

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 3 Cont'd

**Preferred Option:**

34. Having regard to circumstances officers are recommending Option 2.

**4. NEW BRIGHTON – EVALUATION OF AQUATIC DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8281
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Urban Design and Regeneration Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Carolyn Bonis, Senior Planner

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is threefold.
2. Firstly, and as indicated in the June report to Planning Committee, this report summarises the evaluation undertaken by two expert firms of a range of aquatic development options for New Brighton. This stems from a proposal to develop a Waterpark in New Brighton, using funds allocated to a new Eastern Recreation and Sport Facility (**ER&S Facility**). Other aquatic development options have also been considered. A decision is sought as to the nature and scale of any Council-funded aquatic facility in the New Brighton area.
3. Secondly, the report provides a summary of submissions on the Draft Master Plan recommendation to consolidate the New Brighton centre, reducing its commercial zone to approximately 4 hectares. This matter is brought forward from the intended December 2013 meeting to provide some clarity for staff working on Stage 1 of the District Plan Review. A decision is sought on whether to progress the rezoning work at this time. This links closely to the decision on aquatic facilities and revitalisation.
4. Thirdly, for the Committee to note that a separate report has been prepared by the Recreation and Sports Unit on location options for the ER&S Facility across the East. This report focuses only on options for this facility as they relate to New Brighton.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY****Evaluation of aquatic development options for New Brighton*****The Options***

5. The Council requested in February that staff provide a process for integrating the proposed Waterpark with the Draft New Brighton Centre Master Plan ('the Draft Master Plan'). It subsequently agreed in June that a wider range of aquatic development options would be evaluated. This links closely with the Aquatic Facilities Rebuild programme, specifically the ER&S Facility, and the development of a Master Plan to revitalise New Brighton. This evaluation has now been undertaken.
6. The following aquatic development options were considered. Those with asterisks are additional to the options specifically requested by elected members. This report indicates that Option 8 is the preferred option for further consideration, but also outlines other high-ranking alternatives.

Option 1	No Waterpark, ER&S Facility located elsewhere in the East	
Option 2	Waterpark combined with ER&S Facility, in New Brighton	Promoted by David East / Tim Sintes, with technical input from Alan Direen
Option 3	Waterpark only in New Brighton, and ER&S Facility located elsewhere	
Option 4	Council ER&S Facility only, in New Brighton	
Option 5 *	Full 'Village in a Waterpark'	Promoted by consultants Align Ltd, Pivnice Ltd and Joseph & Associates Ltd, as part of

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

		developing an alternative masterplan for New Brighton.
Option 6	Boutique salt water pool in New Brighton, to complement an ER&S Facility elsewhere	As a subset of Option 5, a specific proposal has recently been recommended by Joseph & Associates Ltd.
Option 7	All aquatic entertainment elements in New Brighton, and a reduced scale / fitness oriented ER&S Facility elsewhere.	
Option 8 *	Scaled down 'Village' option	
Option 9 *	ER&S Facility 'plus' – salt water hot pools, day spa, wellness centre.	Additional option identified by one of the consultant firms (SGL) evaluating the options.

7. Among the development options are two alternative proposals for aquatic facilities, developed by different groups within the New Brighton community. These are:

- (a) 'The Waterpark' or Option 2. The intent is to provide a single, 'blockbuster' attraction that would provide New Brighton with a 'wow' factor. 20,000 signatures were gathered by the proponents in support of this proposal. As outlined in the June officers report, the Waterpark proposal is shown located on a block of land currently occupied by the Countdown supermarket and other shops and housing, and extending across Marine Parade and on to the foreshore. Further technical information since provided to the Council and consultants indicates that this development would be a covered facility comprising a waterpark (with slides, spas and a river / lagoon / beach area) with elements of a basic community aquatic facility (with 25 metre pools and a gymnasium). Extracts from the information provided to Council officers are included as **Attachment 3**.
- (b) 'Village in a Waterpark' or Option 5 (also the '**Full Village Option**'). The intent is that New Brighton be cultivated as a seaside tourist attraction by distributing a range of smaller scale aquatic and seaside themed attractions around the periphery of the commercial centre. Extracts from the information provided to Council staff are included as **Attachment 4**. In addition to the existing sea/surf and river opportunities, the group has proposed:
  - A foreshore, relocatable saltwater pool development (refer also Option 6).
  - An attraction by the river – potentially a small whitewater course or river rides (the latter appears from the imagery to be a small waterpark).
  - Other non-aquatic options, such as a coastal promenade, mixed use buildings and markets.

#### **Option Evaluation**

8. This report discusses a variety of aspects, including New Brighton's function and role, and the interface of this report with the ER&S Facility decision process and the Metro Sports Facility. The objectives against which the aquatic development options have been evaluated are:

- Revitalisation of New Brighton Centre through optimising economic spillover effects;
- Aquatic facility provision for residents across the whole of the east, including those in New Brighton;
- A network of facilities that do not directly compete for the same customer base;
- Facilities in New Brighton that reflect and support its longer term function as a community-focussed commercial centre with some seaside tourism functions;
- Affordability (for example: through use of land currently owned by Council; through staging; and/or through sharing of risk and responsibility); and
- Practicality of delivery.

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

9. Two firms were engaged by the Council to evaluate the proposed Waterpark and other aquatic development options for New Brighton. The consultants commenced work on 1 July and provided final draft reports on 6 and 7 August.
10. Simply Great Leisure Ltd (**SGL**) has evaluated the economic feasibility of the above aquatic development options. The analysis considers a range of relevant aspects including: population and household forecasts; tourism visits; aquatic facility attendance; trends in the waterpark industry – including in Australia, the USA and New Zealand; investment potential; the wider aquatic network including the Metro Sports Facility; and the 'pros and cons' in relation to social, economic and environmental outcomes. The SGL report is appended as **Attachment 1**.
11. SGS Economics and Planning (**SGS**) has evaluated the revitalisation potential of the above aquatic development options. The analysis considers a range of relevant matters including: the longer term function and role of New Brighton commercial centre; the potential for an aquatic facility of varying scales to provide a catalyst for revitalisation of New Brighton; and the relationship to the Metro Sports Facility. The SGS report is appended as **Attachment 2**.
12. The aquatic development option favoured by SGL is Option 9, whereas SGS favours Option 8. The consultants have come from different disciplines and perspectives and for this reason their key findings have been combined into a single table, Table 1 of this report.

**Key findings***Function and nature of New Brighton*

13. The advice from SGS is that "New Brighton's future lies in a scaled back, community-focussed retail role, coupled with a regional tourism-oriented function. ... 'Rolling back the clock' to New Brighton's hey-day as a regional shopping destination is in our view, impractical. Having said that, New Brighton has a degree of cache, as a seaside destination, which with care and insight, can be leveraged to provide the centre with an expanded role and trading base." This finding reinforces earlier work by Property Economics Ltd for the Draft New Brighton Centre Master Plan.
14. SGS has further identified that the key intervention required in New Brighton is to reposition its 'brand' as a seaside village offering an array of entertainment, hospitality and retail leisure opportunities to complement its local service functions. This is likely to involve a number of distributed investments in New Brighton to:
  - Improve the compactness and appeal of its retail core;
  - Introduce some new leisure attractions including but not limited to small scale aqua play facilities, fair grounds and enhanced promenades;
  - Improve the perceived safety of the centre's public domain through better street lighting , passive surveillance and other crime prevention through design initiatives;
  - Foster the development of an 'eat street or precinct' with strong pedestrian or visual connections to the sea.

*Waterpark (Option 2)*

15. Consultants made the following findings on the Waterpark proposal:
  - (a) The Waterpark would require a footprint of up to 25,000 square metres, and if combined with an ER&S Facility could require up to 30,000 square metres. This figure includes car parking, landscape buffer zones and future extension zones, but is too large to be provided within the footprint shown on the original plans. For example, consultants have identified a 500 – 600 car park minimum requirement.

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

- (b) Establishment of such a facility, exclusive of land purchase, is anticipated to be approximately \$47 - \$50 million and consultants have revised the proponents anticipated visitation figures downwards from 900,000 visits to between 640,000 and 850,000 annual visits. This is based on catchment analysis and average facility visitation numbers. The visitor numbers are not expected to be sufficient to attract a developer to invest in waterpark facilities.
  - (c) The proposed annual operating revenue has been revised downward from \$7.4 million to between \$3.9 - \$5.4 million. Similarly, operating expenditure was considered to be significantly understated.
  - (d) The development of both the Metro Sport Centre and a major waterpark is not supported by consultants as both facilities will compete directly against one another, undermining visitation to, and consequently viability of, the planned Metro Sports Facility.
  - (e) The 'spillover effects' (additional spending both on-site and off-site) would be up to 11 per cent of existing total retail turnover, with some potential for spinoff private funding and reduction of crime and vandalism. However, visitors would be funnelled into a single facility rather than being spread through the centre.
16. Both SGL and SGS have recommended against building a standalone Waterpark. The economic feasibility is not considered to be strong enough to attract investment, it would compete directly with the Metro Sports Facility and would not generate significant revitalisation in the commercial centre. For this reason, it is not recommended that Council funds be used to support the proposed development, as community benefits are unlikely to be realised. However, it remains open for private investors to continue to investigate this proposal.
- Full Village in a Waterpark (Option 5)*
17. SGL has not provided an assessment of the Village Option, as the concepts are very loosely defined at present. Several of the ideas are related to 'place-making' proposals rather than aquatic developments. However, the firm notes that splitting facilities goes against current industry trends of clustering and connecting community aquatic and leisure facilities.
18. SGS has identified that the greatest potential for revitalising New Brighton lies in spreading attractions around the commercial centre. These attractions may be a mix of aquatic and non-aquatic in nature and ideally would not replicate attractions elsewhere. SGS considers that the Full Village option is likely to generate the greatest spillover effect for both New Brighton and Christchurch, due to the potential for more 'spend opportunities'. In comparison with the Waterpark, tourists would be distributed in the centre rather than concentrated into a particular attraction. This would promote exposure to a wide variety of retail and services in the centre. This option also has the greatest potential for boosting investment activity in neighbouring residential and commercial precincts.
19. However, this option may be ambitious and difficult to deliver if aiming for an outcome similar to major seaside villages elsewhere. This is due to the difficulty in attracting the necessary high level of public and private investment required to deliver the concept. Both firms caution against this option. SGS instead recommends a scaled down version (Option 8).
- Blend of locations and facilities*
20. Options 3, 6, 7, 8 and 9 present a blend of locations – both within and beyond New Brighton. SGL has identified a risk of blending locations: that by splitting high yield components, visitations will be spread across the facilities, the level of revenue at each would drop and the net cost of operation increases. This would impact upon financial viability. This is particularly the case if facilities themselves are similar – for example a large number of waterslides at different locations would likely reduce patronage at the Metro Sports Facility.

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

21. Options 3 and 7 both result in direct competition with the Metro Sports Facility. Option 6 has limited revitalisation benefits. Option 8 is preferred by SGS as it would achieve similar benefits to those outlined above for Option 5, in that it would support pedestrian movement through the commercial core, while being more deliverable in that improvements would be staged over time and in conjunction with improvements in the private realm. Option 9 has merit but again concentrates visitors into one location, and this location will be distant from the commercial centre due to the site size required.

*Other options*

22. Options not already discussed above are Options 1 and 4. Option 1 would provide no revitalisation benefit to New Brighton. Option 4 also has merit but as with some other options would potentially create accessibility issues for residents in some parts of the East.
23. The full range of benefits and drawbacks of the different options is provided in **Table 1** at the end of this report.

*Option 8 - discussion*

24. The option which best addresses the objectives is Option 8, a scaled-back and staged version of the 'full Village in a Waterpark' option. The intent of Option 8 is to support a small range of additional attractions around the commercial core of New Brighton to reinforce a seaside village theme. This would be developed over time and would incentivise time and investment from the local community so that responsibility for success is shared. The new attractions would complement previous investments in New Brighton (library, pier), provide the opportunity and incentive for visitors to wander through the shopping area and encourage business and land owners to continue to invest in the centre.
25. The original intent of this option, as assessed by consultants, was to use a portion of the \$6.5 million Earthquake Appeal funding, given that it would continue to be used for aquatic attractions within the East. However, the Christchurch Earthquake Appeal Trust (CEAT) has since confirmed that it is unlikely that the \$6.5 million would be able to split across different facilities. A further possibility for funding was through the City Council \$50 million fund for 'betterment of facilities and transformational opportunities'. However, this would potentially involve the Council funding the development of private facilities that may not be considered core Council business. Therefore, it is recommended that further work be undertaken to scope the exact nature and location of facilities, as well as funding and management options. The opportunity to explore a mix of smaller scale initiatives, from a range of funding sources and matched with both improvement to the public realm, and the private sector, is something that could continue to be pursued with landowners and the community.
26. Option 8, as originally evaluated by consultants, would comprise the following actions:
- (a) Supporting a small, relocatable salt water hot pool complex, potentially associated with a surf club redevelopment, on the foreshore of New Brighton;
  - (b) Supporting additional attractions and improvements in New Brighton. Criteria for additional attractions might require that the attraction/s:
    - (i) are leisure oriented and seaside or aquatic in nature/theme;
    - (ii) do not replicate the major facilities at either the Metro Sports Facility or the ER&S Facility;
    - (iii) are located in close proximity to the commercial core in a manner to support usage and spend in the centre; and
    - (iv) reflect the intended function of New Brighton as a small but vibrant seaside village;

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

An example might be a unique and bold, Council-developed and maintained splash pad 'with a difference', located at the western end of New Brighton Mall, as part of a wider redevelopment of the Mall. While the original intent of the Draft Master Plan was to develop a slow road through the Mall, community feedback is strongly in favour of retaining this area as a pedestrian and community market space. However, it is currently poorly presented. The aim of a Mall redevelopment would be to encourage family use of the space and pull visitors into and through the commercial core. A further example for a development on the river-side of New Brighton was also included in Option 8.

- (c) Locating the ER&S Facility at a location that best meets Council criteria for the residents of the wider East;
  - (d) Monitoring the level of amenity of commercial sites over the next three years and, if there is evidence of substantial improvement and effort by business and landowners to reinvigorate the centre, consider allocating additional funds through the next Long Term Plan for further attractions/facilities to support revitalisation efforts.
27. **Attachment 5** shows how Option 8 could work spatially.
28. While this Option is preferred by SGS, it is not anticipated to be a panacea for revitalisation of New Brighton, any more than the other options. The issues in New Brighton are complex and require a multi-layered, strategic response. However, this option, together with various place-making and rezoning initiatives proposed through the Draft New Brighton Centre Master Plan, will encourage the additional footfall through the commercial area that is needed for revitalisation as a functioning neighbourhood centre with a wider 'niche' role.
29. The principle alternatives to Option 8 that have ranked high in the evaluation are:
- (a) Option 4: Council ER&S Facility only, in New Brighton;
  - (b) Option 6: Boutique salt water pool in New Brighton, to complement an ER&S Facility elsewhere.
  - (c) Option 9: ER&S Facility 'plus' (salt water hot pool, day spa, wellness centre) – recommended by SGL.

It will be important to consider any relevant reports from the Recreation and Sport Unit before making a decision to support either Option 4 or Option 9, given that there are wider considerations in relation to location of the Eastern Recreation and Sport Facility. SGS has recommended that "the ER&S facility be located to optimise access and use from the sub-region, rather than subordinating these parameters to revitalisation objectives in New Brighton".

**Conclusion and way forward**

30. In summary, there are benefits and drawbacks of the two options put forward by the community (refer Table 1). While there are economic benefits of co-locating all aquatic attractions within the one facility (Waterpark plus ER&S Facility – Option 2), there are fewer revitalisation benefits and greater risks of competing with the Metro Sports Facility.
31. Although the greatest potential for revitalising New Brighton will be achieved through pursuing the full 'Village option' (Option 5), in which New Brighton strives to become a township similar to Australian seaside villages of Glenelg, St Kilda or Byron Bay, this is perceived to be ambitious and potentially less practical to deliver. Therefore, the option which best achieves objectives – Option 8 – is the strongest contender for further exploration.

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

32. To give effect to the intent of Option 8, key stakeholders could work together to identify a range of small scale revitalisation initiatives. These initiatives would need to reflect New Brighton's future function as a unique neighbourhood centre and be distributed within and around the commercial core. Part of this work would involve exploring the role of the private, public and philanthropic sectors, and the mix, timing, and scale of investment needed to ensure that the initiatives are sustaining and successful. The intent is to quickly focus on one or two key initiatives and consider whether these should be Council-led projects or whether they are more appropriately explored by private investors. Any Council-led or supported projects would likely be considered through future LTP or Annual Plan mechanisms.
33. The aspects of Option 8 which could be considered as part of this process are further investigations of a community salt water hot pool facility, and a full redevelopment of Brighton Mall – to upgrade the space for community activity and reinforce the river-to-sea connection. If private sector improvements are commensurate with Council initiatives, then further initiatives may also be considered.

**Draft New Brighton Centre Master Plan – commercial zone consolidation*****District Plan Review and the Draft Master Plan***

34. The Draft Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP) includes actions to support the rebuilding and development of the network of suburban centres. Action 24 requires the Council to amend the District Plan to enable the recovery and rebuilding of businesses and provide for planning provisions for Key Activity Centres and neighbourhood centres that have undergone a suburban centres masterplan process. This is to be completed by 30 June 2014. The LURP also notes that encouraging terrace and town house developments can support the recovery of suburban centres by increasing the population within their catchments.
35. Officers will report on the Draft New Brighton Centre Master Plan in December, in terms of the summary of submissions and a 'way forward', taking into account anticipated September Council decisions on aquatic development options. The most significant action in the Draft Master Plan relates to a proposed rezoning of the commercial core to consolidate the centre. If this is to be achieved as part of Stage 1 of the District Plan Review, work on this will need to commence before December.

***Centre consolidation***

36. Economic analysis undertaken in 2012 indicates that the commercial centre of New Brighton is too large and should be significantly reduced in size. The Draft Master Plan proposes to consolidate the centre toward the sea front and to rezone commercial land to the west of the centre for higher density residential activity, potentially including travellers accommodation. This would support the function of the commercial centre and help limit the impact of the loss of housing from the red zone. The master plan identifies that further studies are required to identify the exact land use and extent of rezoning. To incorporate the rezoning as part of Stage 1 of the District Plan Review would require such additional studies to be high level.
37. **Attachment 6** comprises extracts from the Summary of Submissions report on the Draft Master Plan. These extracts deal specifically with the consolidation of the centre and uptake for residential purposes. The vast majority of submitters agree with the proposal to consolidate the centre and to provide new residential development. Further details are provided in paragraph 61 onwards.

***Options***

38. If Stage One of the District Plan review is to incorporate a re-zoning of New Brighton centre, this is likely to be a contentious process for the landowners concerned, even though the majority of submitters support the concept of consolidating the commercial core. The key reason for the anticipated contentious nature of the concept is that long-established, if underutilised development rights will be restricted. Alternatives are:
  - a) Relying upon non-regulatory methods, including through master plan actions, to signal where the commercial core is intended to be.

**COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013****Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013****4 Cont'd**

- b) Deferring this part of the District Plan Review until further analysis is completed on zoning options and discussions have been held with all relevant parties. Such additional work would likely occur later this financial year.

**Conclusion**

- 39. Given the timeframes concerned and the need to complete further analysis and have discussions with affected parties, the recommendation of this report is that a rezoning be investigated later this financial year and, if considered appropriate, form part of Stage 2 of the District Plan Review.

**Community Board consultation**

- 40. This officers report was prepared immediately following receipt of the two consultants reports. Officers held a seminar with the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board on 19 August and presented the general findings of the consultant reports.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 41. The Council has already budgeted and approved \$30.5 million to develop an ER&S Facility, somewhere in the East of the City. This has been further supported by \$6.5 million from the Earthquake Appeal Trust, for aquatic attractions at the ER&S Facility. The budget is currently anticipated to be spent in one location at one facility. However, there is no additional funding presently allocated for land purchase. There are presently no detailed Council costings for the ER&S Facility and no allowance for land remediation or additional building code requirements.
- 42. The exact financial implications will depend upon the Council's decision on aquatic development options. Most require funding over and above the \$37 million for the ER&S Facility. If Option 8 or similar is chosen, the recommendation is for the more detailed investigation of a series of public (eg splash pad), private (eg Salt Water Pools) or other bespoke aquatic initiatives, together with the type and scale of improvements to the public realm to support this scale of enhancement. A key to this will be to identify the timing, future funding options and to explore the development intentions of key landowners in the New Brighton Mall locality.

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2013-16 TYP budgets?**

- 43. Yes, as above. The recommendation of the report leaves funding options and timeframes open. If the Council chooses, either now or in the future, to allocate budget from the \$50 million included within the TYP for "Betterment of facilities and transformational opportunities", there is presently approximately \$25 million remaining within this fund.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- 44. Should the Council agree in principle to lease Council land to any proposed private investments, such as the relocatable salt water hot pool facility, this will be subject to legal agreements and to appropriate building and resource consents.
- 45. If it is decided to pursue a full Waterpark or other large aquatic facility option within the commercial area of New Brighton, the size of the facility and associated land requirements will either require stopping of at least one road and/or expanding into land elsewhere – that is, beyond the location originally proposed. Depending upon the final location, additional legal considerations may apply.

**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

- 46. Yes, as above.



**COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013****Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013****4 Cont'd****ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

47. Provision has been made for both the Suburban Centres Programme and the Facilities Rebuild Plan through the Annual Plan process. This report and its recommendations enables both projects to move forward.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2013-16 TYP?**

48. The Annual Plan 2012/13 includes levels of service for the recovery of Suburban Centres. New Brighton is not specifically mentioned, although Council added this master plan to the Suburban Centres Programme in April 2012 and budget was allocated for the current financial year. There are also levels of service regarding the delivery of community-based recreation and sport programmes/events and ensuring multi-purpose recreation and sport centres, swimming pools, stadia and other recreation and sporting facilities are provided. There is no direct mention of specific aquatic facilities or development options for New Brighton in the Three Year Plan.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

49. Both recommendations - to consolidate the commercial zoning in New Brighton and to support delivery of smaller scale aquatic developments that reflect New Brighton's place in a network of commercial centres across the City - are consistent with the majority of relevant strategies.
50. The master plans being developed through the Suburban Centre Programme are consistent with the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy objectives and its implementation tool – currently draft Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement as proposed in the Land Use Recovery Plan. The master plans recognise the current hierarchy of commercial centres, and are consistent with the vision of enabling the central city to be the pre-eminent business, social and cultural heart of the City. The master plans are also consistent with District Plan objectives for improving the amenity, design and layout of suburban centres and enabling suburban centres to meet people's needs for goods and services.
51. The Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act requires that certain plans and documents should not be inconsistent with a Recovery Strategy and while the Act does not specifically refer to suburban centre master plans, the Draft Master Plan is consistent with the Recovery Strategy and adopted or draft Recovery Plans. In particular, the development of the Metro Sports Facility as an anchor project in the Central City is supported by the recommendations of this report in that any attractions in New Brighton will not be working in direct competition to a Waterpark or extra-large Eastern Recreation and Sports centre.
52. The Aquatic Facilities Plan 2006 and its 2012 Desktop Review does contemplate additional aquatic facilities being provided in the City, including potential investigation of an outdoor pool in the Central/North New Brighton area in partnership with the school and community organisations. While none of the additional elements identified in the various Options evaluated in this report have been specifically contemplated in the aquatic strategy work, including the March 2012 'Spaces and Places Plan for Sport and Recreation in Greater Christchurch', some Options are more consistent with aquatic strategies than others. In particular, the Waterpark and other options that would directly compete with the Metro Sports Facility would be inconsistent with strategic directions, whereas the salt water pool proposal would not be inconsistent.
53. The Council's Activity Management Plan is clear that the main reason to be in the business of aquatic facilities is to maximise participation in physical activity.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

54. Yes, as above.

**COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013****Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013****4 Cont'd****CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

55. In relation to the proposed consolidation of the New Brighton commercial zoning, this was widely consulted on following release of the Draft New Brighton Centre Master Plan. Although many land owners and business owners within the master plan area chose not to submit, either in support or against the proposal, a further opportunity for submissions will be provided once a draft, reviewed District Plan is released for comment.
56. In relation to aquatic facilities in New Brighton, the Waterpark proposal was publicly released at the same time as the Community Board was asked to endorse the Draft Master Plan. Although the Waterpark proposal did not form part of the Draft Master Plan, many submissions were received in support of either the Waterpark proposal or more generally for a replacement of QEII to enable access to swimming facilities for local residents. The separate Council process for determining a location somewhere in the East for an ER&S Facility is yet to engage in public consultation processes but will provide for public comment from residents across the whole of the East of the City.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Supports in principle the development of a variety of appropriately-sized privately funded attractions and public place-based initiatives in New Brighton, where these assist revitalisation of the commercial core, are economically feasible and do not replicate or compete with the functions of other Council facilities.
- (b) Continue to work with key stakeholders to develop a preferred model of small scale public and private aquatic initiatives (e.g. such as salt water pools, splash pad) that support/match the revitalisation of New Brighton as a functioning but unique neighbourhood centre, together with improvements to the public realm (streetscape), the private realm (landowner and business investment) and funding options.
- (c) Directs staff to consider, as part of the Draft New Brighton Centre Master Plan, a full redevelopment of Brighton Mall. This should support continued use of the space for community markets while reinforcing a river-to-sea theme and providing an attractive and lively space within the centre,
- (d) Locates the proposed Eastern Recreation and Sports Facility wherever it best meets the needs of the communities of the East and in accordance with Council criteria.
- (e) Does not apply Council funds to developing a Waterpark in New Brighton but leaves open this option for private investors to pursue if they wish.
- (f) Directs staff to consider the options for consolidation of commercial zones in New Brighton as part of Stage 2 of the District Plan Review, in accordance with the proposals of the Draft New Brighton Master Plan.
- (g) Agree to consider additional funds to support revitalisation of New Brighton through the next Long Term Plan, subject to significant effort being demonstrated by the relevant business and landowners of the commercial centre in rejuvenating the centre and improving the amenity of private property.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That the Council defer the discussion on this report and that this matter be presented to the incoming council for its consideration.

Councillor Wells abstained from voting on this item.

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

## BACKGROUND

## The Issues

57. The issues that should be addressed by any chosen aquatic development option are:

*New Brighton centre issues*

- (a) The poor economic performance of New Brighton Centre and its associated lack of reinvestment in private property. This has lowered the amenity and function of the centre and resulted in approximately 90% of the catchment's retail dollars being spent elsewhere;
- (b) Population loss has further reduced the immediate catchment of the commercial centre;
- (c) Uncertainty in the community regarding the long term potential function of New Brighton commercial centre and whether there is potential for it to return to its former 'Saturday shopping' size and scale of activity;

*Aquatic facility issues*

- (d) The loss of aquatic facilities to the communities in the East (this is principally covered by a separate report, but relevant to the discussion);
- (e) The potential for aquatic facilities of similar scale and nature to directly compete and so split the customer base, thereby reducing the potential viability of each facility;
- (f) Previous large-scale attractions and facilities (library, pier) in New Brighton have not achieved revitalisation of the commercial centre.

## Centre role and function

58. The advice from SGS is that New Brighton's future lies in a scaled back, community-focussed retail role, coupled with a regional tourism-oriented function. In terms of the City Council's proposed retail hierarchy, the centre would therefore be a 'neighbourhood centre' that could aim for an additional niche role as a seaside centre that attracts visitors from a larger, thinly spread catchment. Other neighbourhood centres that currently function this way are Akaroa, Sumner, Lyttelton and Merivale. The size of these centres is contained to a neighbourhood function, but their economic viability reflects their larger catchments.
59. SGS comments that the community-focussed role reflects the centre's constrained catchment and the development of a strong district retailing network elsewhere in the City over the past twenty years. SGS considers it impractical to aim to return the centre to its former role as a regional shopping destination. However, as a seaside destination it could, with care and insight, expand its role and trading base.
60. SGS has further noted that:
- "The key intervention required in New Brighton is to reposition its 'brand' as a seaside village offering an array of entertainment, hospitality and retail leisure opportunities to complement its local service functions. This is likely to involve a number of distributed investments in New Brighton to:
- Improve the compactness and appeal of its retail core
  - Introduce some new leisure attractions including but not limited to small scale aqua play facilities, fair grounds and enhanced promenades
  - Improve the perceived safety of the centre's public domain through better street lighting , passive surveillance and the like

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

- Foster the development of an 'eat street or precinct' with strong pedestrian or visual connections to the sea.

To support these investments, a fresh marketing campaign for New Brighton is required. This should include a 'place making' program aimed at enlivening the centre during weekends and evenings in particular."

***Draft Master Plan***

61. This finding relates to the proposal in the Draft Master Plan to change the current zoning pattern in New Brighton. The Draft Master Plan proposes, as a 'big picture' concept in the Vision (page 29) to consolidate the centre through rezoning of land. This is supported by a further concept (page 30) to establish precincts, including a residential precinct.
62. The economic analysis undertaken in 2012 indicates that the centre is too large at 11 hectares, whereas an area of between three and four hectares is considered to be sustainable for the centre to operate successfully. The Draft Master Plan proposes to consolidate the centre toward the sea front and to rezone commercial land to the west of the centre (predominantly zoned Business 1 at present). The Draft Master Plan indicates that this zoning would principally be for higher density residential activity, potentially including travellers accommodation. Existing business owners in the rezoned area would retain current development rights until such time as they wished to change the scale, nature or intensity of their activity.
63. A benefit of rezoning and uptake for residential and/or travellers accommodation is that it would support the function of the commercial centre and help limit the impact of the loss of housing from the red zone. The master plan identifies that further studies are needed to identify the exact land use and extent of rezoning. To incorporate the rezoning as part of Stage 1 of the District Plan Review would require such additional studies to be high level.

***Submission summary***

64. **Attachment 6** comprises extracts from the Summary of Submissions report on the Draft Master Plan. These extracts deal specifically with the consolidation of the centre and uptake for residential purposes.
65. In relation to the 'Big Picture' themes:
  - (a) 90 per cent of respondents agree with the proposal to consolidate the centre and 8 per cent are ambivalent. Only 2 per cent disagree.
  - (b) 89 per cent of respondents agree with the proposal to define retail, entertainment and residential precincts, 8 per cent are ambivalent and 3 per cent disagree.
  - (c) The key area of disquiet is that if more people are attracted to New Brighton then the consolidation may be unwarranted.
  - (d) There is also a call for more of a mixed use rather than purely residential area; in this regard the Draft Master Plan notes that the retail/commerce precinct could contain mixed use retail and commercial activity with residential use above ground floor to help create a vibrant and safe environment (page 31).
66. In relation to the Draft Master Plan Actions, Action B5 indicates new residential development occurring on the land rezoned from commercial to residential.
  - (a) 79 per cent of respondents agree with this proposal and 15 per cent are ambivalent. 5 per cent disagree.
  - (b) The key areas of concern are similar to those noted above: that this might be at the expense of people living above commercial premises and that the housing might be low cost, 'slum' housing.

**COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013****Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013****4 Cont'd**

- (c) The Draft Master Plan notes that a higher density of housing might be anticipated and would help ensure that the area offers a range of accommodation to people who want to live close to the centre. The Draft Plan also notes that the current backpackers located within the centre is very well patronised but that there may be demand for additional travellers' accommodation.
67. A further recommendation of this report relates to a redevelopment of Brighton Mall. Action A2 of the Draft Master Plan proposes a continuation of the road through the pedestrian mall. The western part of Brighton Mall was upgraded with the implementation of a slow road in 2006. This brought new life to this area of the mall and has made it the most active area of the mall. The proposal involves extending the one-way road through the pedestrian mall and continuing the streetscape works with new surfacing, planting and seating to help bring new life to the area. This was considered appropriate to transform the area into a vibrant, functional space. The Draft Master Plan provides imagery of this concept.
68. Submissions to the Draft Master Plan were not overly supportive of this concept. Only 40 per cent of respondents agreed with this concept; 15 per cent were ambivalent and 46 per cent disagreed. Essentially, respondents preferred to retain pedestrian-focussed space, particularly as a location for the community market.
69. The recommendations of this report are to undertake further work on the consolidation of the centre, for potential incorporation within Stage 2 of the District Plan Review, and to consider a full redevelopment of the Mall as a lively pedestrian space.

**Aquatic facility network**

70. Although a separate report from the council's Recreation and Sports Unit is being presented on the ER&S Facility project, the two processes are closely linked. The recommendation of this report enables the ER&S Facility project to consider the needs of the wider East and not New Brighton alone, while still enabling additional funding to be applied to assist New Brighton's rejuvenation.
71. The Metro Sports Facility has been identified in the Central City Plan as a key anchor project to support revitalisation of the Central City. Funding has been agreed by CCC and CERA and work is underway. It will be important that any aquatic leisure facilities established elsewhere in the city support an integrated network and distribution that reflects customer catchments and does not result in direct competition between similar facilities. The current anticipated leisure attractions at the Metro Sports Facility incorporate a mix of leisure pools and features, for example:
- Themed spa pools
  - Rapid river, wave or themed pool
  - Sauna, steam and therapy rooms/pools
  - 'Terrifying slides' and a major aquatic themed attraction integrated into the facility design
  - Children's interactive aquaplay
72. Ideally, the network of aquatic facilities across the City would enable primacy for the Metro Sports Facility, and a supporting role for other council facilities with good access from residential catchments. Aquatic attractions beyond the Council network would preferably not duplicate the functions of these facilities.

**THE OBJECTIVES**

73. The principal objectives to be achieved by any chosen aquatic development option are:
- (a) Revitalisation of New Brighton Centre through optimising economic spillover effects;

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

- (b) Aquatic facility provision for residents across the whole of the East, including those in New Brighton;
  - (c) A network of aquatic facilities that do not directly compete for the same customer base;
  - (d) Facilities in New Brighton that reflect and support its longer term function as a community-focussed commercial centre with some seaside tourism functions;
  - (e) Affordability (for example: through use of land currently owned by Council; through staging; and/or through sharing of risk and responsibility);
  - (f) Practicality of delivery.
74. Following a decision on the nature and scale of any facility in New Brighton, further work will be necessary to determine an appropriate location. For example, the chosen facility or facilities, if any, should be a good fit with urban form and design, including consideration of effects on any residential neighbours, the coastal environment, and the road network. There may also be opportunities to provide good energy efficiency. Full economic feasibility assessments will also be required.

## THE OPTIONS

## Key Aquatic Development Options

75. The paragraphs below set out the principal features of each of the aquatic development options and a brief summary of key findings from the assessment table below. A table has been included with each option for ease of comparison. This table references certain elements of key objectives in the left column and shows the degree to which these are met. The longer the shaded band in the table, the greater the degree of consistency with the objectives.

**Option 1: No Waterpark, ER&S Facility located elsewhere in the East**

76. This option involves no Waterpark or other aquatic facility in New Brighton and a full sized Eastern Recreation and Sports Facility (ER&S Facility) located elsewhere in the East.
77. Although the location of the ER&S Facility is subject to a separate report from the Recreation and Sports Centre, there are significant overlaps with this report. The decision may be to locate the ER&S Facility in New Brighton, which is addressed in Option 4 below. Therefore, this option considers only the potential for the ER&S Facility to be located elsewhere.
78. In this scenario, the benefits for New Brighton are principally around the provision within the East of a significant community/district facility. This will, in part, replace the facilities previously available at QEII. An ER&S Facility wholly located elsewhere in the East has only been considered in passing by the consultants as this wouldn't generate revitalisation within New Brighton.

Option 1	-ve	→	+ve
Revitalisation	Low	0	High
Visits New Brighton (000)	Low		High
Visits total (000)	Low	780-900	High
Network	Gaps/Competes		Complements
Centre function	Inconsistent		Consistent
Cost	High additional		\$37M Low additional
Land area New Brighton (sqm)	High	0	Low
Land area total (sqm)	High	20-22000	Low

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

**Option 2: Waterpark combined with ER&S Facility, in New Brighton**

79. The Waterpark option, as initially proposed by David East and Tim Sintes, has been further refined through work undertaken by Alan Direen. Refer Attachment 3 for extracts from the current proposal. The proposal states that this facility is “not intended to be an aquatic centre with just a few water toys on the side. This is a waterpark with elements of aquatic centre attached”.
80. Key elements referred to in the brief and those provided at a Council Recreation and Sport Facility are:
- 25m x 25m laned pool
  - 1x learn to swim pool (25 metre x 12.5 metre) and 1x rise and fall floor pool of the same size.
  - Fitness gymnasium
  - Foyer/reception
  - Café
  - Change rooms
81. These elements are proposed to be housed in a ‘Sprung Instant Structure’. The proposal mentions a ‘fitness gym’. The size and nature of this is unclear. A full ER&S Facility would provide both a fitness centre (group exercise studio) and indoor sport (for example, several basketball courts). For this reason, the costs and land areas given below should take into account that these other ‘dry’ elements may be additional.
82. Additional ‘waterpark’ elements proposed for the facility are:
- Double Flowrider static wave (part of a third party provision joint venture)
  - Superbowl variant
  - Rattler
  - Boomerango
  - River
  - Lagoon
  - Beach
  - Aquaplay 1750TB
  - Outdoor spas
  - A lightweight structure to enclose most facilities from the elements,
  - A footprint of between 11,000 and 12,000 square metres excluding car parking, plant rooms and service areas.
83. These elements are proposed to be housed in a retractable roof ‘OpenAire’ structure.
84. The proposal states that the size of Waterpark has yet to be determined and that land costs and geotechnical surveys have not been included. However, landscaping is identified within the proponents’ capex budget. The indicative costs established by Alan Direen are a total of \$34.7 million capex. The proponents anticipate a \$10 charge to use the Waterpark and a \$5 charge to use conventional pools. Possible operational budget figures are also given in the proposal.
85. These costs have been evaluated by SGL. Excluding costs associated with land purchase and geotechnical surveys, which would be additional, various components of the proposed costings were considered to be substantially understated. These include site preparation, car parking, infrastructure servicing, plant rooms and services, project management, design and fittings. Factoring in these costs, the conclusion is that this Option will likely cost approximately \$47 to \$50 million, excluding other costs identified above. This is substantially more than the \$34.7 million indicated in the proposal.

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

86. The catchment analysis for a new aquatic leisure facility in the NorthEast indicates that around 80,000 people presently live in the primary catchment area. Naturally, locating the facility on the coast will not centre it within the catchment. Based on data for average visits, SGL expects to see a visitation rate of between 530,000 and 650,000 annual visits. Adding in significant water features would increase this to between 640,000 and 850,000 visits. The proposal indicates 900,000 visits a year which SGL says is extremely unlikely for the facilities and area of development proposed. This level of activity would place the Waterpark as greater than the 6th busiest waterpark in the USA. The proposal indicates an expected \$7.4 million in annual operating revenue. Consultants have revised this downward to between \$3.9 - \$5.4 million. Similarly, operating expenditure was considered to be significantly understated.
87. SGL considers that the Waterpark concept would not be supported in the commercial investment world. The firm also considers that a major waterpark would compete directly against the Metro Sports Facility. While not directly addressed by their report given the population data used, there is also likely to be a gap in level of service provision for some areas of the East if all aquatic facilities are concentrated at New Brighton.
88. The likely land area needed, including car parking and landscaping, is assessed by SGL as being in the vicinity of 25,000 – 30,000 sqm. This land area cannot be provided within the New Brighton centre. The original Waterpark proposal was for a smaller piece of land within the commercial centre and included part of Marine Parade and the foreshore. Land parcels near New Brighton centre that are large enough to accommodate the facility are at Rawhiti Domain and the Council-owned land at Owles Terrace. The Central Brighton School site would not be sufficiently large to accommodate the facility.
89. The likely ability for the proposal to revitalise New Brighton has been assessed by SGS who consider, based on a number of assumptions, that there is some potential for spinoff private investment in the centre. However, this is limited in that the facility will funnel visitors into a single attraction rather than spreading them through the centre. Spillover effects of up to 11 per cent of existing total retail turnover in the catchment are identified but these are not as large as the 'Village in a Waterpark' idea (Option 5). If the Council does decide to pursue a waterpark, SGS recommends that the ER&S Facility be provided within the Waterpark too.

Option 2	-ve	→	+ve
Revitalisation	Low	\$10.9-17M	High
Visits New Brighton (000)	Low	800 – 1.19M	High
Visits total (000)	Low	800 – 1.19M	High
Network	Gaps/Competes		Complements
Centre function	Inconsistent		Consistent
Cost	High additional	+\$10-13M	Low additional
Land area New Brighton (sqm)	High	25-30000	Low
Land area total (sqm)	High	25-30000	Low

**Option 3: Waterpark only in New Brighton, and ER&S Facility located elsewhere**

90. This option is a subset of the one above. Although the original Waterpark proposal as first released in 2012 is a close fit with this option, the current Waterpark proposal also incorporates elements of an Eastern Recreation and Sport Facility. Therefore, the evaluation has considered this option as a subset of Option 2 (waterpark elements only), with the ER&S Facility being provided elsewhere in the East and not in New Brighton.
91. Using the 'waterpark elements' from Option 2, the costs for the attractions and OpenAire cover would be approximately \$22 million. This figure does not include land purchase, geotechnical costs, infrastructure and other elements identified by SGL. There is already a budget of \$30.5 million to provide an ER&S Facility so the total figure for provision of both facilities would likely be approximately \$53 - \$56 million, excluding these other costs.



## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

92. This option has the potential to attract additional visitors to Christchurch, but will undermine visitation to, and viability of, the Metro Sports Facility and the ER&S Facility. This option would split catchments and visitations and there would be increased management and governance costs if Council operates both facilities. SGL considers that combined regional population and tourism visitation numbers are not expected to be sufficient enough to attract a developer to invest in a standalone waterpark facility.
93. SGS identifies that potential for spinoff private funding is relatively low and spillover effects in New Brighton would be modest. As for Option 2, this is because the facility funnels visitors into a single facility rather than distributing them throughout the centre.
94. The land area required would be approximately 10,000 to 15,000 sqm for an ER&S Facility and approximately 20,000 – 25,000sqm for a waterpark. This option therefore requires a large land area overall in the East. The school site is approximately 18,000 sqm so would not be sufficient to locate the waterpark element in New Brighton.

Option 3	-ve	→	+ve
Revitalisation	Low	\$6.3-9M	High
Visits New Brighton (000)	Low	410-550	High
Visits total (000)	Low	870 – 1.05M	High
Network	Gaps/Competes		Complements
Centre function	Inconsistent		Consistent
Cost	High additional	+\$16-\$19M	Low additional
Land area New Brighton (sqm)	High	20-25000	Low
Land area total (sqm)	High	36-41000	Low

**Option 4: Council ER&S Facility only, in New Brighton**

95. This option comprises an ER&S Facility only (no Waterpark) located in New Brighton. An ER&S Facility is likely to include:
- 25m lap pool
  - 33m lap pool
  - Learn to Swim pool
  - Leisure: Spa, aqua play, hydro slide/s
  - Fitness centre – group exercise studio
  - Indoor sport (3 basketball courts).
96. The additional \$6.5 million of Earthquake Appeal Funds for water attractions at this facility elevates its function and potential catchment considerably. A 'standard' ER&S Facility would attract between 400,000 to 500,000 visits. SGL notes that the addition of \$6.5 million for waterslide and water play facilities will be a significant attractor and should keep user visits up to the 900,000+ level. Further, this level of expenditure will see the ER&S Centre being allocated the highest leisure and water play budget features of any Council operated facility across New Zealand and Australia. Officers note that the impact of planned additional facilities elsewhere may not result in such a high level of visitor numbers at this facility and that some of this funding will be taken up in buildings and other structures to support the water attractions.
97. With the additional 'dry' elements added to the Waterpark proposal (Option 2), the enlarged ER&S Facility will likely operate at a similar level to the Waterpark and the Metro Sports Facility. SGL describes the facility as 'complementing' the Metro Sports Facility, although this is considered by officers to be less complementary than some other options.

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

98. There are potential accessibility issues for parts of the wider eastern residential catchment intended to be serviced by the ER&S Facility. A separate report addresses this aspect; New Brighton may not be the best location and other locations are not closely considered through this report.
99. SGS identifies that the potential for spinoff funding is limited. However, from the perspective of practicality of delivery, SGS considers this option may be the most superior amongst all.

Option 4	-ve	→	+ve
Revitalisation	Low	\$5.6-9M	High
Visits New Brighton (000)	Low	780-900	High
Visits total (000)	Low	780-900	High
Network	Gaps/Competes		Complements
Centre function	Inconsistent		Consistent
Cost	High additional	\$37M	Low additional
Land area New Brighton (sqm)	High	20000	Low
Land area total (sqm)	High	20000	Low

**Option 5: Full 'Village in a Waterpark'**

100. The New Brighton Business and Landowners Association has, with funding from Eastern Vision, engaged consultants Sam Martin (Align) and Jason Mill (Pivnice) to prepare an 'alternative master plan' for the wider suburb around New Brighton centre. These consultants have independently proposed an alternative to the Waterpark. The concept is 'Village in a Waterpark' which envisages a number of smaller scale aquatic facilities distributed around the edge of the centre and complementing the existing sea and river attractions. The concept is summarised in **Attachment 4** and includes ideas of:
- Boardwalks / coastal promenade
  - Outdoor pools – specifically a salt water hot pool
  - Mixed use buildings and beach front interaction
  - Shopping and markets
  - Focus on the beach and river attractions including surge mats
  - Use of land at Owles Terrace for an attraction by the river – potentially an artificial whitewater course or 'river rides' (this appears from the imagery to be a small water park).
101. This option appears to reference seaside tourist towns overseas, such as St Kilda and Glenelg, which are relatively large, tourist-oriented centres. The concept doesn't presently appear to accommodate the ER&S Facility. There is no overall costing provided for the full 'Village' option and full development would require public and private investment in a range of upgrades throughout the centre.
102. Most elements listed above are at 'initial concept' stage but further work has been progressed on a proposed market located on vacant land between Brighton Mall and Beresford Street, and in developing drawings and initial costings for relocatable salt water hot pools on the foreshore. The salt water pool concept has been informed by Tony Joseph (Joseph & Associates Ltd), who developed the hot pools at Franz Joseph.

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

103. In relation to specific attractions, it is assumed that the 'river rides' fun park would have similar costings to those indicated above for a Waterpark. The idea of an artificial whitewater course has resulted from discussions by the proponents of the proposal with various clubs and stakeholders. A web search indicates that the whitewater stadium at Penrith cost a total of \$AU 6 million, of which \$1.5 million was contributed by Penrith City Council. The Cardington Artificial Slalom Course in the UK has a dual role as both a flood control structure and a whitewater course; it was funded by a consortium that included the local council. No costings have been provided for either of these concepts. The idea of a whitewater course is not listed as a priority in the document 'Spaces and Places Plan for Sport and Recreation in Greater Christchurch (March 2012)'. Proponents of Option 5 have discussed the concept with key stakeholders and apparently achieved support; it may also add value from a revitalisation perspective.
104. The proposed salt water hot pools would be located on the foreshore adjacent to the surf club and using a small portion of the current Council car park. The concept is that the three pools would be 'nested' into the dunes and provide a good visual outlook and new experience for residents and visitors. This is intended to be a flexible and potentially relocatable development that can be constructed soon and, if necessary, moved elsewhere in the future. The pools are modular, assembled offsite. This provides flexibility for staging and reduces investment risk. If there is agreement in principle to leasing a portion of the CCC car park for developing these pools, the proponents would seek investment to commence a high level feasibility study. Bather capacity at these pools is proposed to be 75 – 100 people so the concept is a relatively small development that could be expanded upon in future if desired.
105. The cost of the feasibility study for the salt water hot pools is estimated at \$62,960. An isolated leisure pool development would cost approximately \$3,829,048 but if some facilities were shared as part of a redeveloped surf club – including a possible new 25 metre pool at this complex, this would lower the cost to approximately \$2,990,672. These costs do not include the café shown in Attachment 1 and indeed a café might be counter-productive to revitalising the commercial centre. The proponents consider that the pools could either be a Council developed and managed enterprise or a privately run facility. The surf club redevelopment is, at this stage, simply seen by the proponents as an opportunity that may provide some synergies but is not critical to the success of the hot pools.
106. One of the concepts shown under the full Village option is a 'river rides' funpark concept, which officers consider could have the same range of issues as those identified for the Waterpark above (refer Option 2).
107. SGS has suggested the non-aquatic features of the Village in a Waterpark proposal might also comprise elements such as a surfing museum (to reflect the point of difference as NZ's first beach to have a surf club), an 'eat street', boardwalk, and potentially a sideshow alley or even 'Luna Park' – however these suggestions are additional to those identified by the proponents of the Village Option.
108. SGL has not evaluated this Option given it has been presented as very high level concept drawings. However, the firm notes that splitting development funds and facilities goes against current industry trends of clustering and connecting community aquatic and leisure facilities to improve use and viability. The salt water hot pool element has been carried forward to SGL's own recommendation (Option 9), to form part of a larger, coastal ER&S Facility.
109. SGS has provided broad visitation numbers and spend, based on proxy figures and assumptions from other similar centres and activities. The costs and land area for cultivating New Brighton as a seaside Village, with a variety of attractions spread around the centre, will depend upon the range and nature of attractions. This firm concludes that Option 5 has the maximum potential to turn New Brighton's fortune and presents the best potential to leverage additional private sector funding. This is particularly the case because tourists would be distributed in the centre rather than funnelled into a particular attraction, thereby promoting exposure to a wide variety of retail and services in the centre. SGS also considers that this option meets the vision of the New Brighton community to the utmost. However, they note that the option is very optimistic and not practical to deliver in the short term given the low quality retail environment currently on offer and the need for high levels of stakeholder buy-in.

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

Option 5	-ve	→	+ve
Revitalisation	Low		\$15-\$25M High
Visits New Brighton (000)	Low		1.29M High
Visits total (000)	Low		1.29M High
Network	Gaps/Competes		Complements
Centre function	Inconsistent		Consistent
Cost	High additional		Low additional
Land area New Brighton (sqm)	High		Low
Land area total (sqm)	High		Low

**Option 6: Boutique salt water hot pool in New Brighton, to complement an ER&S Facility elsewhere**

110. This option assumes that the ER&S Facility will not be located in New Brighton and that aquatic elements within New Brighton are limited to a boutique salt water pool, as described above. The relevant details for this option are covered by Options 1 and 5 above. SGL has estimated the capital cost of this facility at between \$4.5 and \$5 million, including site development and car parking areas and has recommended that a day spa and wellness centre would add improved commercial returns.
111. This facility alone does little to fulfil the revitalisation objectives given its relatively small visitor numbers and the fact that it concentrates attractions along the foreshore (when combined with the library and pier). However, it may be a good starting point for a smaller scale 'Village' option, as discussed further below under Option 8. In general, given the limited capacity for users of this facility, it is recommended that the salt water hot pools be considered as part of a wider revitalisation initiative rather than a standalone solution for New Brighton.

Option 6	-ve	→	+ve
Revitalisation	Low	\$1M	High
Visits New Brighton (000)	Low	180-200	High
Visits total (000)	Low	960-1.1M	High
Network	Gaps/Competes		Complements
Centre function	Inconsistent		Consistent
Cost	High additional	+\$4.5M	Low additional
Land area New Brighton (sqm)	High	3-4000	Low
Land area total (sqm)	High	23-2600	Low

**Option 7: All aquatic entertainment elements in New Brighton, and a reduced scale/fitness oriented ER&S Facility elsewhere**

112. This option is a combination of Option 3 (Waterpark only) and Option 6 (salt water pool only), with the difference being that the ER&S Facility elsewhere in the East would provide only 'dry' elements.

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

113. The drawbacks of this option are similar to those identified in Option 3, in that the aquatic entertainment may undermine visitation to, and viability of, the Metro Sports Facility. If the Council operates both facilities, there will be associated increases in operational costs. The land area for the 'dry' ER&S Facility would be approximately 13,500 metres squared and development of the facility would be approximately \$17 million. For the aquatic elements in New Brighton, a development area of 19 - 20,000 metres squared would be needed. The waterpark element would cost \$22-25 million and the salt water pools \$4.5 million. This would result in a total of 33,500 metres squared of land area and \$44 - 48 million. As for Option 3, potential for spillover effects is modest and visitor numbers are not expected to be sufficient to attract commercial investment.

Option 7	-ve	→	+ve
Revitalisation	Low	\$8-12M	High
Visits New Brighton (000)	Low	590-750	High
Visits total (000)	Low	870-1.05M	High
Network	Gaps/Competes		Complements
Centre function	Inconsistent		Consistent
Cost	High additional	+\$7-11M	Low additional
Land area New Brighton (sqm)	High	19-20000	Low
Land area total (sqm)	High	33500	Low

**Option 8: Scaled down 'Village' option – as assessed by consultants**

114. This option reflects upon the benefits and drawbacks of the above options and proposes a refinement to the one promoted as Option 5. The option as originally assessed by consultants involves splitting a portion of the \$6.5 million funding from the Earthquake Appeal Trust (for aquatic leisure facilities at the ER&S Facility), to part-fund a number of smaller scale aquatic attractions within or adjoining the new Brighton commercial core (refer Attachment 5). The Christchurch Earthquake Appeal Trust has now confirmed that it is very unlikely that the \$6.5 million can be used in this way. The wording of the fund is "\$6.5 million for Water Attractions like water slides and rides at the new Christchurch City Council Recreation and Sports Centre in the north eastern suburbs. This contribution includes \$3.1 million generously donated by an anonymous donor. Trustees hope that the Appeal Trust funding can make the aquatic facility great fun with a lot more to offer people and by providing confirmation at this early stage Council can include water attractions in the overall design...". However, the results of evaluating this option have been included in this report to draw attention to the overall benefits achieved. There may be alternative funding mechanisms for any public attractions that are considered to be feasible following further work, such as use of the \$50 million fund for 'Betterment of facilities and transformational opportunities' to achieve the same purposes.
115. This option entails siting the ER&S Facility wherever it best meets the needs of the wider residential catchment across the East.
116. The delivery, over time of a range of unique / boutique attractions in New Brighton would provide a catalyst for additional footfall through the commercial centre if attractions are well-located and have a point of difference. Examples might include:
- further investigation into hot salt water pools, in terms of potential location, scale, configuration, and options for funding and management.
  - a unique and bold splash pad in the pedestrian mall area as part of a wider Mall redevelopment, to encourage use of the area during the week when the community market isn't running. This would ideally have a point of difference from other splash pads – for example, lit at night, or using play elements to reinforce a link between the sea and river; and

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

- (c) supporting riverside attractions. An example put forward by one party is that of a whitewater course adjacent to the river, at a standard suitable for national and international events.

There may be a variety of other examples that might be proposed, evaluated and supported over time.

117. To ensure that business and land owners share responsibility for New Brighton's revitalisation, the amenity and investment in the commercial centre would be monitored and, if there is substantial effort and improvement in the private realm then specific and targeted funding could be considered as part of the next LTP.
118. Other than potentially developing and maintaining an aquatic play area as part of a redeveloped Brighton Mall, and investigating salt water pool options, other developments would principally be privately-led initiatives.
119. As for several other development options, SGL has pointed out that from an economic feasibility perspective – concentrating on construction, maintenance and operation - the most optimal approach is to build a single facility rather than to split provision across multiple sites. However, when considering the degree to which a development option meets the relevant objectives, this option appears, on balance to be the best fit. It would enable a variety of aquatic attractions to establish in New Brighton and support people-movement around the centre. The attractions can be staged over time and further development could be contingent upon equal effort being applied within the private realm. Economic spillover would also increase over time and move from those expected in Option 3 (\$6.3 - \$9 million) to a point that it more closely emulates Option 5 (\$15 - \$25 million).
120. SGS has commented that this option appears a better alternative to the more ambitious full-scale Village option, as investments in facilities will be staged, allowing sufficient lead time for Council to implement an interventionist strategy if need be and garner community support to partner in the delivery of this option. Importantly, this option will not compromise visitation to the planned Metro Sports Facility. The firm recommends pursuing the revitalisation of New Brighton through staging the "Village in a Waterpark concept, focusing on leveraging the centre's seaside location through a variety of attractions as distinct from a single 'blockbuster' attraction".
121. The graph below represents the option as evaluated by the two consultants, which involved an initial investment of \$4.5 - \$5 million from the Christchurch Earthquake Appeal Trust Fund, which they have since advised is not likely.

Option 8		-ve	→	+ve
Revitalisation	Low		\$6.3M	\$25M
Visits New Brighton (000)	Low			High
Visits total (000)	Low			High
Network	Gaps/Competes			Complements
Centre function	Inconsistent			Consistent
Cost	High additional		\$4.5 – 5M	Low additional
Land area New Brighton (sqm)	High			Low
Land area total (sqm)	High			Low

## Option 9: ER&amp;S 'plus'

122. SGL has also proposed a further option. This entails a full sized ER&S Facility with significant leisure features, expanded further to include a day spa and salt water pools on a coastal location. The key driver is understood to be the economic efficiencies gained by co-locating facilities. This Option entails a combination of the \$37 million available for the ER&S Facility, plus the \$4.5 million for salt water pools as noted above, plus \$3.5 million for development of a

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

## 4 Cont'd

day spa / wellness centre. As with the other options above, any land purchase, infrastructure and geotechnical costs are additional.

123. Due to the boutique element of the facility, and its potential to provide a marketing opportunity to link with Hanmer Springs packages, SGL considers it has potential to attract annual visitations of 970,000 to 1.1 million each year. SGL considers such a development would provide many of the outcomes proposed by the waterpark project and would help theme the commercial centre. The consultant report is neutral on the location of this facility across the East, but notes that a coastal location would be necessary for the salt water hot pool component. A key point in this regard is that the visitation figures for the ER&S Facility as provided by SGL remain constant regardless of the facility's location in the East. Refer to the report from the Recreation and Sports Unit for more detail on this matter.
124. SGS has evaluated a moderate potential spillover spend of \$7-8 million annually. A footprint of 22,000 – 23,000sqm would be required for this facility, which is not able to be provided in the commercial centre. A further drawback, as with other options proposing an ER&S Facility on the coast, is the 'gap' in aquatic provision for some existing and planned residential areas elsewhere in the East.

Option 9	-ve	→	+ve
Revitalisation	Low	\$7-8M	High
Visits New Brighton (000)	Low	970-1.1M	High
Visits total (000)	Low	970-1.1M	High
Network	Gaps/Competes		Complements
Centre function	Inconsistent		Consistent
Cost	High additional	+\$8M	Low additional
Land area New Brighton (sqm)	High	22-23000	Low
Land area total (sqm)	High	22-23000	Low

## ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

125. Table 1 on the following pages is informed by the two consultant reports (refer Attachments 1 and 2). The options are evaluated in light of the objectives (paragraph 65).

## THE PREFERRED OPTION

126. Each option has associated benefits and drawbacks. The information above has not weighted these. However, assuming the key objectives are to revitalise New Brighton at the lowest possible cost, and in light of the wider aquatic network, the intent underlying Option 8 is preferred. This promotes a smaller scale and staged 'Waterpark in a Village' option, which is considered to best meet the objectives outlined above. This option also supports a consolidated retail core and the rezoning proposed in the Draft Master Plan.
127. The principle alternatives to Option 8 are those that also achieve a good degree of revitalisation, are affordable and integrate with the wider aquatic network. These are:
- (a) Option 4: Council ER&S Facility only, in New Brighton;
  - (b) Option 6: Boutique salt water pool in New Brighton, to complement an ER&S Facility elsewhere.
  - (c) Option 8: scaled down 'Village' option
  - (d) Option 9: ER&S Facility 'plus' (salt water hot pool, day spa, wellness centre)

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

Option 4	-ve → +ve			
Revitalisation	Low	\$5.6-9M		High
Network	Gaps/Competes			Complements
Cost	High additional		\$37M	Low additional

Option 6	-ve → +ve			
Revitalisation	Low	\$1M		High
Network	Gaps/Competes			Complements
Cost	High additional		+\$4.5M	Low additional

Option 8	-ve → +ve			
Revitalisation	Low	\$6.3M	\$25M	High
Network	Gaps/Competes			Complements
Cost	High additional		\$4.5-5M	Low additional

Option 9	-ve → +ve			
Revitalisation	Low	\$7-8M		High
Network	Gaps/Competes			Complements
Cost	High additional		+\$8M	Low additional

128. It will be important to consider any relevant reports from the Recreation and Sport Unit before making a decision to support either Option 4 or Option 9, given that there are wider considerations in relation to location of the Eastern Recreation and Sport Facility.





## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

Table 1: Benefits and drawbacks of each aquatic development option, relative to key objectives

BENEFITS AND DRAWBACKS RELATIVE TO KEY OBJECTIVES						
AQUATIC DEVELOPMENT OPTION	Revitalisation	Aquatic facility provision for all residents across the East	Good hierarchy/network of aquatic facilities in City	Reflects longterm commercial function of N.B.	Affordability	Practicality of delivery.
<b>Option 1:</b> No Waterpark, ER&S Facility located elsewhere in the East	+ = Zero spend per visit so not a revitalisation catalyst for New Brighton. The centre would be reliant on non-aquatic catalysts for its ongoing commercial development and revitalisation. If the non-aquatic catalysts are also not progressed, New Brighton will continue its downward trend.	+ ER&S would provide for all Eastern catchment residents. Full ER&S includes \$6.5m of leisure slides. Catchment 77,431 people. Visitations of 530,000 - 650,000/yr plus 250,000 - 350,000 with water features. Total annual visits <b>780,000 – 900,000.</b> = Doesn't reflect what New Brighton residents have been seeking: salt water pools (for many years) and, more recently a Waterpark (20,000 signatures)	+ ER&S complements the Metro Sports Facility. Provides NE with replacement facility for a range of former QEII aquatic facility users. =	+ New Brighton able to consolidate its future as a neighbourhood centre. = If revitalisation doesn't occur, the function of the centre will potentially further diminish.	+ <b>All \$37 million</b> funding provided through LTP and Earthquake Appeal funds. =	+ Aquatic elements are readily deliverable. Footprint of 6500 – 7500 sqm, total development area including landscaping and carparking of <b>20,000 – 22,000 sqm.</b> = To attract maximum users, need to locate facility off main road or high profile location preferably close to commercial area.
<b>Option 2:</b> Waterpark combined with ER&S Facility, in New Brighton	+ Aquatic facilities in themselves will enable New Brighton's revitalisation. Maximum potential spend per year in New Brighton, on and off site: <b>\$10.9 - 17 million.</b> Spillover effects of up to 11% of existing total retail turnover. Some potential for spinoff private funding and reduction of crime and vandalism. = Funnels visitors into a single facility rather than spreading them through the centre.	+ Will meet community aspirations for a Waterpark. Primary catchment population 77431 people (530,000 – 650,000 visits). Secondary catchment 268,921 people (270,000 – 540,000 visits). Regional/tourist visits 50,000. Total annual visits <b>800,000 – 1,190,000 visits.</b> = Will be less accessible for residents in the Prestons/Parklands area, for regular community swimming purposes. Doesn't provide the salt water pools that residents have been seeking for many years	+ Combines key elements at one location. Provides NE with replacement facility for a range of former QEII aquatic facility users. = A direct competitor for the leisure components planned for the new Metro Sports Facility so likely to undermine visitation to, and viability of, the Metro Sports Facility	+ = If located within the centre, will overwhelm the community function and be difficult to provide enough space. Risk of increasing expectations that New Brighton will return to its previous commercial 'heyday'.	+ High yield components will assist the financial sustainability of the centre. Management, marketing, infrastructure and services costs at one site. May be some opportunity to attract commercial investment of feature(s) eg flow rider. Sprung roof and glazing may provide energy efficiencies. = Cost of delivery estimated at <b>\$47 - \$50 million</b> (SGL) subject to final site development and acquisition costs. If provided within the centre, will have high land costs. Higher spend per user compared with other options.	+ = Would require a footprint of 11,000 – 12,000 sqm and total development area including carparking and landscaping of <b>25,000 – 30,000 sqm.</b> Likely difficult to attract a private investor.

Points to note with all options: 1. all figures are based on assumptions. 2. the location of the ER&S Centre, if in New Brighton, is not centred within its catchment.

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

<p><b>Option 3:</b> Waterpark only in New Brighton, and ER&amp;S Facility located elsewhere</p> <p>SGL assessment assumes the ER&amp;S Facility doesn't include \$6.5 million in aquatic attractions.</p>	<p>+ Maximum potential spend per year in New Brighton, on and off site: <b><u>\$6.3 - 9 million</u></b>. Modest spillover effects in New Brighton of up to 6% of existing total retail turnover in catchment.</p> <p>= Spinoff private funding and reduction of crime and vandalism relatively low. Funnels visitors into a single facility in New Brighton rather than spreading them through the centre.</p>	<p>+ Will meet community aspirations for a Waterpark. ER&amp;S would provide for all Eastern catchment residents. Waterpark primary catchment population 77431 people (232,000 visits). Secondary catchment 268,921 people (130,000 - 270,000 visits). Regional/tourist visits 50,000. Waterpark total annual visits <b><u>410,000 – 550,000 visits</u></b>. ER&amp;S Facility primary catchment population 77431 people (460,000 – 500,000 visits). Combined 2 facility visits <b><u>870,000 – 1,050,000 visits</u></b>.</p> <p>= Doesn't provide the salt water hot pools that residents have been seeking for many years</p>	<p>+ = Splits catchments and facilities. A direct competitor for the leisure components planned for the new Metro Sports Facility so likely to undermine visitation to, and viability of, the Metro Sports Facility .</p>	<p>+ = If located within the centre, may overwhelm the community function and be difficult to provide enough space. Risk of increasing expectations that New Brighton will return to its previous commercial 'heyday'.</p>	<p>+ = Cost of delivery very high at <b><u>\$53 - \$56 million</u></b> development cost, being \$22 - 25 million for the New Brighton Waterpark and \$30.5 million for the ER&amp;S Facility elsewhere (assuming ER&amp;S Facility doesn't include slides). If provided within the centre, will have high land costs. Double-up on management costs at 2 separate sites. Splitting high yield facility components will decrease visitations and level of revenue to both facilities. If \$6.5 million used at the Waterpark, the lack of 'attractor' facilities at the ER&amp;S Facility will result in Council subsidising operations. Lower spend per visit at ER&amp;S Facility.</p>	<p>+ = Waterpark would require a footprint of 6,000 – 7,000 sqm and development site of <b><u>20,000 – 25,000sqm</u></b>. ER&amp;S Facility would require a footprint of 5,000 – 6,000sqm and development area of 16,000sqm. Combined 2 facility total development area including landscaping and carparking of <b><u>36,000 – 41,000 sqm</u></b>. Combined regional population and tourism visitation numbers are not expected to be sufficient to attract a developer to invest in a stand alone waterpark facility.</p>
<p><b>Option 4:</b> Council ER&amp;S Facility only, in New Brighton</p>	<p>+ Maximum potential spend per year in New Brighton, on and off site: <b><u>\$5.6 – 9 million</u></b>. Limited spillover effects of up to 4% of existing total retail turnover in catchment. This is positive, but nowhere near as high as other options.</p> <p>= Limited potential to attract visitors from beyond the local area. Potential for spinoff private funding and reduction of crime and vandalism is very limited. Funnels visitors into a single facility rather than spreading them through the centre.</p>	<p>+ Provides a good level of service for New Brighton residents including significant leisure component. Primary catchment population 77431 people (530,000 – 650,000 visits) plus 250,000 – 350,000 with water features. Total annual visits <b><u>780,000 – 900,000</u></b>.</p> <p>= Will be less accessible for residents elsewhere in the East, for regular community swimming purposes. Residents have been seeking salt water pools for many years</p>	<p>+ ER&amp;S complements the Metro Sports Facility. =</p>	<p>+ If located near, but not within the centre, would potentially support New Brighton's continued development as a neighbourhood centre.  = If located within the centre, may overwhelm the community function and be difficult to provide enough space.</p>	<p>+ All <b><u>\$37 million</u></b> funding provided through LTP and Earthquake Appeal funds. Single management / governance model.  =</p>	<p>+ Practicable option to deliver. Would require a footprint of 6,500 – 7,500sqm and total development area including carparking and landscaping of <b><u>20,000 sqm</u></b>.  =</p>

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

<b>Option 5:</b> Full 'Village in Waterpark'	Points to note with all options: 1. all figures are based on assumptions. 2. the location of the ER&S Centre, if in New Brighton, is not centred within its catchment.  Brighton, on and off site: <b>\$15 - 25 million.</b> Maximum spillover effects (up to 17% existing total retail turnover in catchment). Has the maximum potential to turn New Brighton's fortune. This option presents the best potential to leverage additional private sector funding and positive spillover effects on other land uses, especially residential development in the centre and help in reducing crime due to improving overall urban fabric and amenity.  = very optimistic option. Investor interest may be limited given present retail offer.	800,000 and 1.19 million from primary and secondary catchment and up to 100,000 regional and tourist visits. Total: <b>up to 1.29 million visits annually.</b> If 'river rides' is built, this will address calls for a Waterpark. If 'river rides' is additional to an ER&S Facility elsewhere in the East, this will also provide for all Eastern catchment residents. Provides the salt water pools that residents have sought for many years.  = Bather capacity at salt water hot pools is relatively low.	= The inclusion of river rides may undermine visitation to, and viability of, other facilities in the aquatic network. However, insufficient details provided in concepts to enable analysis.	neighbourhood centre with significant tourist component.  =	spreading risk. Key components potentially able to use Council land, reducing overall costs.  = Several ideas are likely to be individually costly and, when combined with the non-aquatic elements of this proposal, are likely to be very expensive. In particular: the whitewater course, the 'river rides' fun park, the boardwalks and the private land redevelopments. Split development funds and facilities goes against current industry trends of clustering and connecting community aquatic and leisure facilities to improve use and viability.	the largest at Owles Terrace for possible whitewater course / river rides. Able to be staged over time. Salt water hot pools are modular and able to be moved elsewhere in future. If decided by Council, dedicated efforts can be made to turn New Brighton's prospects by investing in facilities and services, which may render this option viable.  = In the short term, this option appears impractical to deliver given the low quality retail environment currently on offer. Requires high stakeholder buy-in.
<b>Option 6:</b> Boutique salt water pool in New Brighton, to complement an ER&S Facility elsewhere  Note: could run as a Council or a private facility.	+ Maximum potential spend per year in New Brighton, on and off site: <b>up to \$1million.</b> Boutique facilities, if located on coast may attract tourist markets.  = V. limited spillover effects in New Brighton (1%). Very limited potential to turn the fortunes of New Brighton or to reduce vandalism and improve amenity of New Brighton centre. Concentrates attractions along the foreshore, rather than encouraging movement into the commercial centre. Unless located close to the shore, doesn't have potential to attract new visitors. Only limited potential to promote Christchurch as a 'prosperous' city.	+ Provides the specialist salt water pools that residents have sought for many years. Based on Mt Maunganui, <b>180,000 – 200,000</b> visits/yr. ER&S Facility elsewhere would provide for all Eastern catchment residents. Full ER&S includes \$6.5m of leisure slides.  = Bather capacity at salt water hot pools is relatively low. Doesn't provide the Waterpark sought by many residents.	+ Would not compete with proposed Metro Sports Facility or ER&S Facility.  =	+ New Brighton able to consolidate its future as a neighbourhood centre.  = If revitalisation doesn't occur, the function of the centre will potentially further diminish.	+ SGL estimated capital cost <b>\$4.5 - \$5 million</b> including site development. May return operating surplus if the right product is provided. Could take advantage of natural salt water resources, provided facility located within 0.5km of coast. Potentially able to use Council land, reducing overall costs. Development of day spa and wellness centre would add improved commercial returns.  = Facility would need to be located near salt water source (0.5km) otherwise facility would be unviable. High cost of management and reception for low usage facility.	+ Salt water hot pools are modular and able to be moved elsewhere in future. Based on drawings, footprint 1,000sqm, total development area including carparking and landscaping of <b>3,000 - 4,000sqm.</b> Public carparking already adjacent to the site. Plus land area for ER&S Facility elsewhere 16,000sqm. Total 19-20000sqm.  = Coastal location will have environmental and resource consent issues to resolve.

Points to note with all options: 1. all figures are based on assumptions. 2. the location of the ER&S Centre, if in New Brighton, is not centred within its catchment.

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

<b>Option 7:</b> All aquatic entertainment elements in New Brighton, and a reduced scale/fitness oriented ER&S Facility elsewhere	<p>+ Maximum potential spend per year in New Brighton, on and off site: <b><u>\$8-12 million</u></b>. Modest spillover effects.</p> <p>- Funnels visitors into a single facility in New Brighton rather than spreading them through the centre.</p>	<p>+ Facilities themselves will meet community aspirations. Waterpark: primary catchment population 77431 people (232,000 visits) plus secondary catchment 268,921 people (130,000 – 270,000 visits). Regional/tourist visits 50,000. Waterpark total annual visits 410,000 – 550,000 visits. Salt water pool 180,000 – 200,000 visits/yr. Total Waterpark plus saltwater pools: 590,000 – 750,000 visits. Dry ER&amp;S Facility 280,000 – 350,000 visits. Combined 2 facility visits <b><u>870,000 – 1,050,000 visits</u></b>. 'Dry elements' of ER&amp;S would provide for all Eastern catchment residents. Provides the Waterpark and salt water pools sought by New Brighton residents.</p> <p>- Will be less accessible for residents elsewhere in the East, for regular community swimming purposes.</p>	<p>+ - Waterpark element would be a direct competitor for the leisure components planned for the new Metro Sports Facility so likely to undermine visitation to, and viability of, the Metro Sports Facility .</p>	<p>+ - If located within the centre, may overwhelm the community function and be difficult to provide enough space. Risk of increasing expectations that New Brighton will return to its previous commercial 'heyday'.</p>	<p>+ - Cost of delivery are high at \$22 - 25 million for the Waterpark, \$4.5 million for salt water pools and \$17.5 million for the 'dry' ER&amp;S Facility. Total cost <b><u>\$44 - \$48 million</u></b>. Increased management costs if Council operates both facilities. If provided within the centre, will have high land costs. Combined regional population and tourism visitation numbers are not expected to be sufficient to attract a developer to invest in a stand alone waterpark facility.</p>	<p>+ - Dry ER&amp;S Facility would require footprint of approx 3,500sqm and total development area of 13,500sqm. Aquatic entertainment and salt water pools will require footprint of 9,000sqm and total development area of <b><u>19,000 – 20,000sqm</u></b>. Total development area across 2 facilities including carparks and landscaping: <b><u>33,500sqm</u></b>.</p>
<b>Option 8:</b> Scaled down 'Village' option	<p>+ The potential for revitalising New Brighton is not as high as Option 5 but provides necessary lead time for a wider strategy to be implemented. As this option matures, it should emulate maximum annual spend results expected in Option 3: <b><u>\$6.3 – 9 million</u></b> and over time will emulate Option 5. Potential to provide modest spillover effects of up to 6% of existing total retail turnover in the catchment. Good synergies between</p>	<p>+ The gathering of community support to uphold the delivery of this option over time will enable ownership amongst local residents. ER&amp;S would provide for all Eastern catchment residents. Full ER&amp;S includes \$6.5m of leisure slides. Supports provision of the salt water pools, sought by residents over many years.</p> <p>- Doesn't provide the Waterpark sought by many</p>	<p>+ Redistributing some of the \$6.5 million funds for aquatic leisure attractions beyond the ER&amp;S Facility to other aquatic attractions in New Brighton would have lessened the risk of the ER&amp;S Facility directly competing with the Metro Sports Facility.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>+ Additional niche / boutique, smaller scale aquatic facilities will support New Brighton's development as a neighbourhood centre with some additional visitor spend.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>+ At <b><u>\$4.5 - \$5 million</u></b>, this option less costly than some others. Reliance on joint funding and spreading funds across several smaller proposals also spreads the responsibility and therefore the risk to Council. Potential for staging spreads the costs over longer time frames. Could take advantage of natural salt water resources, provided facility is located within 0.5km of coast.</p>	<p>+ From the perspective of the surrounding retail offer and community need perspective, this option appears one of the most superior amongst all. Uses Council owned land, none currently in significant active use. Council would only be responsible for developing: the ER&amp;S Facility, wherever it may locate in the East; and the additional splash pad (as part of redeveloped mall area), and agreeing to lease of land. Other deliverables</p>

## COUNCIL 3. 10. 2013

## Planning Committee 4. 9. 2013

	<p>activities and location around the centre will draw visitors through the commercial core.</p> <p>= Potential for revitalisation not as high as full 'Village' option.</p>	residents.			<p>= As originally assessed, the option uses a portion of the \$6.5M CEAT funding. However other Council and private funding options would instead be required. All supplementary funding needs to be obtained from other sources. Splits facilities, increasing development, management and governance costs, therefore not recommended by SGL.</p>	<p>are the responsibility of other parties. Salt water hot pools are modular and able to be moved elsewhere in future. Salt water pool: refer option 6 for footprint and development area.</p> <p>= Risk of non-delivery of projects requiring joint funding. Large footprint / development area for whitewater course on Owles Terrace.</p>
<b>Option 9: ER&amp;S 'plus'</b>	<p>+ Maximum potential spend per year in New Brighton, on and off site: <b>\$7-8 million</b>. Spillover effects of up to 5%.</p> <p>= Funnels visitors into a single facility rather than spreading them through the centre. Potential for spinoff private funding and reduction of crime and vandalism is very limited.</p>	<p>+ Primary catchment for ER&amp;S Facility 77,431 people (530,000 – 650,000 visits). Extra water features expected to add 250,000 – 350,000 visits. Salt water pools 180,000 – 200,000 visits. Day spa/wellness visits 10,000/yr. Total annual visits <b>970,000 – 1.10 million / year</b>. Provides the salt water pools sought by residents over many years. Provides for major ER&amp;S Facility with significant leisure component, similar to the concept of the Waterpark.</p> <p>= Will be less accessible for residents elsewhere in the East, for regular community swimming purposes.</p>	<p>+ Combined facilities provide significant point of difference.</p> <p>= SGL describes the facility as complementing the Metro Sports Facility, although its size and similar functions suggest there is an element of risk of competing catchments.</p>	<p>+ = If located within the centre, will overwhelm the community function and be difficult to provide enough space. Risk of increasing expectations that New Brighton will return to its previous commercial 'heyday'.</p>	<p>+ ER&amp;S capital cost allowance \$37 million already budgetted. Hot saltwater pools \$4.5 million. Day Spa/Wellness Centre \$3.5 Million. Total cost <b>\$45 million</b>. High yield components (wellness centre and salt-water pools) will assist financial sustainability. Integrated facility supports efficient management / governance. Could take advantage of natural salt water resources, provided facility located within within 0.5km of coast.</p> <p>= Cost of delivery higher than other options. Higher spend per user compared with other options.</p>	<p>+ Large single development to deliver so one of the most superior options in terms of practicality of delivery.</p> <p>= ER&amp;S footprint 6,500 – 7,500sqm. Saltwater pools 1,200sqm. Day spa and wellness centre 1,000sqm. Total development area including carparks and landscaping <b>22,000 – 23,000 sqm</b>. Unable to be readily provided within the centre.</p>

Points to note with all options: 1. all figures are based on assumptions. 2. the location of the ER&S Centre, if in New Brighton, is not centred within its catchment.