

7. AQUATIC FACILITIES PLAN: APPROVAL FOR STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to recommend that the Council seek feedback from identified stakeholders on the contents of the draft Aquatic Facilities Plan.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Aquatic Facilities Plan arose in response to the Council's request for a city wide planning framework to assist the provision of aquatic facilities to meet current and future need.
3. The Aquatic Facility Plan is a city-wide plan setting out how the city's pools and associated facilities can be provided over the next 30 years. This plan recognises existing Council and other provision.
4. The Plan, if adopted, will:
 - Determine the future number and location of aquatic facilities
 - Outline the type, size and priority order of facilities to be developed
 - Explore options for collaboration with others
 - Include plans for dealing with aging facilities.
5. Christchurch City already has a network of aquatic facilities. The plan shows how this network can be developed to meet current and future community demand. By identifying gaps in today's network, the plan should ensure that, as far as possible, the city will have a relatively uniform spread of core aquatic features across the city.
6. It also considers facilities that, in time, are no longer required to serve the Council's aims. For instance, a new modern facility in an area can be expected to supplant a need to keep older outdoor pools in the area operating. In such cases, the plan recommends their closure.
7. This plan is a long-term framework to help Council decision-making. Its adoption will not automatically mean every project it sets out will be built. Rather, each project identified in this plan will come to the Council as a specific business case, as part of the LTCCP process for funding decisions.
8. To ensure the plan remains current and reflects community changes and city growth, it will be reviewed every five years and, if necessary, updated.
9. The plan has been developed over the past year through extensive research with stakeholder and community input. The plan is now at a draft stage and the feedback from identified stakeholders is needed before the Council can approve the final draft to be included in the 2006 LTCCP process for formal public consultation.
10. A draft plan is attached to this report. A summary document is also separately enclosed.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

11. This report recommends that the Council seek feedback on the draft plan from identified stakeholders. The Council will not be asked to make any decisions with a financial or legal impact. Any decisions will be made through the LTCCP process.
12. The plan, if adopted, will act as a decision making framework rather than binding the Council in absolute terms. However the plan will clearly signal the Council's intentions subject to available funding. Each project identified in the plan will come back to the Council with a separate business case, as part of the LTCCP process for funding decisions.
13. The plan contains estimates of the capital cost (in today's dollars) of proposed development options into the future. The costs are a ballpark contractor estimate with a number of qualifications. The sums are indicative only for higher level planning purposes and will be firmed up as the planning process proceeds.
14. CAPEX and OPEX scenarios are included (in today's dollars) under the assumptions covered in section 13 of this report (above) in table 11, page 41 of the attached plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council approve the Aquatic Facilities Plan (Draft for Stakeholder Consultation document as attached) for stakeholder consultation (including Community Boards) from 21 November 2005 to 31 December 2005.

BACKGROUND ON THE AQUATIC FACILITIES PLAN

15. The Aquatic Facilities Plan stakeholder list currently identifies over 300 individuals or groups with an interest in the city's pools. It includes community boards and community groups, schools, sports clubs, pool committees, other providers and individuals. It includes anyone who has commented on the process to date as well as those known to have an interest in aquatics. Consequently it is highly likely that the release of the draft plan will be a bona fide public release. The plan is likely to create expectations in some areas and cause concerns in others.
16. The full consultation process for the Aquatic Facilities Plan is summarised below:
 - I. Nov-Dec, 2005: Stakeholders invited to submit feedback on the draft plan.
 - II. Jan-Feb, 2006: Stakeholder feedback considered and, where appropriate, incorporated into draft plan.
 - III. Late Feb, 2006: Draft plan before the Council for approval. Available again for public feedback as part of the draft 2006-16 long-term community plan consultation in May 2006.
 - IV. June 2006: Public feedback considered by Councillors.
 - V. End-June 2006: Council adoption of plan.
17. The Aquatic Facilities Plan:
 - Confirms the first order of business is to ensure the city's existing facilities are properly maintained and, where it suits the plans/priorities, redeveloped. It says new developments should add to the existing indoor pools network and not merely shift participation from an existing facility to itself.
 - Will be reviewed every five years over its 30-year horizon to ensure it remains current with community needs and preferences.
 - Takes account of the planned Jellie Park redevelopment, and its effect on city-wide demand for aquatic facilities. Even so, it suggests new facilities will be needed to cope with population and demand growth.
 - Takes a city-wide view and aims to provide access to an indoor facility in each major area of the city for the majority of residents.
 - Makes a priority of ensuring access for children, youth, older adults, people with disabilities and families on lower incomes or limited access to private transport. Areas of the city which are further away from existing indoor pools and which have higher proportions of people in those target groups are given priority for new facilities.
 - Takes account of expected city growth and its changing demographics as outlined in the Urban Development Strategy. It also recommends that new facilities be built close to major hubs, such as malls, and transport routes.
 - Identifies facilities that, as the network develops, will no longer meet community need and so should be closed.
 - Encourages consideration of partnerships, including co-location with other public recreation facilities, schools and other providers. It says that, where possible, new aquatic facilities should be located with, or nearby, other Council facilities, such as libraries.

A Network of Aquatic Facilities For Christchurch in 2021

18. This plan signals the Council's intention to create a comprehensive network of aquatic facilities that meets the community's needs by about 2021 and into the future. If the plan was followed, the network in another 15 years might look like this:

City Area	Aquatic Facility Description	
Central	Existing	Centennial Leisure Centre
Central-west	Existing	Wharenui Pool and Stadium
West	New	Likely to be a slightly larger pool than Centennial
North-west	Existing	The redeveloped new facility with deep water
North-west	Existing	Jellie Park Outdoor
North	New	Slightly smaller scale pool than Centennial
North-east	Existing	QEII
East	Existing	Waltham Pool
East	New or Existing	Similar in size to Centennial or the retention of Aquagym
South	Existing	Pioneer Leisure Centre
	New	Add a children's pool at Pioneer
South-west	Existing	Halswell Pool

Proposed Developments and Closures

19. The plan identifies new developments and closures of existing facilities. Each decision will be made by Council on a case by case basis.

City Area	Major Actions	Suggested Closures	Timing
North-west	Complete the Jellie Park redevelopment	Sockburn	2004/05-2006/07
North	Negotiate a land and support partnership with Papanui High School and Northlands Mall for an aquatic facility and school gym at Papanui High	Papanui, Belfast, Edgware	2006/07-2008/09
South	Add a children's shallow pool to existing Pioneer facility		2008/09 – 2009/10
West	Develop new area facility in the Hornby or Halswell area	Templeton. Review asset condition of Wharenui	2015/16 - 2017/18
East	Develop new area facility in Linwood Woolston area when aquagym reaches the end of its life.	Woolston	2017/18-2019/2020

Council Consideration to Date

20. The Council's Creating Strong Communities Portfolio Group considered the plan on 1 September 2005. The feedback received and subsequent actions are summarised below:

Portfolio Group Feedback	Action
Land bank suitable sites in the east and west of the city.	Recommended in page 34 of the plan.
Incorporate "Art in public Places" to the design and features of new or redeveloped facilities.	Has been included into the updated RFP for the Jellie Park redevelopment. Incorporated into the northern corridor partnership.
Allow for the possibility that the priorities for developments will shift over time.	Plan will be reviewed every five years. Plan is a framework for decision making only.
Offer the Council the option of closing Sockburn Pool when the Jellie Park redevelopment opens.	Done. Page 28 of the plan.
Could the local community board fund a children's/toddler's pool at Pioneer.	Community Board funding may not be appropriate as this is a metropolitan plan with facilities that have a citywide appeal.

21. The Plan was considered at a Council seminar on 20 September 2005. The feedback received and subsequent actions are summarised below:

Council Seminar Feedback	Action
Investigate ways of supporting existing school pools rather than build new pools.	Non asset solutions and ways of supporting schools have been included in pages 32 and 40 of the plan.
Can schools be encouraged to issue pool keys to allow public access.	The Council will incur legal risks if it supports this practice, it contravenes health and safety regulations.
Fully investigate "hubbing" where a facility forms part of a multi dimensional infrastructure with different partners.	This concept has been investigated, the first potential partnership is at Papanui High, hubs with other community services have also been considered on page 22 of the plan.
Consider locations out west other than Goulding Avenue.	Other locations considered included Denton Park, Kyle Park, Wigram and Halswell Domain. Goulding Avenue does have some limitations and a site investigation remains in progress. The project team are aware of limitations on the Goulding Avenue site.
Clarify argument for closing Sockburn when Jellie is redeveloped.	Considerations for closing a facility are listed on page 25 of the plan. The option to close Sockburn was included at Councillor request. The plan is a framework, if adopted, a detailed appraisal of Sockburn with options will be put to Council.
Why have 2km and 3km radii been used by the mapping tool.	The 2km and 3km radii are necessary to better identify the populations of the groups the Council asked to be included. These distances provide a more sensitive and robust analysis in identifying target groups who have access and mobility issues. If larger radii are used on this mapping tool it corrupts the results. The two and three km radii are more consistent with assumptions for transport analysis, 2km is the limit of a "short trip" (NZ Transport Survey).
Can Councillors see the mapping tool with 4km radii.	Copy will be circulated at the meeting

Council Seminar Feedback	Action
Provide information on numbers using the Orbiter/Metro Star to get to QEII from the north of the city.	Figures are commercially sensitive but we have ascertained that on average about 100 adults and 100 children get on a bus at QEII daily. Improved bus services are strongly recommended in the plan, page 39.
Is a pool in the northern corridor likely to cause customers to switch participation from QEII to the same extent as a pool in the east will switch participation from Aquagym, Centennial and QEII.	Any additional facility will cause a certain amount of customer switching. The plan focuses on facilities that will best target an existing need and future city growth. The pool on the northern corridor is considered best able to do this. An additional pool out east would be positioned too close to Centennial and Aquagym. The east of the city does not have the same growth expectation at this time than the north and west. The Council has already invested heavily in the east and central-east sectors at QEII, Centennial and Waltham. All these facilities have spare capacity for more swimmers.
Have land banking costs been included.	A financial allowance for land banking has not been included. Land banking is detailed on page 34. The plan has endeavoured to recommend suitable sites that the Council owns or that can be included in partnerships ie Papanui High.
The plan outlines CAPEX costs in today's dollars, what are future costs likely to be.	This is a corporate calculation that should be applied to all projects in the LTCCP. Current information will be presented at the meeting.
Can an outdoor pool be covered.	None of our outdoor pools can be covered for regulatory and climatic reasons. It is better to build new.
Has appropriate provision been made for asset management in operational and capital budgets	The asset management plan is nearing completion, unless this identifies something "left field", we feel adequate provision has been made.
What will Northlands get out of a partnership with Council/Papanui High.	Northlands have offered a sum of money to assist in the development of scoping plans that will allow the company to determine exactly what's in it for them.
Has brown field as well as green field future growth and development been considered?	All the tools used to predict the city's growth are based on those being used for all other planning purposes. Brown field development is considered, see page 12 of the plan for the map of projected population growth in 2026. The five yearly review will take heed of any changing patterns of development.
Will the government announcement of \$32 million for sports stadia be considered for funding.	Our research indicates the intent of this funding is for nationally significant stadia, not community facilities. It is a nationwide fund, the chances of qualifying are slim.
Non asset solutions need to be considered especially as the availability of facilities does not lead automatically to increased participation.	Page 41 of the plan details non asset actions.