

11. JELLIE PARK REDEVELOPMENT

General Manager responsible:	Stephen McArthur General Manager Community Services
Officer responsible:	John Filsell, Manager Recreation Facilities
Author:	John Filsell, DDI 941-8303

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to consider and recommend an option to resume the redevelopment of Jellie Park pool.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The LTCCP provides for a number of recreation facility developments over the next nine years to a total value of \$26.4 million. The first development already approved by the Council, at Jellie Park is scheduled to be completed by 2007.

Feedback from the Council's Aquatic Facility Strategy process (which has scrutinised the Jellie Park redevelopment from a city wide perspective) concludes that the original scope of the Jellie Park redevelopment is not adequate. It does not include deep water, sufficient capacity for schools useage, a waterslide and other future proofing measures.

The current budget of \$6.2 million for Jellie Park is based on 2002 construction prices. It is now insufficient by up to \$5.8 million⁸. This is primarily due to inflation in the construction sector increasing costs by 30% to 40% and a small increase in the scope of the project. The project has begun (total value of work done to date is \$466,444⁹.) and has been put on hold to enable the Council to re-evaluate how it wishes to redevelop Jellie Park.

Redevelopment options include, Option 1 repairing the existing facility (up to \$2.5 million¹⁰). Option 2, completing the redevelopment as originally planned (\$9.96 million). Or, Option 3, completing the redevelopment in a manner informed by the feedback from the development of the Aquatic Facility Strategy process (\$12 million). Officer advice is that Option 3 be preferred.

There is sufficient funding in the LTCCP over the next nine years to complete Jellie Park at a cost of \$12 million and two smaller aquatic facility developments at a combined cost of \$14.4 million, but it is allocated into the wrong years.

All options were put to the Creating Strong Communities Portfolio Group who supported Option 3¹¹. There is now a need for the Council to make a prompt decision on how it wishes Jellie Park to be redeveloped.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Considerations

3. The LTCCP currently includes \$26.4 million for recreation facility developments over the next nine years. \$6.2 million for Jellie Park and \$20.2 million for other facilities. This is shown in Table 5 in Attachment 1 to this report.
4. If the Council redevelops Jellie Park at a cost of \$12 million, there is a remaining \$14.4 million in the LTCCP over the next nine years. This is sufficient for two smaller aquatic/recreational facility developments¹². However funds are allocated in the wrong years and will need to be reprioritised in the 2006 LTCCP.

⁸ Depending on which option for redevelopment Council adopts.

⁹ This includes \$31K planning and design fees, \$318K mechanical upgrades and \$117K buying contractor leases.

¹⁰ Dependent on the scope of the work.

¹¹ See section 23 of this report.

¹² This will depend on exactly what type of facility Council chooses.

5. The Council will review its LTCCP in 2006. As part of this review the Council can reprioritise capital expenditure allocated to recreation facility developments to fund the Jellie Park redevelopment. Table 5 in Attachment 1 to this report outlines how to do this.
6. There is sufficient funding in the LTCCP for 2005/2006 to resume work on the Jellie Park redevelopment. The funding needed to complete the project in 2006/2007 will come from a reprioritisation of existing capital expenditure allocated to recreational facilities. The reprioritisation will occur as part of the 2006 LTCCP process.
7. There will be no impact on rates if the Council adopts redevelopment Option 3 at a cost of \$12 million. The Council's Corporate Services group have advised that if capital expenditure is reprioritised within the 10 year period in the LTCCP there will be no effect on rates as long as the total expenditure (\$26.4m for aquatic/recreation facilities) does not increase. This is because the capital spend is averaged out over the 10 year period and the Council will not be borrowing additional funds.
8. There will be no additional net operational cost as a result of the Council adopting Option 3 in preference to Option 2, the original proposal. The net operational cost to the Council from Option 3 will be lower than that of the option originally conceived. This is because Option 3 includes more scope to generate revenue through swim education, greater patronage and an indoor water slide.

Any net increase in operational cost from a redeveloped pool over the current pool will depend on the final design of the facility; estimates indicate an increase of between \$200K and \$300K over present levels. This will be budgeted into the 2006/2016 LTCCP.

The Council can make substantial savings in operational costs if older facilities are retired. These savings can off-set the operational costs of new or redeveloped facilities. Often older facilities that are not designed to attract a large revenue or patronage have higher net operating costs. For example, the Sockburn Recreation Centre (not including the Pool) has a total operating budget of \$220K per annum and a yearly patronage of 25,000.

The Council has recently made similar decisions in respect of Papanui and Woolston pools and it is suggested that the Council reviews older facilities as part of its decisions on the Aquatic Facility Strategy later this year.

Legal Considerations

9. The Council's Legal Services Unit advises that it is not necessary for the Council to enter into further public consultation in order to make a decision on the matters dealt with in this report, i.e. Jellie Park Redevelopment. This is because:
 - (a) The redevelopment has been approved by the Council, it is in the LTCCP and initial work has begun.
 - The original redevelopment and this review have been widely consulted in the media, community, the Community Board as part of the research for the Aquatic Facility Strategy.
 - (b) The principal reason for the cost increase is inflation in the construction sector, taking the cost of the original option to \$9.96 million.
 - The Council has recently made decisions allowing projects with significant cost increases to proceed, e.g. wastewater pipeline.
 - (c) The preferred option at \$12 million is a \$2 million increase on the cost of the project as originally approved by the Council. The increase is made up of a design and build contingency and a small extension in scope, e.g. deep water, movable floor and bigger change areas.
 - The redevelopment is not viable without an extension in scope.
 - The extension in scope is consistent with the Aquatic Facility Strategy.
 - The extension in scope is consistent with criteria for future aquatic facility developments approved by the Council in March 2005 (Aquatic Facility Strategy Criteria Report).

- (d) The LTCCP already includes funding for the redevelopment in the 2005/2006 year. It is intended that existing capital expenditure allocated to recreational facilities in the LTCCP for the 2007/2008 and 2012/2013 years will be brought forward to the 2006/2007 LTCCP and included in the consultation process for that year. The Aquatic Facility Strategy and its recommendations will also be the subject of consultation in 2006/2007.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Commit to Option 3 for the redevelopment of Jellie Park, (up to a maximum expenditure of \$12m), and that work recommence immediately on the project.
- (b) Reprioritise capital expenditure allocated to recreation facility developments to fund the Jellie Park redevelopment as part of the 2006/2016 LTCCP.
- (c) Note that sufficient funding is available for two further smaller aquatic/recreation facilities within the current LTCCP.
- (d) Review ongoing commitments to existing facilities to fund additional expenditure for new facilities as part of decisions on the Aquatic Facility Strategy.
- (e) Note that detailed plans for the Jellie Park redevelopment will be brought back to the Council for approval.

BACKGROUND ON THE JELLIE PARK REDEVELOPMENT

10. A total of \$6.2 million is included in the LTCCP over the years 2004 to 2007 to redevelop Jellie Park. Work began on the project and in September 2004 a quantity surveyors estimate on the cost of the redevelopment option favoured at the time was \$9.96 million.

In June 2004 the Council became concerned about the number of plans for new aquatic facilities coming piecemeal from different areas of the city. As a result in October 2004 the Council began work on an Aquatic Facility Strategy. Its aim being to develop a comprehensive plan for the provision and upkeep, for the next 30 years, of aquatic facilities in the city. The Strategy assumes the Council's prior commitment to the Jellie Park redevelopment and aims to inform the nature of the development.

Research done and feedback received on the Strategy to date (from a city wide perspective) has indicated that the original proposal to redevelop Jellie Park will not meet the needs of the community. In particular, the need for deep water, additional room for schools and special groups and measures to future-proof the development (such as an indoor waterslide and dummy piping) now need to be included.

In October 2004 the General Manager Community Services asked the recently appointed Recreation Facilities Manager to review Jellie Park. The review was delivered to the Council's Executive Team in December 2004. The Executive Team requested a full review of the Jellie Park redevelopment project in light of the emerging information on the cost of the development and its compatibility with the Aquatic Facility Strategy, and that the review be reported to the Council.

11. The two identified issues are:
 - The original scope of the redevelopment is no longer appropriate when viewed through a city wide perspective using the research and feedback from the Aquatic Facility Strategy.
 - The cost on the redevelopment is more than is currently provided for between years 2004 and 2007 in the LTCCP.
12. Work has begun on the project bringing the outdoor pool plant up to standard and preliminary design work on the redevelopment. Leases held by the previous pool contractor, the Body Tamers Gym and Physiotherapist have been bought out. The total value of work done to date is \$466,444. The project is on hold and no further outgoings are due.

The Condition of Jellie Park Pool

13. A number of maintenance processes have been deferred in the expectation that the redevelopment will proceed. Jellie Park is in urgent need of repair in order to preserve its useful life. If the redevelopment or repair does not proceed promptly there is a risk of significant degradation to the asset.

Estimates indicate that if the full redevelopment does not proceed between \$2 million and \$2.5 million will be needed to maintain the existing features Jellie Park has to offer. This course of action is included as Option 1, in this report.

Maintenance issues are significant, the most serious involve:

- The reception and changing building parting company from the indoor pool and beginning to lean.
- Cracks developing in the reception and poolside floors
- Poor ventilation rotting the interior fabric of the building.
- Many of the temporary plant repairs involve pipe-work rerouted over rooftops as the underground services are inaccessible without extensive excavation.

The extent of the damage is well documented and photographs are included as Attachment 2, to this report.

14. Suitability of Jellie Park as a Location for a Larger Aquatic Facility

- (a) Jellie Park redevelopment can specifically cater to the needs of groups who traditionally face barriers accessing community facilities; youth, older persons and those on lower incomes. The Council specifically asked for these groups to be included in the Aquatic Facility Strategy Criteria Report March 2005.
- Youth, will enjoy water slides, hot pools (to be seen in) and deep water for water sports.
 - Older persons will enjoy deep water for aqua jogging, lane pools with range of temperatures, more dignified changing facilities and hot pools for therapy and conversation.
 - Lower income groups will enjoy better schools' access to ensure more schools children have the opportunity to learn to swim. They will also have better opportunity to hire pool space for sports, church group activities or recreational social gatherings.
- (b) New Zealand has the second worst drowning rate in the western world, only 25% of our children can swim proficiently by the age of 12.
- Water safety cannot be effectively taught without deep water, Christchurch needs more deep water.
 - Jellie Park is located on the opposite side of the city to the only other public deep water in Christchurch, at QEII.
- (c) Jellie Park Pool runs uncomfortably over capacity with waitlists on most programmes. It has an annual patronage of 400,000.
- Casual lane swimming and recreational sessions are now restricted to Monday to Friday Noon to 1.00pm and after 7pm, Weekends noon to 6pm.
 - Demand is growing.
- (d) Jellie Park is situated in the centre of a large residential area; population is growing in its catchment.
- The nearest indoor pool to Jellie Park is at Wharenui, this is also at capacity.
- (e) There are four schools with over 4000 pupils within five minutes of Jellie Park; these are Burnside Primary and High Schools, Christ The King Primary and Cobham Intermediate.
- There are twenty nine other schools serviced at Jellie Park, most needing more room.
- (f) Jellie Park has indoor pools, a gym and is one of the best outdoor pools in the country. This will complement any redevelopment.
- (g) Jellie Park was originally gifted to the community by James Jellie for the purposes of recreation. The pool complements the Park and vice versa, providing a pleasant "buffer" between local residents.
- (h) Jellie Park has adequate land for redevelopment already within the perimeter of the current pool, negating the need to buy land.
- (i) Jellie Park is accessed by well constructed, wide and safe roads; Memorial Avenue, Ilam Road and Greers Road.
- (j) Jellie Park is well served by public transport; it is on the route of The Orbiter.

OPTIONS

15. Three options are presented, these are listed below. Keeping the project on hold indefinitely (Maintain the Status Quo) is not listed as an option for reasons detailed in section 21 of this report.

- Option 1. Maintain existing facility, no upgrade.
- Option 2. Complete project as planned before the Aquatic Facility Strategy
- Option 3. Complete project in a manner consistent with the Aquatic Facility Strategy

Details on each option are outlined in Table 1 as follows:

Option	Scope of Work	Estimated Cost ¹³	Advantages	Disadvantages
Option 1: Maintain existing facility, no upgrade	A substantial building and plant overhaul to bring the existing complex up to a basic operational standard. This will require a detailed engineers report	\$2M to \$2.5 million <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on quantity surveyor estimates Ranking: 56/100¹⁴ OPEX: \$600K	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will preserve the asset and existing functions of Jellie Park No additional funding needed Remaining funds to other developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facility will not be redeveloped as decided by Council in 2003 Will prohibit further redevelopment Community need for additional water space not addressed The community spend up to \$2.5 million and get an old pool that is too small
Option 2: Complete project as planned before the Aquatic Facility Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -An additional 8 lane pool -Refurbished changing areas -Refurbished gym area -Maintained existing pool area -Re modelled reception and entry -Spa and toddlers pools -Landscaping and car parking 	\$9.96 million <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on quantity surveyor estimates A four lane option will cost \$7.8M Ranking: 35/100 OPEX: Plus \$200K to \$300K¹⁵	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient water area for anticipated long term need Dry facilities up to an accessible standard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires existing capital expenditure for recreational facilities in the LTCCP to be reprioritised Does not include deep water, attractions, changing for schools or future proofing End up with a pool that does not meet needs yet costs a lot of money
Option 3: Complete project in a manner consistent with the Aquatic Facility Strategy This is the preferred option.	As per option 2 (above) plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Deep water with a movable floor -An indoor waterslide -Dummy under pool piping for future attractions -Changing areas modified to accommodate schools/groups 	\$12 million <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on quantity surveyor estimates Deep water, movable floor, user attractions and changing areas estimated by suppliers Ranking: 84/100 OPEX: Plus \$200K to \$300K¹⁶	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets current and future needs as defined in the emerging findings of the Aquatic Facility Strategy Meets the criteria for the design and location of new facilities in the Aquatic Facilities Strategy Criteria Report April 2005 Includes deep water, better facilities for schools and future proofed user attractions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires existing capital expenditure for recreational facilities in the LTCCP to be reprioritised Is the most expensive

¹³ Estimates of cost have a 10% design contingency and a 10% inflation contingency.

¹⁴ See section 17 of this review (overleaf) for ranking details.

¹⁵ This is a broad brush estimate that can not be firmed up until the details of the facility are established.

¹⁶ This is a broad brush estimate that can not be firmed up until the details of the facility are established.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

17. Options one, two and three are evaluated on a scale of one to ten, in terms of the degree to which they satisfy the Council's principles driving the review as well as community need. The results are detailed in Table 2 below

Table 2: The Preferred Option for the Redevelopment of Jellie Park			
Council's Principles Driving the Review	Option 1: Maintain existing facility, no upgrade	Option 2: Complete project as planned before the Aquatic Facility Strategy	Option 3: Complete project in a manner consistent with the Aquatic Facility Strategy
The redevelopment of Jellie Park happens and begins promptly	5/10	6/10	7/10
The redevelopment of Jellie Park gives value for money	11/20	5/20	18/20
The redevelopment of Jellie Park will not compromise Council's ability to fund other developments which might arise from the Aquatic Facility Strategy in the future	10/10	8/10	8/10
The redevelopment is funded from within existing provision for aquatic facilities in the LTCCP	10/10	5/10 ¹⁷	5/10 ¹⁸
The redevelopment meets community needs	10/30	6/30	30/30
The redevelopment proceeds in a manner consistent with Council's sport and recreation policies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All people have the right to participate regardless of age, ability, discretionary income, ethnicity, gender and geographical location. Council must manage limited recreational resources in a manner that ensures equity fairness and effectiveness Physical assets meet the identified and viable needs of Christchurch and minimum legal standards 	10/20	5/20	16/20
Totals¹⁹	56/100	35/100	84/100

PREFERRED OPTION

16. The preferred option is Option 3; complete the project in a manner consistent with the Aquatic Facility Strategy.

¹⁷ Requires a reprioritisation of existing capital expenditure for facilities in the LTCCP

¹⁸ As above

¹⁹ Each criteria is marked out of 10, 20 or 30 depending on significance, 1 being least favourable

17. Option 3 will best satisfy current and future community need:
- (a) It will cater to a predicted increase in schools use by offering:
 - more pool space,
 - better changing facilities.
 - (b) It will specifically cater to community and schools' learn to swim initiatives:
 - The movable floor will provide large areas of safe, shallow and warm water.
 - (c) It will cater to the proven need for water safety education which cannot happen in shallow water.
 - The movable floor will provide large areas of safe deep water.
 - (d) It will best cater to the needs of youth by including;
 - an indoor water slide,
 - hot pools for conversation and a place to be seen,
 - deep water for popular team water sports such as water polo, underwater hockey and canoe polo.
 - (e) It will best cater to the needs of older persons by offering;
 - a 25 metre pool with warmer water,
 - deep water for aqua jogging,
 - hot pools for therapy and conversation,
 - more dignified changing facilities.
18. Option 3 will be future proofed and represents the best value for money.
- It is large enough to meet anticipated demand.
 - It will be future proofed with features like dummy piping, better changing areas and an indoor water slide.
 - The movable floor caters to what ever aquatic activity is en vogue.
19. Option 3 recognises that Jellie Park is to be one of the city's two significant aquatic facilities; it is on the opposite side of the city to QEII, the other significant facility.
- At present the only indoor public deep water is at QEII which is running over capacity and has issues catering to the demand. Especially with the new slides expected to increase loadings.
 - Option 3 will ease the pressure on QEII and make aquatic sports and recreation for people of all backgrounds more accessible in the west of the Christchurch.
20. If the Council does not wish to proceed with the redevelopment of Jellie Park, then Option 1 is recommended. This will provide for essential maintenance and preserve the life of the current facility. If Option 1 is chosen it will largely prohibit any future redevelopment by making it uneconomic as a newly repaired facility will be demolished to make way for a redevelopment.

Maintain the Status Quo (Not Preferred Option)

21. Keeping the project on indefinite hold (maintaining the status quo) is not considered a viable course of action for Council, for the following reasons.
- (a) There is an existing financial commitment from the Council for a redevelopment.
 - (b) There is a firm community expectation built over the past eight years that a redevelopment will happen.
 - (c) Work has begun on the redevelopment. This has been halted until the Council decides the project's future.
 - (d) Significant degradation to the asset will result if redevelopment or repairs do not happen soon.
 - (e) The current cost estimates upon which options are based will no longer be accurate as the gap between estimate and construction increases with time.

- (f) Construction costs continue to rise; further delay will result in further cost.
- (g) The Aquatic Facilities Strategy process is based on an assumption that Jellie Park will be redeveloped. The Strategy relies on a decision on which option Council wants.
- (h) The Council has 20 employees on fixed term contracts that expire when the facility closes for redevelopment. Contracts have been extended each time the redevelopment time frame has been extended. Further extension of these contracts may not be possible without making the employee's permanent, and compensating them when the facility eventually closes.
- (i) Over the past three years the Council has "bought out" the leases of three independent contractors based at Jellie Park under the justification of a redevelopment. The expense and the motive could be questioned if the redevelopment does not proceed.

The Council's Aquatic Facility Strategy

22. The Council should not wait for the Aquatic Facility Strategy before it makes a decision on the Jellie Park redevelopment. A decision is needed now because:
- (a) The Council has already resolved to redevelop Jellie Park and this is reflected in the current LTCCP.
 - (b) The redevelopment is on hold pending a decision by the Council on its future.
 - (c) The Jellie Park redevelopment has had the benefit of being reviewed in light of the research and emerging findings of the Aquatic Facilities Strategy development process. Option 3 contained in this review will support and complement the Strategy.
 - (d) Irrespective of the Strategy there is proven community need and an established community expectation for redevelopment.
 - (e) None of the redevelopment options presented will financially compromise the Council's ability to deliver the strategy, see sections 3 to 8 of this report.
 - (f) In many respects the Strategy relies (and has always relied) on having a firm decision on the future of Jellie Park. The Jellie Park redevelopment would be a fundamental part of the Strategy in any case.
 - (g) The Strategy is scheduled to report in September. Once the Strategy is approved by Council consultation on the implications of the strategy will be aligned to the 2006 LTCCP. This delay will jeopardise the redevelopment for the reasons given in section 21 of this report.
 - (h) If redevelopment or repairs do not begin soon there is a risk of significant degradation to the asset.

Previous Consideration of the Jellie Park Redevelopment

23. Portfolio Group 21 April 2005
Options to re develop Jellie Park were presented to the Creating Strong Communities Portfolio Group. There was support for option 3 subject to the provision of certain information. This is summarised in Table 3 as follows:

Table 3: Information Sought by the Strong Communities Portfolio Group	
Information Sought	Response
Will Council have sufficient funds to construct two other smaller community pools and redevelop Jellie Park?	Yes. Council will have \$14.4 million in the LTCCP for the construction of recreational facilities. This is sufficient for the construction of two smaller pools. The exact cost of other pools will depend on the size and facilities Council wishes to include. Please see sections 3 to 8 of this report and Table 5 in Attachment 1.
If a \$12 million redevelopment option is approved, will the project be capped at this level?	Yes. The options for redevelopment have been quantity surveyed, and costs reviewed by Councils City Solutions Team and a 20% contingency added. A cap of \$12 million will be set and is realistic.
Do you have a contingency?	Yes. There is a 10% design and 10% build contingency build into the cost estimates. Added to this, aspects of the project have been priced by contractors in today's market.
Have you considered partnerships?	Yes. The Aquatic Facility Team and an independent contractor have pursued the opportunity for partnerships; current leads include facilities to the north and east of the city.
Have you consulted the Fendalton Waimairi Community Board? Do they support Option 3?	Yes. The board Chair Mike Wall and Val Carter were briefed on May 2 nd . There was full support for Option 3 providing there was no effect on rates as a result. There is no effect on rates. Please see sections 7 and 8 of this report. The Board was also invited the Council Seminar on May 10 th .
Have you considered the impact of operational costs?	Yes. Operational costs are likely to be less for Option 3 than those for the option originally approved. This is because Option 3 includes greater capacity to generate revenue. Please see section 8 of this report.

23. Council Seminar May 10th
Options to redevelop Jellie Park were presented to a Council seminar and the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board. There was concern at the cost escalation. There was also a realisation that the Council has approved a redevelopment and that work has begun. Information was requested, this is summarised in Table 4 as follows:

Table 4: Information Sought by the Council Seminar

Information Sought	Response
Does Council have sufficient funds to cover the increase?	<p>Yes Council has \$26.4 million in the LTCCP for recreational facilities. Council has adequate funding for 2005/2006 already allocated, the remaining funding already in the LTCCP will be reprioritised in the 2006 LTCCP review.</p> <p>Please see sections 3 to 8 of this report and Table 5 in Attachment 1.</p>
Will Council be given the Opportunity to retire older facilities to offset the cost of new ones?	<p>Yes. This process has already begun with Council's decision in respect of the Suburban Pool review. There will be full opportunity to retire older facilities as new ones are built in the Aquatic facility Strategy.</p> <p>Please see section 8 of this report.</p>
Will there be any impact on rates as a result of a \$12 million redevelopment?	<p>No. Capital Cost If existing capital expenditure is reprioritised within the 10 year period in the LTCCP there will be no effect on rates as long as the total expenditure does not increase. This is because the capital spend is averaged out over the 10 year period and Council will not be borrowing additional funds.</p> <p>Operational Cost Operational costs are likely to be less for Option 3 than those for the option originally approved. This is because Option 3 includes greater capacity to generate revenue.</p> <p>Please see sections 3 to 8 of this report and Table 5 in Attachment 1.</p>
Will Council have sufficient funds to construct two other smaller community pools and redevelop Jellie Park?	<p>Yes. Council will have \$14.4 million in the LTCCP for the construction of recreational facilities. This is sufficient for the construction of two smaller pools. The exact cost of other pools will depend on the size and facilities Council wishes to include.</p> <p>Please see sections 3 to 8 of this report and Table 5 in Attachment 1.</p>
Can Council make a decision without further community consultation in an annual plan?	<p>Yes. Council's Legal Services Unit have confirmed that it is not necessary for Council to enter into further consultation in order to make a decision on matter contained within this report. The redevelopment is already approved by Council, is in the LTCCP and work has begun. The principle reason for a cost increase is inflation in the construction sector; Council has recently made decisions allowing other projects with cost escalations to proceed e.g. Wastewater Pipeline. There is only a small increase in scope in Option 3 to that of the original option. This involves deep water, bigger changing areas and a slide. The LTCCP includes sufficient funding in the 2005/2006 year. Existing capital expenditure allocated to recreational facilities in the in the LTCCP for the 2007/2008 and 2012/2013 years will be brought forward to the 2006/2007 LTCCP and included in the consultation process for that year.</p> <p>Please see section 9 of this report.</p>