There is an expectation that further funding will not be sought from this source for the projects.

REPORTING PROCESSES

Of the projects identified for funding at the seminar two fall in to the Urban and Environmental Category under the Artworks in Public Places Policy. Operational procedures including reporting mechanisms have been drafted for this category as well as for the Community Artworks category. Staff wish to discuss these draft procedures with the Committee at an upcoming seminar.

Seven of the projects identified for funding fall into the Integrated Artworks category in the Artworks in Public Places Policy. To date no standard operational procedures have been developed for this category.

There is a need to enable the project management staff to implement these integrated projects and without burdening them with excessive reporting processes. During the debate on funding of artworks in public places in the Annual Plan process, some members expressed concern about potential delays to capital programmes through involving an arts component. It is important that any such delays are kept to an absolute minimum.

To this end it is proposed that once the Council has confirmed its funding allocations, that progress reporting be made by the Arts Advisor through the regular pARTicipation reports.

ALLOCATION PROCESS FOR THE CONTESTABLE FUND FOR INTEGRATED, FUNCTIONAL ITEMS

Within the budget allocations indicated at the seminar is the creation of a fund for integrated, functional items of \$50,000 per annum for the next two years. The general expectation for this fund is that it is for units or community boards undertaking capital project to install functional items eg seats, water fountains, bike racks, to enable these to be integrated with arts rather than merely basic, functional items. The expectation is that the fund is a 'top-up' to allow the arts to be integrated and not to pay for the full cost of the items.

A process is required to allocate this fund between competing projects.

It is proposed that the maximum level of funding for any project from this source is \$15,000 and the following criteria need to be met for projects to be considered for this fund:

- Integrated/functional items only,
- The project is for top-up funding only (ie the unit or community board is expected to provide the funding for at least the basic item),
- The unit/community board can genuinely not afford to integrate artworks into the item without top-up funding from this fund,
- The project must be initiated in the current financial year and completed within the current or next financial year,
- The project management (artworks process) is incorporated in the total project budget.

It is proposed that staff prioritise amongst the qualifying projects using the matrix in Appendix 3. Projects funded will be reported to the Committee.

PROCESS TO PRIORITISE PROJECTS IN THE FIVE YEAR ARTWORKS PLAN

A large number of potential artworks in public places locations/projects have been identified in the process to develop a five-year plan. A process is needed to prioritise amongst these locations/projects. It is suggested that this prioritisation be taken to the point at which high, medium and low priority locations/projects are identified rather than a list starting with the highest priority going right through to the lowest priority.

When the Committee comes to consider the allocation of the artworks in public places budget for 2005/06 for example, it would consider projects in the following order:

- (a) High priority locations/projects with capital programmes associated in 2005/06.
- (b) High priority locations/projects with no associated capital programmes.
- (c) Medium priority locations/projects with capital programmes associated in 2005/06.

It is intended that a matrix similar to the one for the integrated projects be developed to enable the prioritisation to be carried out. There are however, some additional factors that need to be considered. Factors to be considered have been identified along with the means to apply them to the prioritisation process, as follows:

Place Related Criteria

- Visibility based on vehicular traffic flow - street hierarchy,
- Proximity to pedestrian routes,
- Association with public transport interchanges,
- Association with a community facility (eg libraries, leisure facilities, community centres) - based on the scale of (and therefore foot traffic to) the community facility,
- Association with significant natural feature,
- Association with a heritage building or place - based on mapping of heritage buildings and sites,
- Cultural Significance to Maori.

People Related Criteria

- Association with Council target groups - based on whether the site/project has an association with one of the Council's target groups identified in policy (ie children, youth, older people, people with disabilities),
- Association with visitors - based on the degree to which the location/site is frequented by visitors to the city,
- Association with a significant event - based on whether the site/project is associated with and adds value to a major event for the City.

Project Related Criteria

- Integration with a capital programme - based on trying to integrate as much as possible with other works happening in the same location.
- External funding sources - likely to be based on potential to attract external funding sources rather than actually confirmed sources.
- Identified stakeholders - likely to be based on whether there is an identified stakeholder group associated with the location/area likely to be actively supportive.
- Supported by research and/or consultation - based on level of local support as identified in any research or consultation undertaken in the area.
- Linkage with other planning processes (eg Reserve Management Plans, Neighbourhood Improvement Plans) - based on trying to integrate artworks with other planning processes as much as possible.

A number of other possible criteria have been considered but not included at this stage due to no process to consistently apply them being identified. These areas are as follows:

- Pedestrian flow levels - limited data is available.
- Cultural significance ethnic minorities - how to apply.
- Distribution citywide - there are a lot of varying drivers from the desire for central city revitalisation to the desire to increase the number of artworks outside the current central city cluster. It is not clear whether most impact can be gained by aiming to distribute artworks fairly evenly across the city or develop them in clusters possibly associated with areas that have developed a particular theme or brand.

Staff

- Recommendation:**
1. That the projects listed in Appendix 1 be approved for funding from the Artworks in Public Places budget for 2003/04 and 2004/05.
 2. That where a capital project, incorporating an artworks in public places budget funded integrated artwork, is reported through another standing committee, the Chairperson of the Arts, Culture and Heritage Committee (or nominee) attend the relevant committee meeting.
 3. That the Committee consider the criteria in Appendix 3 for assessing projects for the integrated, functional artworks fund and indicate the weightings for the different factors.
 4. That the process for allocating the integrated, functional artworks fund be as detailed in section 4 and Appendix 3 of this report.

Chairman's

- Recommendation:** That the officers recommendation be supported.