

20. HILLSBOROUGH COMMUNITY CENTRE – OPTIONS REPORT

Officer responsible
Property Manager

Author
Bill Binns, Property Services Officer, DDI 941-8504

The purpose of this report is to seek the Community Board's comments for the Property and Major Projects Committee's consideration when it makes its recommendation to Council to determine the future use of the building situated at 29 Curries Road (Hillsborough Community Centre).

CONTEXT OF THE REPORT

In accordance with the Council's policy in regard to making a decision about the future of this property, the property has been internally notified as being available.

The current 2003/04 financial budget provides for \$10,421 per annum operational costs. The Property Unit previously received \$5,067 per annum in rental from the Tamariki School, which has since moved. Part of the building is leased to the 'Word of Life Fellowship', for which the Council receives still \$1,200 per annum. This group's occupancy is on a month-by-month basis. No provision has been made for capital improvements or for the disposal of the building.

This report summarises those groups who have expressed interest and outlines the options available.

BACKGROUND

The property at 29 Curries Road was acquired by the Heathcote County Council as a reserve which has since been changed to Recreation Reserve by Gazette notices 1985 p2166 & 1983 p3638.

The legal descriptions are Lot 12, 13 & 17 DP 7237 & Lot 18 DP 2717 & Lot 13 DP 27317 (classified) (GAZ 1985 P2166) and (GAZ 1983 p3638) (see Appendices 1 and 2).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In December 1996 Council staff were advised that the Hillsborough Community Centre was no longer required by the community. However, subsequent to this the Council received a request from the Tamariki School Board of Trustees to utilise the building for temporary accommodation until they could either purchase or build their own facilities. Council agreed to this request. The Tamariki School finally vacated this facility in March of this year. This report outlines internal options compared to other options for the future use of this building.

RELEVANT CURRENT POLICY

Council Policy

There are two policy issues relevant to this project:

1. Future use of properties that are no longer required for operational purposes must be determined in accordance with the "property decision-making flow chart". The main steps in this process are:
 - Step 1 Identifying that a property asset is no longer required for operational purposes or is under-utilised.
 - Step 2 Assessment of the property, ie features, legal status etc.
 - Step 3 Internal circularisation for the purpose of establishing whether there are other Council/public uses.
 - Step 4 Property Unit assessment of internal/public submissions and preparation of an Options Report.
 - Step 5 Council resolution on future use or sale.
2. Should Council resolve to sell the property this will need to be conducted in a public manner, ie. *"That, in principle, the Council should publicly tender properties for sale unless there is a clear reason for doing otherwise"*.

Through the process of internally notifying Council Units that the building is available, two submissions were received from Community Advocates/Council officers.

DESCRIPTION OF OPTIONS (OUTLINED BELOW)

Option 1 Retain the Property for use by the Opawa/St. Martins Plunket Toy Library.

The internal process produced one submission from Community Advocates/Council officers for a group within the community to utilise the property.

The Beckenham Community Advocate advised that this site should be considered as a second option for the relocating of the Opawa/St Martins Plunket Toy Library, which is presently occupying the former Parks Unit garage at Risingholme Park.

The Toy Library's preference is to relocate in the former Beckenham Public Library, which is also no longer required for operational purposes and is therefore the subject of a similar but separate report.

The intent of this process of internal circularisation is to establish "internal" uses, not to create an opportunity for the promotion of external activities, albeit community-based. The conclusion we can draw from this is that there are no internal needs/demands for this building. A potential community-based activity has been identified, but it would be inappropriate to deal unilaterally with this group at this stage in the process, i.e. a public process would need to be adopted to ensure all possible community groups are afforded an equal opportunity.

Option 2 Removal of Building from the Reserve

The second internal submission received from the Parks Unit seeks the removal of the building from the reserve so that it can be more effectively utilised. This option would allow parks to look at:

1. Turning the car parking area into a half court.
2. Landscaping the area where the building stood.
3. Looking at the possibility of upgrading the play equipment.
4. Turning the reserve into a picnic area.
5. As this reserve is near an industrial area, looking at creating a time out or placid area for industrial workers (ie Disraeli Reserve).

This would be a new project funded out of the Parks and Waterways Capital Work Programme. Once the building was removed and a decision on which or a combination of the above options was accepted, an estimated \$10,000 would be required. The effects on the on-going operation costs to the reserve would depend on which option was chosen.

Option 3 Revocation of the Reserve and Disposal of the Land

Council could consider revocation of the Reserve and disposal of the land. Whilst this is an option, if pursued, the Council would have to hand the land back to the Crown subject to Part 9 of the Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 and be offered for purchase or lease to Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu in certain circumstances.

Option 4 Tender seeking Request for Proposals

For Council to invite proposals from interested parties in the community to put forward concepts for the use of the building. At this point Council has not asked the community at large whether there are any community groups that could utilise the building. As a result it is therefore difficult to recommend option 1, as this would be seen as "picking winners" and subverting Council's undertaking requirements of open and public processes.

ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES

Option 1 Retain the Property for use by the Opawa/St Martins Plunket Toy Library

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides a further option for the Opawa/St Martins Plunket Toy Library.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This site is outside the catchment area of the Toy Library.• Ties premises to one group.• Council responsible for future operational and capital costs.• Building situated in an industrial area.• Seen as dealing unilaterally.

Option 2 Removal of Building from the Reserve

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Remove a building for which there appears to be no significant need/demand.• The Reserve can be developed into a placid open area in an industrial location of the benefit of the community and workers.• Council not responsible for future operational and capital costs.• Reduces number of properties Council owns.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Costs involved in developing the building site.• No future income.• On-going operational costs. Although depending on option taken this could be minimal.

Option 3 Revocation of the Reserve and Disposal of the Land

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nil.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Council loses a reserve.• Land handed back to Ngai Tahu.

Option 4 Tender seeking Request for Proposals

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Opportunity for community to put forward their ideas for the use of the building.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minimal rent return.• Council responsible for operational and capital costs.• Tie up a property that has a more beneficial use to the community as a recreation reserve.• Retaining a building which has minimal use.

CONCLUSION

In 1996 the Property Unit put before the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board a report seeking policy direction for the future of the Hillsborough Community Centre. The Board asked that extensive advertising be carried out over the greater Christchurch area to see if there was any interest in the Centre. As an interim measure the Tamariki School was granted a short-term lease. The Board received four submissions to its advertising campaign. Unfortunately, the needs amounted to only one or two days' occupancy a week. The Tamariki School's lease was extended on a month-by-month basis and in April this year the lease was terminated by the School.

On Sundays the Work of Life Fellowship had been using the premises and they were allowed to remain. Since the Tamariki School departed the Word of Life Fellowship have been put on a monthly lease. Little interest has been shown in this facility by the community since the 1996 report.

Staff

Recommendation: That the Council resolve as follows:

1. That the Hillsborough Community Centre at 29 Curries Road be tendered for removal.
2. That the land be retained by Council and incorporated into the existing Reserve.
3. That the above building be offered for sale by public tender and the Property Manager be authorised to sell the building.

Chairperson's

Recommendation: For discussion.