

**REPORT 3**  
*(1215/52/IM)*

---

## **COMMUNITY FACILITIES POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLANS FEEDBACK FROM CONSULTATION**

---

### **1. Purpose of Report**

The purpose of this report is to:

- report back on the feedback received through the consultation on the draft Community Facilities Policy and Implementation Plan
- recommend changes to the draft policy for adoption
- recommend changes to the draft implementation plan for inclusion in the 2010/11 Annual Plan, 2011/12 Annual Plan and review of the LTCCP in 2012.

### **2. Executive Summary**

Consultation on the draft Community Facilities Policy and Implementation Plan has been completed. This report presents a summary of the feedback received during the consultation and makes recommendations for amendments to the draft policy and plan in response to this feedback.

The majority of submitters raised issues around the proposed implementation plan rather than the draft policy itself. Around half of submissions commented on the proposed investments in swimming pools with the majority of submissions in support of the partnerships with schools or a new deep water pool. A number of submitters were concerned around media reports of suburban library closures and wanted the policy strengthened around retention of the existing library network. All proposed investment in libraries and community spaces received some level of support, although some submitters were concerned that investment in technology in libraries would not be at the expense of books. Requests were received for investment in the Johnsonville library and Kilbirnie Community Centre to be brought forward in the works programme.

The results of a survey of Churton Park residents show support for investment in a larger venue with potential for use for indoor sports, smaller meetings spaces and playgrounds. There are opportunities for the council to partner with the new school and developer or the commercial centre to achieve these outcomes although the timeframes around reaching agreement is tight.

### 3. Recommendations

It is recommended that the Strategy and Policy Committee:

1. *Receive the information.*
2. *Agree to the Community Facilities Policy attached as Appendix 1.*

#### **Aquatics**

3. *Agree the following initiatives included in the draft Community Facilities Policy and Implementation Plan for aquatics for inclusion in the 2010/11 Annual Plan and subsequent years as follows:*
  - (a) *additional teaching pool space at the Karori Pool (\$0.585m -10/11);*
  - (b) *a dedicated hydrotherapy pool at the Wellington Regional Aquatic Centre (\$2.1m – 2010/11);*
  - (c) *planning and implementation of an upgrade of the Keith Spry Pool in Johnsonville (\$0.180m -2010/11, \$3.0m - 2011/12, \$1.7m - 2012/13);*
  - (d) *replacement of the Tawa Pool roof (\$1.6m – 2011/12);*
  - (e) *installation of a retractable roof to extend the operational use of the Thorndon outdoor pool (\$0.050m – 2010/11, \$1.250m – 2013/14).*
4. *Agree changes to the draft Community Facilities Policy and Implementation Plan for aquatics for inclusion in the 2010/11 and subsequent Annual Plans by increasing the total funding for partnering for school pool upgrades through the Social and Recreation Grants pool fund from \$500k over two years starting in 2011/12 to \$2.0m as follows:*
  - *\$0.5m – 2010/11,*
  - *\$1.0m – 2011/12 and*
  - *\$0.5m – 2012/13*
5. *Note that there is \$60k in CO34 opex for planning and feasibility work for meeting future demands for aquatic activity. The outcome of this work will be reported back to the Council for its consideration as part of the review of the LTCCP in 2012.*
6. *Note that if the proposed schedules of Aquatic Upgrades are adopted then the requirement to implement the proposed sessionalisation policy for the management of pool space at peak times across the pools network would be significantly diminished.*

7. *Agree that the introduction of a sessionalisation policy is an appropriate management tool for prioritising the allocation of pool space at peak times. In the event that pool managers may need to utilise the policy, then the maximum service level impact permitted by facility managers in meeting the needs of their customers will require 60 days notice to be issued to customers prior to any change.*

### **Libraries**

8. *Agree the feasibility study for the relocation and expansion of the Johnsonville library (\$50k opex and \$330k capex – 2010/11) included in the draft Community Facilities Policy and Implementation Plan for Libraries for inclusion in the 2010/11 Annual Plan*
9. *Agree in principle the following initiatives included in the draft Community Facilities Policy and Implementation Plan for Libraries for inclusion in the review of the LTCCP in 2012 and relevant annual plans as follows:*
  - (a) *A refresh of the central library and introduction of electronic item management system - \$14.88m (\$180k – 2011/12, \$7.8m – 2012/13, \$4.0m – 2014/15 and \$2.9m – 2015/16)*
  - (b) *Technology investments to enable the library service to respond to changes in technology and introduction of digital formats - \$11.28m (\$100k – 2011/12, \$820k – 2012/13, \$1.295m per year from 2013/14)*
  - (c) *A new library in Johnsonville - \$11.6m (\$750k – 2015/16, \$4.37m – 2016/17 and \$6.2m – 2017/18)*
  - (d) *A feasibility study for collocation of Island Bay library and community space - \$45k – 2019/20)*

*(Note: all costings are at 2009 prices).*

10. *Note that the funding for the relocation and expansion of Johnsonville library is scheduled for construction in 2017/18 and is 4 years after Stage 1 of the expansion of Keith Spry Pool will be completed and that the feasibility study will address any potential savings and efficiencies around the timing and scheduling of the two facility upgrades.*

### **Community Space**

11. *Agree in principle the following initiatives included in the draft Community Facilities Policy and Implementation Plan for Community Spaces for inclusion in the review of the LTCCP in 2012 and relevant annual plans as follows:*

- (a) *Development of a partnership to deliver facilities in Churton Park - \$0.85m (2012/13)*
- (b) *Upgrade of the community facilities in the catchments centred on*
- (i) *Aro Valley - \$0.98m (\$45k – 2013/14, \$100k – 2014/15 and \$835k – 2015/16)*
  - (ii) *Strathmore - \$1.00m (\$40k – 2014/15, \$140k – 2015/16 and \$820k – 2016/17)*
  - (iii) *Newtown \$2.745m (\$45k – 2016/17, \$285k – 2017/18 and \$2.415m – 2018/19), and*
  - (iv) *Kilbirnie \$3.78m (\$45k – 2018/19, \$185k – 2019/20 and \$3.5m – 2020/21)*

*(Note: all costings are at 2009 prices).*

12. *Agree the priorities for community facilities for Churton Park are a multipurpose indoor (sports) space, meeting rooms and playground upgrades.*
13. *Agree to defer the \$812.5k capex funding for community facilities in Churton Park from the 2010/11 Annual Plan to the 2011/12 Annual Plan.*
14. *Note that some of the capex funding identified for the provision of community facilities in Churton Park may be opex if Council does not have ownership of the final assets and that any changes from capex to opex will be dealt with through the 2011/12 Draft Annual Plan process and the review of the Long Term Council Community Plan in 2012.*
15. *Direct officers to negotiate with:*
- *the Amesbury Drive School Establishment Board of Trustees*
  - *the Ministry of Education and/or*
  - *the developer of the proposed commercial centre in Churton Park*
- to achieve the developments identified in recommendation 12 above.*
16. *Delegate to the Chief Executive Officer the authority to enter into an agreement with the Ministry of Education to achieve the priorities set out in recommendation 12 above. The agreement will:*
- *state the level and nature of the Council's investment*
  - *state the level of community access to Council supported facilities*
  - *establish the governance arrangements around the community facility*

- *provide value for money*
- *be consistent with the results of the recent survey of Churton Park residents*
- *be consistent with the draft Community Facilities Policy levels of service.*

17. *Note that additional funding may be required to address legacy issues in the community facilities portfolio and these will be considered through the relevant Draft Annual Plan and LTCCP processes.*

### **Grants**

18. *Agree the amendments to the general grants framework attached as Appendix 2.*

19. *Agree the increase in the Social and Recreation Grants pool by \$55k per year starting in 2010/11 as included in the draft Community Facilities Policy and Implementation Plan for community spaces for inclusion in the 2010/11 Annual Plan and subsequent years.*

20. *Agree funding of \$203.8k per year for three yearly community centre contracts for inclusion in the 2010/11 Annual Plan.*

21. *Agree \$35,713 included as part of the \$203.8k in recommendation 19 above and identified for a Churton Park community centre once it is built is tagged for community development in Churton Park in 2010/11.*

## **4. Background**

In December 2009, the Strategy and Policy Committee agreed the draft Community Facilities Policy and implementation plan for public consultation.

The overarching principle underpinning the draft policy is that the Council will provide facilities in partnership with the community, recognising the Council is not the sole provider of community facilities. The draft policy outlined the key objectives and principles Council would consider when deciding on investment and redevelopment of its community facilities. Investment would be directed towards key strategic priorities for each facility type.

The policy also set a level of service that communities could expect which is based on a hierarchy of centres with larger centres providing services to a wider catchment as well as their local populations. These larger centres are expected to provide a full range of services across the facility types whilst the smaller neighbourhood centres would only provide spaces where people could meet.

The hierarchy is largely reflective of that identified in the Council's Centres Policy. The type and scale of facilities provided in each centre is determined by

the population within the catchment. For libraries and community spaces, the scale of facility is determined according to set formulae. For swimming pools, no set formula is defined for the level of provision but the location of facilities is defined.

The draft implementation plan for aquatics reprioritisation of existing funding and it was agreed these would be included in the 2010/11 Draft Annual Plan. As such, the projects recommended to the Council on 17 March 2010 by the Strategy and Policy Committee were:

- Additional teaching pool space at the Karori Pool (\$0.585m -10/11)
- A dedicated hydrotherapy pool at the Wellington Regional Aquatic Centre (\$2.1m – 10/11).
- Planning and implementation of an upgrade of the Keith Spry Pool in Johnsonville (\$0.180m -10/11, \$3.0m - 11/12, \$1.7m -12/13),
- Funding for partnerships to upgrade existing school pools to improve access for learn to swim and aquatic sport (\$0.681m – 11/12, \$1.384m – 12/13)
- Replacement of the Tawa Pool roof (\$1.6m – 11/12) – moved to CX056 Aquatic Facility Renewals.
- A retractable roof to extend the operational use of the Thorndon outdoor pool (\$0.50m - 10/11, \$1.250m – 13/14).

Subsequently, the Council agreed to include all the above projects in the 2010/11 Draft Annual Plan for community consultation but with the following amendments:

- Remove funding of \$2.065m for partnering for school pool upgrades and instead increase the Social and Recreation Grants pool fund (C678 - opex) by \$250k each year for two years (2011/12 and 2012/13) for this purpose.
- Include \$60k in C034 – pools opex for 2010/11 to carry out further work to identify the options for meeting future demands for aquatic activity. The residual capex funding of \$1.505m to be retained but moved to 2013/14 of the LTCCP.

These changes were also reflected in the consultation documentation on the draft Community Facilities Policy and Implementation Plan.

## **5. Consultation process**

Public consultation on the draft Policy and Implementation Plan ran concurrently with the consultation period for the Draft Annual Plan and draft Climate Change Action Plan – 9 April to 10 May 2010. Three public meetings were held in Johnsonville library, Wellington Regional Aquatic Centre and in the Mezzanine room at the Central Library.

94 submissions and one late submission were received on the draft policy and plan and a further 15 submissions on the draft Annual Plan also commented on the draft policy and implementation plan. Hearings on these matters were held between 13 and 18 May 2010.

## **6. Draft Community Facilities Policy**

### **6.1 Consultation feedback**

The majority of submissions made comments on the investment proposals. Only around a third made submissions on the policy itself. Of these, 25 submissions supported the overall direction of the policy, with many supporting the identification of activity centres and linking facility type and scale to community size. 4 submitters opposed the policy in its totality, with one concerned the policy was a 'blueprint for destroying libraries'. Other submitters raised concerns around:

- the policy focus on local community needs at the expense of consideration around Wellington's in a regional, national or international context for sports and culture,
- the lack of focus on competitive sport and fitness,
- prioritisation of inner city facilities over those in the northern suburbs,
- an overemphasis on aquatics,
- the effect of catchment size on walkability to facilities,
- too little focus on non Council facilities, and
- too narrow scope in terms of types of facility covered.

Other submitters requested clarity around the existing level of provision of libraries, and terminology used in the policy.

33 submitters commented on the strategic priorities outlined in the draft policy. The majority supported these priorities, with 3 opposed completely. A number of submitters commented that they agreed with the strategic priorities but questioned the methods used to achieve these – these submitters in the main supported the development of another deep water pool either through a partnership with a school or at WRAC. Others commented there should be greater focus on:

- investment in all libraries not just those in high growth areas,
- children's sports facilities,
- providing access to pools that are fit for purpose to enable club and sport growth, and
- providing for aquatic sports.

## **6.2 Discussion**

The draft policy focuses on the community facilities as a vehicle to support community strengthening and development. It is acknowledged that community facilities do support other purposes, such as education and learning and sport and fitness, however this is not the policy's primary purpose. Where decisions are made to invest in facilities at a higher level than the service levels in the policy, this is likely to be a reflection of the Council's wish to support these other purposes.

The draft policy acknowledges the current levels of provision may be different from the levels of service in the policy and that Council is likely to continue with that current provision. The draft policy has been amended to strengthen the wording around retention of the existing networks of facilities.

A particular issue raised at the public meetings was around the definition of the term 'low usage' in the policy. The definitional issue was raised in particular around libraries given that the levels of service state that neighbourhood centres should not expect a library (Wadestown is defined as a neighbourhood centre) and that district centres should only have a library service (Ngaio, Island Bay, Khandallah, and Brooklyn are defined as district centres).

Low usage can be measured in a number of ways for each facility type and across facilities. For example measures could be number of visits, number of users, number of issues (libraries), number of hits on website, or users per square meter of space etc. Given the nature of the library service is likely to change significantly over the next decade, it is not recommended that a firm definition of low usage is adopted as this may become invalid over time as the service changes. However officers have amended the draft policy to include more information around the process to be followed before any decision to close or divest a facility.

In addition, the level of service has been amended to 'small library' rather than 'library service' for district centres and no change is recommended for neighbourhood centres.

The strategic priorities have flowed from the community facilities review conclusions and no changes are recommended.

## **7. Draft Implementation Plan**

### **7.1 Changes to Grants**

The partnership approach was supported by a number of submitters however no submitters specifically commented on the changes to the general grants to assist organisations to access other non Council facilities.



One submitter, Mt Cook Mobilised, requested assistance with lease costs of a building to create a community meeting space in Mt Cook. This is addressed below.

## **7.2 Aquatics**

### **7.2.1. Consultation feedback**

Overall submitters were generally supportive of ongoing investment in aquatic facilities and services acknowledging their positive contribution to Wellington's sense of place, health and well being.

While there was a reluctance to support the introduction of sessionalised use of pool space at peak times, around 50% of submitters accepted it as a possible short term option to lessen congestion.

There was support for more teaching space at Karori Pool and progressing plans to upgrade the Keith Spry Pool in Johnsonville. Several submitters questioned the merits of a retractable cover for Thorndon Pool citing its popularity as an outdoor venue and the pool's heritage value. Two submitters proposed the installation of a bulkhead and raised floor at the shallow end of Thorndon pool to create additional water space for learn to swim, along with the possibility of creating a toddlers pool over the existing plant room.

The majority of submitters' responses resulted in two major themes emerging from consultation: They were:

1. Increasing the partnership funding to support the upgrade of school pools for school and community use and;
2. Immediate development of a new pool located at the Wellington Regional Aquatic Centre to meet the demand for use by aquatic sports.

One submitter requested all aquatics funding be reallocated to a partnership fund.

### **7.2.2. Aquatics Discussion**

The initial projects recommended to the Council in March 2010 by the Strategy and Policy Committee represented a response to the present demands for more water space, particularly for learn to swim and training space for aquatic sports.

It was made clear to officers that any investment initiatives needed to be within the current funding available for pool upgrades in the LTCCP and that, where possible, these should be accelerated over the next 3 years to make a positive difference and minimise the need to introduce sessionalisation of pool space at peak times.

The proposal from two submitters to create additional learn to swim and child pool space at Thorndon Pool were not without merit, although they would

present some significant technical issues that would need to be overcome. Officers will include further investigation of these options as part of the work proposed under recommendation 5.

Partnering with schools and other stakeholders to upgrade some existing primary and college swimming pools is still considered an effective and affordable way of increasing the area of pool space in the city available to the community. The proposal would likely remove some barriers (time and cost), particularly for low decile schools, improving their access to learn to swim and aquatic education programmes.

It would open up access for local communities, provide swim club training bases, learn to swim opportunities for clubs and commercial providers while lessening impact on public pools at peak times and minimise the need for significant ratepayer capital investment and ongoing operating costs for an expanded public swimming pool network.

The need for more deep water space and dry area training facilities for aquatic sport is acknowledged and the sports codes themselves have indicated their preference to have that space available at WRAC. Currently no capital funding is allocated in order to progress this project.

Further detailed planning and identification of elemental costs are proposed to be carried in 2010/11 with recommendations brought back for consideration of the Council as part of its next LTCCP review in 2012.

It is noted that the ongoing operational costs for such a project would represent a significant issue in respect of the pools achieving their current user funding ratio. It had been envisaged that further detailed work would be undertaken and recommendations provided to the Council for consideration at the next review of the LTCCP in 2012.

If the Council's view was to respond to the needs of aquatic sporting interests now and undertake construction of a new deep water pool at the Wellington Regional Aquatic Centre the estimated construction costs would be \$10m-\$12m.

In the event that this project proceeded it would be recommended that the proposed provision of a dedicated hydrotherapy pool should take place simultaneously to minimise disruptions and achieve some likely cost savings. In this case the total project would have an estimated value of \$11.5m-\$13.5m with a project timeline of approximately 24 to 26 months commencing 1 July 2010.

The likely estimated rating and opex impacts of the deep water pool are:

|                                                     |        |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------|
| <b>Rates Impact</b>                                 |        |
| Estimated additional annual rates                   | \$1.2m |
| % additional rates increase                         | 0.5%   |
| <b>Revenue and Financing Policy (R&amp;F)</b>       |        |
| Estimated user funding %                            | 21%    |
| R&F user funding target                             | 40%    |
| User funding shortfall                              | \$0.3m |
| Ratepayer subsidy per visit                         | \$26   |
| <b>User impact</b>                                  |        |
| Cost per hour for pool hire excluding pool entry    | \$130  |
| Estimated additional pool uses annually             | 45,150 |
| Across the board price increase to user funding gap | 9.6%   |

At this stage three possible scenarios to manage the gap to Revenue and Finance compliance have been identified:

1. Accept non compliance with the target and / or change the target to accept inability to meet it as a result of building the new facility
2. Raise pool entry prices across the board to generate the required additional revenue (modelling indicates 9.6% in addition to any inflationary increases will be required in the year the facility opens)
3. Increase the charge to hire lane space from \$13/lane/hour to \$25/lane/hour on the basis aquatic sports groups want the development and will be the key beneficiaries

### **7.3 Libraries**

#### **7.3.1. Consultation feedback**

Support for the proposed relocation and expansion of the Johnsonville library was high amongst those submitters who commented. The issues of adequate car parking and integration with the mall and community centre were raised, along with the scheduling and timing of proposed roading upgrades around the hub location. Submitters requested the new library and upgrade of the pool be brought forward. The Johnsonville Community Centre requested they be involved in the feasibility study for the new library and there was a request for consultation with the local community.

Other issues raised around libraries were support for increased investment in technology, although not at the expense of the core book collection, and concern around media reports of a number of suburban libraries being closed. One submitter sought assurance that Island Bay library would not be closed or the

service reduced. Two submitters questioned the difference between the library funding in the DAP and the 2010/11 LTCCP.

### **7.3.2. Discussion**

The feasibility study for the Johnsonville library will be undertaken next year and officers will ensure the community centre is involved in the development of options. The results of the study will be reported back to the Strategy and Policy Committee and the issue of staging and timing will be addressed in the report. There are likely to be some synergies and efficiencies to be gained from constructing the new library and the redevelopment of the Keith Spry Pool at the same time. The potential option is to schedule the refresh of the Central Library after the Johnsonville library upgrade. It should be noted that the investment in technology and the refresh of the Central Library ground floor (stage 1 of the Central library investment) must be undertaken at the same time as the reorganisation of the space is required to accommodate the new issuing machines and increased PC numbers.

Officers omitted to include a feasibility study to assess options around Island Bay library and community centre in the recommendations of the December 2009 report on community facilities and recommend this is reintroduced. Island Bay library has one of the highest use for a facility of its size and under the draft policy would have a library of approximately double the current size. The feasibility study would look at potential options for expanding the current library and integrating it with Council's community space.

Two submitters questioned the differences between the level of operational funding for libraries in the 2010/11 DAP and the 2009/19 LTCCP. The LTCCP included nearly \$21 million (net) proposed for Libraries in 2010/11, compared to \$19.2 million (net) in the 2010/11 DAP. The difference between the two figures is as a result of the need to make operational savings to keep the rates low because of the current economic climate. All budgets were examined and built up from a zero base. The Libraries business unit identified savings however these savings do not affect the core levels of service for the libraries.

## **7.4 Community spaces**

### **7.4.1. Consultation feedback**

Submissions were received in support for all community centre upgrades and one questioned what was proposed for Strathmore. Submitters were split over the upgrade of Kilbirnie and Lyall Bay Community Centre with some supporting a relocation to a site adjacent to the library and other wanting the community centre retained in the town centre. Submissions were received requesting Aro Valley and Kilbirnie upgrades being brought forward.

## **7.4.2. Discussion**

Upgrade of the community centres was generally supported and no changes are recommended to the schedule. The location of the Kilbirnie and Lyall Bay Community Centre will be addressed through the initial planning work around the upgrade and through the proposed Kilbirnie Town Centre Plan studies.

Given the legacy issues around many of the community centre and hall buildings, building integrity issues are being uncovered as more investigation works are carried out. Earthquake strengthening may be required for at least two buildings in the portfolio – Northland Memorial Hall and Oriental Bay Band Rotunda. The Band Rotunda has structural issues that will need to be addressed. The details and timeframe for remedial works will be considered as part of the relevant Annual Plan and/ or LTCCP.

## **7.5 Churton Park**

### **7.5.1. Consultation feedback**

Four submissions were received through the DCFP consultation and a further two through the DAP consultation. These submissions were generally in support of the proposed investment in Churton Park and raised issues around linkage with other key projects in the suburb (the commercial centre, new school and Westchester Drive extension) and sought assurance that both the proceeds from the sale of the land on Amesbury Drive and the funding identified in the DCFP implementation plan for Churton Park would be retained through the DAP and LTCCP processes. The Amesbury Drive School Establishment Board of Trustees indicated they were open to discussions around the potential for shared community facilities on the school site.

In addition to the consultation above, targeted consultation was carried out to better understand the wishes of Churton Park residents for community facilities for their suburb. This consultation incorporated 7 focus groups and a follow up phone survey of approximately 350 residents to test the findings of the focus groups. The focus groups comprised groupings around those at home during the day, youth, commuters, Mandarin speakers, Cantonese speakers, Hindi speakers (x2).

Focus group participants generally characterised the suburb as safe and peaceful. People valued the atmosphere in Churton Park and wanted it protected. Indeed many considered that they didn't want large facilities as this may necessitate having to advertise their use outside the suburb. Participants were generally looking for immediate and small scale solutions that enhanced what is already available to enable a stronger, more self-sufficient community. A number commented that there are already community-orientated things happening in Churton Park but there seems to be no sense of central focus, co-ordination or information sharing.

The core themes from the focus groups on what Churton Park needed were:

1. basic services: supermarket, medical, cafe, DVD rental etc
2. upgrade of what currently exists in the parks and reserves, walking areas and bus routes
3. more places to do things – for both passive and active recreation
4. places to meet

Respondents to the phone survey were provided with background information on the probable developments in the suburb (school, centre and road) and the potential funding available through WCC. They were asked to indicate how important it was to have the following facilities and then rank their top three preferences.

- Meeting rooms for interest groups or other groups in the community to use
- Multipurpose indoor space that could be used for physical activity or sports as well as other larger group activities
- A place for youth to 'hang out'
- Creating new tracks and/or enhancing existing tracks for walking and biking
- Creating new and/or enhancing existing children's playgrounds
- Enhancing existing parks and reserves
- An outdoors all-weather surface for sports and other activities.

In addition respondents were asked whether the Council should concentrate on providing just their first preference or spread funding over two or three facilities

The survey responses supported (in order of preference):

- A multipurpose indoor space for physical activity
- Meeting rooms for interest groups in the community
- Creating new and/or enhancing existing children's playgrounds
- A place for youth to 'hang out'.

Respondents also supported the idea that Council support more than one of these facilities and preferences for location were a multisport space at the new school, meeting rooms at the proposed commercial centre. Officers consider the proposed quantum of funding is sufficient to achieve the top three preferences identified in the survey.

Submissions sought assurance that Council funding would not be used to provide basic school facilities but would enhance the facilities provided.

### **7.5.2. Discussion**

Officers have held initial discussions with both the School Establishment Board (including representatives from the Ministry of Education) and the Callenders, the developer of the proposed commercial centre.

The resource consent process for the commercial centre is in its final stages and it is likely the developer will begin working drawings for the centre later this year. Initial indications are that ownership of all buildings in the centre will remain with the developer and if the Council wished to develop community space in the commercial centre this will be on a lease basis. Some space has been identified on the concept plans for community use, however there is some flexibility around where any community space may be located.

The School Establishment Board and the Ministry of Education is currently in the process of refining the design brief for the school and agreeing the concept design. Given the stated aim of opening the school for the 2012 school year, the concept design, design brief and funding must all be approved by the Ministry of Education by the beginning of October 2010. This means any agreement to include any additional community facilities in the school must be completed by mid to late August 2010.

Currently the funding is identified as capex. However, investment in community space at the school is likely to be achieved via a grant to the Ministry of Education, with conditions on hours of community access to the space(s) and community space at the commercial centre is likely to be on a lease basis. Investment in Council's playgrounds will remain as capex. However, if a playground were developed at the new school site for community use further discussions are required over whether any playground at the school will be part of the Council's playground network and owned and maintained by the Council or owned and maintained by the school.

If the Committee agrees to invest in community facilities at the school, then officers will negotiate with the Establishment Board and Ministry of Education to achieve community access to a flexible, multiuse community space(s) which is suitable for some indoor physical activity. In addition, if the Committee agrees to support the provision of community space at the commercial centre, then officers will negotiate with the developer to identify a suitable space and appropriate linkage with other activities in the centre.

It is likely that any funding for either community space or playground will not be required prior to the 2011/12 financial year and it is recommended that the \$812,500k funding be deferred to 2011/12. The split between opex and capex can then be established as part of the 2011/12 Draft Annual Plan process.

Given the tight timeframes to achieve an agreement, officers propose that the Chief Executive Officers be delegated the authority to enter into an agreement with the Ministry of Education and/or Amesbury Drive School Establishment Board to achieve in part or in full the outcomes identified through the residents survey at the school site. This agreement will include the amount of grant funding and the level of community access and must:

- state the level and nature of the Council's investment
- state the level of community access to Council supported facilities
- establish the governance arrangements around the community facility

- provide value for money
- be consistent with the results of the recent survey of Churton Park residents
- be consistent with the draft Community Facilities Policy levels of service.

Further work is required for any community space in the commercial centre around the nature, governance and management of such a space. Officers will work with the community and developer to establish an appropriate framework for the community space. Given the timeframes for the development of the proposed commercial centre, it is likely any community space will be available in the second half of the 2011/12 financial year. As such, funding for any community space in the commercial centre may be required in this financial year. This will be reported back to the committee as part of the 2011/12 DAP process.

## **8. Community Centre funding**

### **8.1 Consultation feedback**

There were 9 submissions via the DAP process and a further 3 via the DCFP consultation strongly supporting the proposed changes to community centre funding. One submitter requested the funding identified for Churton Park be reallocated to Johnsonville Community Centre for 2010/11. Another submitter requested the \$45k cap be removed from the funding allocation model. Additional funding was requested for a community coordinator and assistance towards lease costs for community space in Mt Cook.

### **8.2 Discussion**

Council supported community centres are funded through 3 yearly contracts. The quantum of funding has been generally based on historical arrangements and there are some inequities between centres as a result of this. A review of the funding of community centres proposed an allocation model based around a base funding component plus additional amounts based on catchment population, the number of available spaces for activities and the social deprivation index of the local suburb they serve. In addition, the model proposed the maximum funding for any one centre would be set at \$45k.

Submissions were generally in support of the funding, and officers recommend the funding of \$203.8k per annum be included in the 2010/11 Annual Plan.

The intent of the funding model was to provide a more equitable way of allocating funding. The cap was put in place to limit the required funding pool and to limit the differences between centres. Six community centres are funded at the maximum level under the proposed model. The effect of the cap reduces the funding allocation to centres by between \$1k and \$18k depending on the location and size of the facility. Removal of the funding cap would require an



increase to the community centre funding by a further \$54k under the proposed funding model.

At the higher end of the range, the biggest factor in determining the level of funding is the number of lettable spaces as only two centres have significantly more than 5 lettable spaces. These additional spaces, whilst increasing the running cost of the buildings, also enable the centres to attract more users and potential revenue.

Given the objective of the funding model is to remove inequities, officers consider the cap in funding should be retained.

Support for new community facilities in Churton Park is being considered as part of this paper. Funding for a community centre in the suburb was considered as part of the review of the three year funding contracts for community centres starting from 2010/11. In April 2010, the Council agreed that the funding for Churton Park would not be available until a centre was built and that *“the unallocated \$35,713 will be available for allocation if required across community centres after the Draft Annual Plan consultation on the funding model on community centres is completed.”*

The focus groups identified there was a need for some coordination of community initiatives in the suburb. As significant development will be occurring in the suburb over the next 18 months, officers consider some funding is required for Churton Park to identify and create opportunities for community development and enable greater community awareness of progress on the development of the school, road and commercial centre.

Officers will be working with the Churton Park community to encourage greater engagement and awareness. Officers support the retention of the \$35,713 funding for Churton Park and do not support redistribution amongst other community centres for 2010/11. Officers will report back to the Grants sub-committee how this funding may be allocated.

## **9. New funding requests**

### **9.1 Senior centre in Kilbirnie**

Two submissions and a petition with 50 signatures were received outlining the issues faced by seniors accessing community and recreation space in the Kilbirnie area. The petition requested a dedicated accessible senior centre be developed in the suburb with meeting space for 200, with adequate seating and heating and ‘wired for hard to hear’.

With the proposed redevelopment and expansion of the Kilbirnie Community Centre, the availability of suitable space for seniors groups will increase. Until this time, officers have met with the main submitter and will continue to work

with them to identify potential venues and assist seniors groups access community and recreation space.

## **9.2 Funding for Mt Cook Mobilised**

Additional funding has been requested by Mt Cook Mobilised for financial support towards a community coordinator and lease costs of a building. Their aim is to build capacity and capability within the community to meet the needs, concerns and recognise achievements of those living and working within the community. The purpose of the changes to the grants funding proposed through the draft community facilities policy is to meet this type of request.

The purpose of the changes to the grants funding proposed through the draft community facilities policy is to meet this type of request. Financial support through the funding of a community coordinator would fit with the draft policy. Officers consider Mt Cook Mobilised is able to apply for funding through the normal grants process for both their requests and this is the appropriate vehicle for their funding request.

## **10. Financial implications**

The tables below show the changes between the LTCCP and the recommendations included in this report. The capital expenditure figures included in these financial tables are the most accurate estimates available at the current time. They are based on scoping and concept designs and will need further refinement prior to the projects commencing. This analysis is split into 3 sections:

- Pools Upgrade
- Libraries
- Community Space

## 10.1 Pools Upgrade

### Pools Upgrade Programme

#### Option 1 Officers Recommendation

| Proposed Capex Upgrades             | Capital expenses<br>'\$000 |              |              |              |          |          |          |          |          |          |               |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------------|
|                                     | 10/11                      | 11/12        | 12/13        | 13/14        | 14/15    | 15/16    | 16/17    | 17/18    | 18/19    | 19/20    | Total         |
| Keith Spry Pool upgrade (see notes) | 180                        | 3,000        | 1,700        |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 4,880         |
| WRAC Hydrotherapy Pool              | 2,100                      |              |              |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 2,100         |
| Thorndon Pool Roof                  | 50                         |              |              | 1,250        |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1,300         |
| Karori Learn to Swim Pool           | 585                        |              |              |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 585           |
| Tawa Roof Replacement - CX056       |                            | 1,600        |              |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1,600         |
| <b>Total</b>                        | <b>2,915</b>               | <b>4,600</b> | <b>1,700</b> | <b>1,250</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>10,465</b> |

| LTCCP 09/10         | Capital expenses<br>'\$000 |          |              |              |            |            |            |          |          |          |               |
|---------------------|----------------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|---------------|
|                     | 10/11                      | 11/12    | 12/13        | 13/14        | 14/15      | 15/16      | 16/17      | 17/18    | 18/19    | 19/20    | Total         |
| Pools Upgrade CX055 |                            |          | 6,685        | 5,408        | 181        | 185        | 126        |          |          |          | 12,585        |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>-</b>                   | <b>-</b> | <b>6,685</b> | <b>5,408</b> | <b>181</b> | <b>185</b> | <b>126</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>12,585</b> |

|                                      |              |              |                |                |              |              |              |          |          |          |                |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------------|
| <b>Difference (LTCCP v Proposed)</b> | <b>2,915</b> | <b>4,600</b> | <b>(4,985)</b> | <b>(4,158)</b> | <b>(181)</b> | <b>(185)</b> | <b>(126)</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>(2,120)</b> |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------------|

| Opex Impact of Pools (Change in LTCCP)       | Operating expenses<br>'\$000 |              |            |           |             |              |              |              |              |              |              |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                                              | 10/11                        | 11/12        | 12/13      | 13/14     | 14/15       | 15/16        | 16/17        | 17/18        | 18/19        | 19/20        | Total        |
| Revenue                                      |                              | (162)        | (162)      | (262)     | (330)       | (330)        | (330)        | (330)        | (330)        | (330)        | (2,566)      |
| Operating Expenses                           |                              | 88           | 88         | 230       | 396         | 396          | 396          | 396          | 396          | 396          | 2,782        |
| Opex Impact of Capex                         | 95                           | 406          | 433        | 91        | (153)       | (169)        | (184)        | (191)        | (191)        | (191)        | (54)         |
| School Partnerships                          | 500                          | 1,000        | 500        |           |             |              |              |              |              |              | 2,000        |
| Feasibility Study for Future Pool Investment | 60                           |              |            |           |             |              |              |              |              |              | 60           |
| <b>Total</b>                                 | <b>655</b>                   | <b>1,332</b> | <b>859</b> | <b>59</b> | <b>(87)</b> | <b>(103)</b> | <b>(118)</b> | <b>(125)</b> | <b>(125)</b> | <b>(125)</b> | <b>2,222</b> |

#### Option 2 Deep Water Pool added at WRAC

| Proposed Capex Upgrades   | Capital expenses<br>'\$000 |               |              |              |          |          |          |          |          |          |               |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------------|
|                           | 10/11                      | 11/12         | 12/13        | 13/14        | 14/15    | 15/16    | 16/17    | 17/18    | 18/19    | 19/20    | Total         |
| WRAC Hydrotherapy Pool    | 840                        | 1,260         |              |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 2,100         |
| WRAC WRAC Deep Water Pool | 4,560                      | 6,840         |              | -            |          |          |          |          |          |          | 11,400        |
| Other Upgrades (Option 1) | 815                        | 4,600         | 1,700        | 1,250        |          |          |          |          |          |          | 8,365         |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>6,215</b>               | <b>12,700</b> | <b>1,700</b> | <b>1,250</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>21,865</b> |

| LTCCP 09/10         | Capital expenses<br>'\$000 |          |              |              |            |            |            |          |          |          |               |
|---------------------|----------------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|---------------|
|                     | 10/11                      | 11/12    | 12/13        | 13/14        | 14/15      | 15/16      | 16/17      | 17/18    | 18/19    | 19/20    | Total         |
| Pools Upgrade CX055 |                            |          | 6,685        | 5,408        | 181        | 185        | 126        |          |          |          | 12,585        |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>-</b>                   | <b>-</b> | <b>6,685</b> | <b>5,408</b> | <b>181</b> | <b>185</b> | <b>126</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>12,585</b> |

|                                      |              |               |                |                |              |              |              |          |          |          |              |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|
| <b>Difference (LTCCP v Proposed)</b> | <b>6,215</b> | <b>12,700</b> | <b>(4,985)</b> | <b>(4,158)</b> | <b>(181)</b> | <b>(185)</b> | <b>(126)</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>9,280</b> |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|

| Opex Impact of Pools (Change in LTCCP)       | Operating expenses<br>'\$000 |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |               |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
|                                              | 10/11                        | 11/12        | 12/13        | 13/14        | 14/15        | 15/16        | 16/17        | 17/18        | 18/19        | 19/20        | Total         |
| Revenue                                      |                              | (55)         | (513)        | (613)        | (680)        | (680)        | (680)        | (680)        | (680)        | (680)        | (5,261)       |
| Operating Expenses                           |                              | 18           | 764          | 905          | 1,071        | 1,071        | 1,071        | 1,071        | 1,071        | 1,071        | 8,113         |
| Opex Impact of Capex                         | 202                          | 832          | 1,459        | 1,117        | 873          | 857          | 842          | 835          | 835          | 835          | 8,687         |
| School Partnerships                          | 500                          | 1,000        | 500          |              |              |              |              |              |              |              | 2,000         |
| Feasibility Study for Future Pool Investment | 60                           |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              | 60            |
| <b>Total</b>                                 | <b>762</b>                   | <b>1,795</b> | <b>2,210</b> | <b>1,409</b> | <b>1,264</b> | <b>1,248</b> | <b>1,233</b> | <b>1,226</b> | <b>1,226</b> | <b>1,226</b> | <b>13,599</b> |

#### Notes

Only Phase 1 of the Keith Spry Pool Upgrade is included in the figures.

## 10.2 Libraries

| Libraries Investment Programme      |                  |              |               |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |               |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Proposed Capex Upgrades             | Capital expenses |              |               |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |               |
|                                     | \$000            |              |               |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |               |
|                                     | 10/11            | 11/12        | 12/13         | 13/14        | 14/15        | 15/16        | 16/17        | 17/18        | 18/19        | 19/20        | 20/21        | Total         |
| Refresh Central & Elec. Item Mgmt   |                  | 180          | 7,800         |              | 4,000        | 2,900        |              |              |              |              |              | 14,880        |
| Invest in tech, pc & internet*      |                  | 35           | 352           | 252          | 252          | 252          | 252          | 252          | 252          | 252          | 252          | 2,403         |
| Johnsonville Library                | 330              |              |               |              |              | 750          | 4,370        | 6,160        |              |              |              | 11,610        |
| Johnsonville Library Collection     |                  |              |               |              |              |              |              | 660          | 66           | 66           | 66           | 858           |
| Existing Capex Programme (in LTCCP) | 1,943            | 2,041        | 2,254         | 4,380        | 2,426        | 2,274        | 2,200        | 2,280        | 2,334        | 2,550        | 2,318        | 27,000        |
| <b>Total</b>                        | <b>2,273</b>     | <b>2,256</b> | <b>10,406</b> | <b>4,632</b> | <b>6,678</b> | <b>6,176</b> | <b>6,822</b> | <b>9,352</b> | <b>2,652</b> | <b>2,868</b> | <b>2,636</b> | <b>56,751</b> |

| LTCCP 09/10 - Capex                 |                  |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |               |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| LTCCP 09/10 - Capex                 | Capital expenses |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |               |
|                                     | \$000            |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |               |
|                                     | 10/11            | 11/12        | 12/13        | 13/14        | 14/15        | 15/16        | 16/17        | 17/18        | 18/19        | 19/20        | 20/21        | Total         |
| CX077 Library materials upgrades    | 1,896            | 1,896        | 1,896        | 1,896        | 1,896        | 1,896        | 1,896        | 1,896        | 1,896        | 1,896        | 1,896        | 20,858        |
| CX269 Computer replacement upgrades |                  |              | 80           | 2,134        | 80           | 80           | 80           | 80           | 80           | 80           | 80           | 2,774         |
| CX338 Central library upgrades      |                  |              | 107          | 107          | 107          | 107          | 107          | 107          | 107          | 107          | 107          | 960           |
| CX358 Branch libraries upgrades     |                  |              | 93           | 93           | 93           | 93           | 93           | 93           | 93           | 93           | 93           | 840           |
| CX359 Branch libraries renewals     | 46               | 145          | 77           | 149          | 250          | 97           | 24           | 103          | 157          | 374          | 142          | 1,566         |
| <b>Total</b>                        | <b>1,943</b>     | <b>2,041</b> | <b>2,254</b> | <b>4,380</b> | <b>2,426</b> | <b>2,274</b> | <b>2,200</b> | <b>2,280</b> | <b>2,334</b> | <b>2,550</b> | <b>2,318</b> | <b>27,000</b> |

| Difference (LTCCP v Proposed) |                  |            |              |            |              |              |              |              |            |            |            |               |
|-------------------------------|------------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Difference (LTCCP v Proposed) | Capital expenses |            |              |            |              |              |              |              |            |            |            |               |
|                               | \$000            |            |              |            |              |              |              |              |            |            |            |               |
|                               | 10/11            | 11/12      | 12/13        | 13/14      | 14/15        | 15/16        | 16/17        | 17/18        | 18/19      | 19/20      | 20/21      | Total         |
| <b>Total</b>                  | <b>330</b>       | <b>215</b> | <b>8,152</b> | <b>252</b> | <b>4,252</b> | <b>3,902</b> | <b>4,622</b> | <b>7,072</b> | <b>318</b> | <b>318</b> | <b>318</b> | <b>29,751</b> |

| Opex impact of New Capex          |                      |           |            |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |               |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Opex impact of New Capex          | Operational expenses |           |            |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |               |
|                                   | \$000                |           |            |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |               |
|                                   | 10/11                | 11/12     | 12/13      | 13/14        | 14/15        | 15/16        | 16/17        | 17/18        | 18/19        | 19/20        | 20/21        | Total         |
| Opex impact of Capex              |                      | 30        | 315        | 1,298        | 1,457        | 1,735        | 2,369        | 2,762        | 3,950        | 3,983        | 4,016        | 21,915        |
| Invest in tech, pc & internet*    |                      | 65        | 468        | 1,043        | 1,043        | 1,043        | 1,043        | 1,043        | 1,043        | 1,043        | 1,043        | 8,877         |
| Refresh Central & Elec. Item Mgmt |                      |           |            | 44           | 44           | 44           | 44           | 44           | 44           | 44           | 44           | 352           |
| Island Bay Feasibility study      |                      |           |            |              |              |              |              |              |              |              | 45           | 45            |
| Johnsonville Feasibility study    | 50                   |           |            |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |               |
| Johnsonville Operational Impacts  |                      |           |            |              |              |              |              |              | 652          | 652          | 652          | 1,956         |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>50</b>            | <b>95</b> | <b>783</b> | <b>2,385</b> | <b>2,544</b> | <b>2,822</b> | <b>3,456</b> | <b>3,849</b> | <b>5,689</b> | <b>5,767</b> | <b>5,755</b> | <b>33,195</b> |

Invest in tech, pc & internet\* 11,280

### Notes

Costs in 2009 dollars

Includes operational expense for Johnsonville

Includes Johnsonville Collection increases

Rephase and update of costs relative to Johnsonville library

Does not include efficiency savings as a result of investment or development contributions

## 10.3 Community Space

### Community Space Investment Programme

| Proposed Capex Upgrades              | Capital expenses<br>\$000 |              |              |            |            |              |              |            |              |            |              |               |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|---------------|
|                                      | 10/11                     | 11/12        | 12/13        | 13/14      | 14/15      | 15/16        | 16/17        | 17/18      | 18/19        | 19/20      | 20/21        | Total         |
| New Community Centre in Churton Park |                           |              | 845          |            |            |              |              |            |              |            |              | 845           |
| Community Centre Upgrades            |                           |              |              |            |            |              |              |            |              |            |              |               |
| Aro Valley                           |                           |              |              | 45         | 100        | 831          |              |            |              |            |              | 976           |
| Strathmore                           |                           |              |              |            | 40         | 140          | 820          |            |              |            |              | 1,000         |
| Newton                               |                           |              |              |            |            |              | 45           | 285        | 2,415        |            |              | 2,745         |
| Kilbirnie                            |                           |              |              |            |            | 50           |              |            | 45           | 185        | 3,500        | 3,780         |
| Defer Churton Park Facilities        | -813                      | 813          |              |            |            |              |              |            |              |            |              | 0             |
| Existing Capex Programme (in LTCCP)  | 1,311                     | 502          | 445          | 552        | 495        | 531          | 416          | 488        | 501          | 450        | 452          | 6,144         |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>499</b>                | <b>1,314</b> | <b>1,290</b> | <b>597</b> | <b>635</b> | <b>1,552</b> | <b>1,281</b> | <b>773</b> | <b>2,961</b> | <b>635</b> | <b>3,952</b> | <b>15,490</b> |

| LTCCP 09/10 - Capex                       | Capital expenses<br>\$000 |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |              |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
|                                           | 10/11                     | 11/12      | 12/13      | 13/14      | 14/15      | 15/16      | 16/17      | 17/18      | 18/19      | 19/20      | 20/21      | Total        |
| CX467 Community Halls Upgrades & Renewals | 90                        | 14         | 12         | 67         | 64         | 46         | 19         | 92         | 104        | 53         | 56         | 619          |
| CX181 Playgrounds renewals/upgrades       | 1,221                     | 487        | 433        | 485        | 432        | 485        | 396        | 396        | 396        | 396        | 396        | 5,525        |
| <b>Total</b>                              | <b>1,311</b>              | <b>502</b> | <b>445</b> | <b>552</b> | <b>495</b> | <b>531</b> | <b>416</b> | <b>488</b> | <b>501</b> | <b>450</b> | <b>452</b> | <b>6,144</b> |

| Difference (LTCCP v Proposed) | Capital expenses<br>\$000 |            |            |           |            |              |            |            |              |            |              |              |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
|                               | 10/11                     | 11/12      | 12/13      | 13/14     | 14/15      | 15/16        | 16/17      | 17/18      | 18/19        | 19/20      | 20/21        | Total        |
| <b>Total</b>                  | <b>-813</b>               | <b>813</b> | <b>845</b> | <b>45</b> | <b>140</b> | <b>1,021</b> | <b>865</b> | <b>285</b> | <b>2,460</b> | <b>185</b> | <b>3,500</b> | <b>9,346</b> |

| Opex impact of new Capex | Operational expenses<br>\$000 |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |              |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
|                          | 10/11                         | 11/12      | 12/13      | 13/14      | 14/15      | 15/16      | 16/17      | 17/18      | 18/19      | 19/20      | 20/21      | Total        |
| Opex impact of Capex     | -53                           | -53        | 27         | 85         | 91         | 128        | 222        | 293        | 382        | 560        | 679        | 2,360        |
| Additional Grants Pool   | 259                           | 259        | 259        | 259        | 259        | 259        | 259        | 259        | 259        | 259        | 259        | 2,849        |
| <b>Total</b>             | <b>206</b>                    | <b>206</b> | <b>286</b> | <b>344</b> | <b>350</b> | <b>387</b> | <b>481</b> | <b>552</b> | <b>641</b> | <b>819</b> | <b>938</b> | <b>5,209</b> |

## **10.4 Commentary**

Expenditure included in the LTCCP to upgrade swimming pools is proposed to be re-prioritised and brought forward through the draft Community Facilities Policy and Implementation Plan. In addition some capital expenditure is proposed to be transferred to operational expenditure to support the partnership with schools proposal.

If the Council makes an in principle decision to upgrade the libraries and community spaces identified as priorities, then additional funding will need to be considered for these project in the next review of the LTCCP in 2012.

The LTCCP includes \$812,500k within the Playgrounds capex budget for community facilities in Churton Park. Recommendations on the best use of this funding propose investment in facilities at the new school on Amesbury Drive. If this proceeds, some of the funding will need to be transferred to opex for grant funding to the Ministry of Education. Officers are recommending this funding is deferred for one year and the split between opex and capex realized through the 2011/12 DAP process. Any potential change between capex to opex is not reflected in the tables.

## **10.5 Potential Sources of Funding**

The figures do not reflect any potential income through development contributions or asset sales. Initial estimates are that approximately 20% of the Johnsonville library costs may be allocated to growth, and some elements of the community space upgrades may also attract development contributions. Development contributions have been collected for the Keith Spry upgrade since 2007. Further work is required on the impact of the proposed investment on development contributions.

There will be efficiency gains as a result of technology investment. These have not been quantified but will be included in the finalised proposal in the 2012 LTCCP.

With the relocation and expansion of the Johnsonville library, if the Council decides to declare the existing Johnsonville library site surplus, the proceeds from the sale of the existing building and associated housing units (total GV of 2,650,000) may be used to fund the redevelopment of the proposed library.

## **11. Conclusion**

The consultation around the draft Community Facilities Policy and Implementation Plan was generally in support of the proposed policy and plan. The issue attracting the most submissions was that of the level of support for aquatic sport and the contention an additional deep water pool is required at the pool in Kilbirnie. Support for the funding towards partnerships with schools

was strong with a number of schools expressing an interest in partnering with the Council to provide greater community access to their school pool.

Officers have recommended some minor amendments to the draft policy to clarify issues raised and have made recommendations around some changes to the partnership fund for schools and timings of initiatives.

Contact Officer: *Neville Brown, Director, City Services*  
*Wendy Walker, Director, Citizen Engagement*

## Supporting Information

### **1) Strategic Fit / Strategic Outcome**

*The policy supports Council's overall vision of affordable, internationally competitive city.*

*The policy supports Council's social and recreation outcomes*

### **2) LTCCP/Annual Plan reference and long term financial impact**

*There is no provision for the upgrade of libraries or community centres or halls in the current LTCCP with the exception of the feasibility study for Johnsonville library and investment in Churton Park facilities. The remaining projects are recommended for consideration at the next review of the LTCCP in 2012.*

*The recommended approach for aquatic facilities is to increase funding in the Partnership with Schools fund to \$2.0m.*

### **3) Treaty of Waitangi considerations**

*There are no general Treaty of Waitangi issues with the policy.*

### **4) Decision-Making**

*This is not a significant decision. The report outlines the consultation feedback and officers recommendations to address any issues raised.*

### **5) Consultation**

#### **a) General Consultation**

*Consultation was carried out in April and May with submissions open from 9 April 2010 to 10 May 2010, hearings from 13 to 18 May 2010. In addition, focus groups and a survey of 300 randomly selected Churton Park residents was completed to understand community preferences for facilities in the suburb.*

#### **b) Consultation with Maori**

*Mana whenua were provided with copies of the policy and summary document for comment.*

### **6) Legal Implications**

*There are no immediate legal implications for the policy*

### **7) Consistency with existing policy**

*The policy is consistent with Council's strategic outcomes and objectives*



