

Title: Yardstick – Parkcheck Management Measures Results for 2018
Section: Liveable Communities
Prepared by: Garrett Blair (Contracts & Asset Manager)
Meeting Date: 10 October 2018

Legal Financial Significance = low

Report to **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & SERVICES** Committee for information

The provision and management of libraries, museums, reserves, and other recreational facilities and community amenities are core services under the Local Government Act 2002. Yardstick has been developed for the industry as a benchmarking tool to collect management and planning information to measure current performance and drive future improvements.

This report provides a high-level summary of the results from the 2017 Park Check Management Measures. Management measures Council's reviews, financial performance, compares the provision of our parks network with others, and provides comparative information for open space planning.

Results from the 2017 survey identifies that comparably, Council's current investment in Parks and Open Spaces has shown a slight increase from previous years but we are still well under the national median.

The decisions or matters in this report are considered to be of **low** significance in accordance with the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Community Development & Services Committee:

- 1. Notes the contents of this report.**

Authorised by:



Keita Kohere
Director Transformation & Relationships



Andrew White
Director Liveable Communities

Keywords: yardstick, parkcheck, parks and open spaces, nzra,

BACKGROUND

1. Yardstick is owned, operated and supported by a collaborative partnership of industry organisations including the New Zealand Recreation Association (NZRA), International Federation of Parks and Recreation (ifpra), Parks and Leisure Australia (PLA) and the Institute of Public Works Engineering Australia (IPWEA).
2. Council subscribes to Yardstick for Parkcheck benchmarking against other local governments. In 2017, twenty-four other Councils were involved in Parkcheck, which gave a very strong basis of comparison when considering the results.
3. The report itself is 284 pages of benchmarking data. Copies can be made available on request.
4. The 2017 report information covers the following areas:
 1. Key performance indicators (KPI's)
 2. Provision
 3. Investment and Efficiency
 4. Operational Excellence
 5. Infrastructure Management
 6. Strategic Planning
 7. Environmental Sustainability
 8. Community Engagement
 9. Country specific data (New Zealand)

DISCUSSION and OPTIONS

5. The following key benchmarking data comes from the Parkcheck Survey that related to Council's Parks and Open Spaces activity. For the purposes of this report, staff have selected a Peer Group Median of other local councils based on similar population sizes only. These are:
 - Nelson City Council
 - Waipa District Council
 - Invercargill City Council
 - Western Bay of Plenty Council
 - Tasman District Council
 - Napier City Council

Overall Best Practice Score

6. The overall Best Practice score is derived from the best practice assessment completed against the Yardstick audit meeting, and is a measure of how well each organisation is performing in terms of operational excellence, infrastructure management, strategic planning, environmental sustainability and community engagement. The Gisborne District Council scored a 69.8%, which is the highest of its peer group and well above the median (44.8%). This score is predominately down to the review and implementation of the Mahi mo Te Tairāwhiti contract as well as the work carried out in the Community Facilities Strategy.

Levels of Service – Key Points

7. Gisborne District is above the mid-range for:
 - Area of actively maintained park per 1000 residents, at 14.0ha/1000 residents (median 10.1ha/1000 residents).
 - Provision of sports parks per 1000 residents, at 6.2ha/1000 residents (median is 2.7ha/1000 residents).
 - Total direct annual operational cost per hectare, at \$4468 (median is \$3362/ha), noting that Gisborne manages a high percentage of actively maintained parkland relative to peer Councils..
 - Street Tree maintenance expenditure per tree \$118 per tree (median is \$77 per tree).
 - Tree maintenance expenditure budget per 1000 residents is \$10,387 (Median is \$5,068), noting Council's Long Term Plan focus on implementing the newly adopted Street Trees and Gardens Plan after years of no funding.
8. Gisborne District is on par with the median average of:
 - Provision of playgrounds per 1000 children under 15, at 4 playgrounds/1000 residents (median is 4 playgrounds per 1000 residents).
 - Provision of street trees per 1000 residents, at 88 trees/1000 residents (median is 88 trees/ 1000 residents).
 - Provision of planted beds per 1000 residents, at 486m²/1000 residents (median is 486m²/ 1000 residents).
 - Annual capital expenditure per 1000 residents \$46,569 (Median is \$46,569).
 - Playground maintenance cost per playground is \$2782 (Median is \$2782).
 - Grass sportsfields maintenance cost per 1000 residents is \$6976 (Median is \$6976).
9. Gisborne District is below the median average of:
 - Provision of park land per 1000 residents, with 17.4ha/1000 residents (median is 45.4ha/1000 residents)
 - Total grass Sportsfields maintenance cost per ha is \$5779 (Median is \$10,134).
 - Total direct annual operation cost per 1,000 residents is \$87,959 (Median is \$119,706).

Conclusions

- Council is performing at the highest levels in its peer group in terms of operational excellence, infrastructure management, strategic planning, environmental sustainability and community engagement.
- Council's total open space portfolio is small relative to peer Councils. However, within this, it is evident that Gisborne provides a very high percentage of actively maintained parkland when compared with its peer Councils, resulting in a relatively high per hectare cost of operations. Council should consider focusing any future acquisition investment into passive open space land in preference to actively maintained space if it wishes to benchmark more closely with its peer group.
- Council provides and maintains grassed sportsgrounds at a significantly lower cost than peer Councils, which is a valuable contribution to the affordable community health outcome.
- Gisborne District is spending well above the median when it comes to the maintenance of street trees, nearly double the median (noting renewed focus on trees management in the current Long Term Plan).

ASSESSMENT of SIGNIFICANCE

Criteria	This Report	The Process Overall
The effects on all or a large part of the Gisborne district	Low	Low
The effects on individuals or specific communities	Low	Low
The level or history of public interest in the matter or issue	Low	Low
Inconsistency with Council's current strategy and policy	Low	Low
Impacts on Council's delivery of its Financial Strategy and Long Term Plan.	Low	Low

10. The decisions or matters in this report are considered to be of **low** significance in accordance with Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

11. No community engagement has been carried out as part of this report.

CONSIDERATIONS

Financial/Budget

12. There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Legal

13. There are no legal implications associated with this report.

POLICY and PLANNING IMPLICATIONS

14. There are no policy or planning implications associated with this reported.