



### 3. COMMUNITY FACILITIES – ALLOCATION OF UNSPECIFIED FUNDS

<b>Officer responsible</b> Community Relations Manager	<b>Author</b> Tony Gemmill and others
Corporate Plan Output: Facilities/Halls/Cottages 6.1 text 15	

The purpose of this report is to recommend the adoption of a proposal for the development of a new Council community facility, and to report progress in respect of current reviews of “community facilities”.

#### BACKGROUND

In the course of developing the 1999/2000, Plan the Annual Plan Working Party considered a number of requests associated with the development of new Community Centres.

In approving the draft 1999/2000 Annual Plan for release for public consultation the Council resolved:

*“That a report be brought to the appropriate Committee on the needs for the development and upgrading of Community Centres city-wide.”*

In adopting the **final plan** the Council also resolved:

*“That, in accordance with the earlier resolution of Council, all proposals for Community Centres be evaluated in a city-wide review, the evaluation to include set up and ongoing operational costs.”*

A report on these issues was tabled at one of the Community Services Special (Outputs and Standards) Committee meetings earlier this year.

#### RECENT ACTIVITY

##### City-Wide Review

Work is underway on a city-wide review of facilities which are available for use by the community (i.e. community facilities). It is relevant that while the Council owns approximately 40 such facilities, there are over 400 other facilities, which provide for a wide range of uses by the community. A substantial number of these other facilities are owned/operated by schools, churches, and sporting organisations.

The overall objective for this review is to develop a city-wide database of such facilities.

##### Outputs and Standards Review

The Community Services Special Committee, earlier in the year, identified the community facilities output for review. In its deliberations, the Committee noted that there were a large number of other facilities which were also competing for the same customers who use the Council’s facilities.

The terms of reference for the Special Committee's review are based upon "A Strategic review of all Council provided community facilities against a background of the overall supply of community facilities i.e. Council, and private".

The review is intended to "combine facility information (type, location, and use) alongside Council Strategic Objectives and Policies, and an assessment of current delivery and community outcomes".

There is a general acknowledgment that the outcome from the work underway in set out above will be the resource that will enable the review of this particular output.

### **Evaluation System**

The Annual Plan Working Party, during its deliberations on the 1999/00 Annual, Plan, sought a process to enable relative priorities to be established for all bids for new/upgraded facilities in order that funding could be fairly allocated on a priority basis.

Over past months work has been underway in designing a weighted attributes evaluation system, which would suit this purpose. The development of this resource has recently been completed, and has been used to prioritise a number of current "bids" for allocation of the Council's "unspecified community facilities" funding.

### **UNSPECIFIED COMMUNITY FACILITIES FUNDING**

Current funding available through the Council's Annual Plan is \$404,000. This sum includes a figure of \$200,000 from 1999/00 (which has been requested to be carried forward) and \$204,000 from the present financial year.

As mentioned above, all current "bids" against this fund have recently been considered through the weighted attributes evaluation system with the following outcomes:

<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>ESTIMATED COST</b>	<b>SCORE (see note 1)</b>
Multicultural Centre – Hornby (R/W)	Purchase and modification of an existing Community Facility (“Friendship House”) currently owned and managed by the Presbyterian Church/Trust.	\$300,000	8.55 (see note 2)
Avic Hill Art and Craft Centre (F/W)	Internal conversion of residential section of existing building, plus other site improvements.	\$45,000 to \$60,000	6.8
Fendalton (ex) Library (F/W)	Conversion of former library building to provide for additional passive community/neighbourhood use (and to enhance use of adjacent Fendalton Community Hall).		6.7
South New Brighton Community Centre (B/P)	General renovation of facility to enhance use of facility by the school and other community users.	(no costs available)	3.9
Windsor School and Community Hall (B/P)	Expansion of existing hall/facility	(no costs available)	2.8
North New Brighton Community Centre (B/P)	General renovation of facility to enhance use.	(no indicative cost available, although this may exceed the \$404,000 presently available).	1.75

- Notes:
1. The wide variation in scores obtained through the evaluation process are more a reflection of the absence of various steps completed in the overall flow chart to be followed for the development of such new projects: i.e. it is not based on an “apples-for-apples” comparison of each project.
  2. The Multicultural Centre proposal is the only one, which fully qualifies as a “completed” process against the project flowchart.

The following officer comments apply in support of the favoured project (i.e. the Multicultural Centre):

The Community Advocate, Riccarton/Wigram comments:

In December 1997 an independent researcher, Nona Milburn, completed a needs analysis of the Broomfield area. Results from this report highlighted the “lack of local amenities, opportunities to meet or know what is on, and facilities for activities. Workers in the area emphasised the social isolation and separation of groups as the greatest concern as well as the lack of access to services (health and social) in the central city, support groups, places to meet”. A report by Kath Jamieson (Senior Researcher, Christchurch City Council) on poverty and hardship also identified this geographical area as one experiencing high levels of poverty and hardship. Isolation was again stressed as one of the significant factors associated with those on limited incomes. This area has significantly higher proportions of both Maori and Pacific Island residents (12.7% and 5.3% respectively), and a high proportion of both single parent households and residents whose income is less than \$20,000 pa.

Since this report the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board contracted Family and Community Division of Anglican Care to provide two community development workers to address the needs identified, through a community development process. The main task of the Maori community worker was to identify the needs of the Maori community as this had been a major gap in Nona Milburn's report. The outcome was a series of hui which again highlighted the need for a communal place to meet in the Broomfield Hei Hei area.

In December 1999, a report was submitted to the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board identifying the need for a multi-cultural centre in the Hornby area. The Riccarton/Wigram Community Board was very supportive of the concept and a working party was established to ensure the development of the project.

Recently 'Friendship House' a community facility previously run by the Presbyterian Trust on the border of Hei Hei and Broomfield became available for purchase. The buildings, and layout of the facility would be ideal for the needs of small and large groups to meet. It currently has a resource consent to operate as a community facility. The venue at St Aiden's where the two community workers are at present working from is "over flowing" in terms of space. Programmes for example, computer classes, are having to share space and time with other activities. A five day Wananga for 60 students from Hornby High School had to be located outside the area because there was no available, suitable and affordable venue in Hornby.

The following activities are currently held at St Aidan's:

1. Playgroup (Monday morning)
2. Craft Group (Tuesday)
3. Multiple Birth Group (Tuesday)
4. Living Skills Group (Wednesday afternoon)
5. 'Drop In' (Thursday morning/afternoon)
6. Community Lunch (Friday)
7. Walking Group (Wednesday)
8. Waiata Class (Friday)
9. Foster Parent Support Group (Thursday afternoon)
10. ADS Support Group
11. Community liaison meeting
12. Russian Group (Saturday)
13. Anglican Church (Sunday)
14. Computer Education Class
15. Whanau Youth support
16. Kapa haka group

Discussions have been held with representatives of the Presbyterian Trust, who are very keen to see 'Friendship House' continue to meet the needs of the surrounding community. The working party as well as the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board are fully supportive of purchasing these premises should funding be made available. A report went to the Community Board on the 29 March 2000, along with a valuation of the property and description from the consent officer related to the condition and maintenance requirements of the buildings.

The Riccarton/Wigram Community Board recommended that the Christchurch City Council purchase Friendship House for the purpose of developing a multi cultural centre to meet identified needs in the Hornby area. It also recommended that funds be obtained from the Property Units unspecified community facilities budget and that the purchase of this property be given high priority by the Property Unit. This report, plus all the attached documents, was passed onto the Property Unit.

It is difficult to assess accurately the ongoing operating costs and potential revenue. The Hei Hei Community Centre has an operating budget of \$17,000 pa. This does not include overheads (\$50,000). The total revenue for 1998/99 was \$10,146. It is unrealistic to expect community facilities in low income geographical areas to cover their costs totally and this is a consistent theme throughout Christchurch City. The overriding priorities of the new Social Wellbeing Policy are to reduce disparity between groups (Maori and non-Maori and socio-economic groups) and to reduce multi disadvantage. Community facilities must therefore be affordable and accessible for all, so that these priorities can be addressed in a practical manner.

The Property Asset Manager comments:

“An independent valuation for the property has been obtained. It acknowledges that the main hall is in reasonably good order and condition for its age and would add value for the Council’s intended use. However, the prefab buildings (weatherboard, ‘ex army’ barrack type accommodation) could only be considered as in fair to poor condition compared with other Council owned community facilities. A figure of \$50,000 has been estimated by one of the Service Centre staff, to address only the immediate deferred maintenance issues (roof repairs/exterior painting etc).

Although the \$50,000 may satisfy the immediate/short term requirements of the proposed users, the potential medium to long term upgrading costs (carpet, partitions, heating, car parking, underground services etc) and the ongoing general maintenance requirements or replacement cost, would most likely fall back onto the Council to fund. Although this has not been estimated, it is likely to be significant. The prefab building could most probably be considered a liability in the long term.

No investigation in terms of potential upgrading costs to meet any immediate specific user group requirements has been undertaken to date. This is on the advice that the proposed users are happy with the current state of the buildings, and that any labour/material costs to satisfy their immediate requirements will be provided by the groups/users concerned. If the Council is to proceed with the purchase it should do so on the basis that the ongoing maintenance cost and future upgrading cost for this property will be significant. Although the proposed purchase may appear attractive in the short term to satisfy an immediate need, purchase should not be considered by the Council until a comprehensive Building Audit is carried out so that the future maintenance and upgrading cost can be quantified, and also to determine who will be responsible for these costs (e.g. Council, users, a combination or grants etc).”

## SUMMARY/DISCUSSION

Of the present “bids” for the Council’s “unspecified community facilities” fund, the only one to have passed through the full list of steps required to be followed for the development of a new facility is the proposal to purchase and modify an existing facility in Hornby. The project therefore qualifies for consideration for funding this year.

While none of the other proposals have, as yet completed the process of needs analysis/building-site selection/concept planning/costing they may, nevertheless, eventually be worthy proposals in their own right. Further work is being carried out on each of these by the respective Advocacy Team/Community Board.

Any decision of the Committee to allocate funding for a new facility needs to be taken in the light of the present outputs and standards review initiated by the Community Services Special Committee i.e. whether or not the Council should commit itself to another facility before the bigger picture of the city-wide evaluation is completed.

While the above consideration would suggest that there should be no approval given for the creation of further community facilities, pending the outcome from the present review, the case of the Multicultural Centre could be seen as being different because of the already established programmes being provided from an existing facility. For this reason the proposal should be endorsed by the Committee subject, of course, to a Building Audit being carried out to determine future maintenance and upgrading costs.

- Recommendation:**
1. That the information be noted on the work currently underway in evaluating city-wide needs for community facilities.
  2. That the purchase and upgrading of the facility known as “Friendship House” be endorsed, subject to final information on the building audit, and future maintenance and upgrading costs being submitted to the 18 September meeting of the Committee.
  3. That the Community Services Committee be advised of the content of this report.

**Chairman’s**

- Recommendation:** That the above recommendation be adopted.