

Sport and Recreation Facilities Benchmarking

Document Information and Acknowledgements

Document version: Draft December 2020

Authors: Deb Hurdle, Kiri Pope, Anna Lindsay

Acknowledgements

RSL would like to thank for following people and organisations for their input into developing this plan:

Project Team

Anne Blakeway

With Thanks To

Adam Ellmers, BVL

Garth Dawson, Auckland City Council

Lance Vervoort, Hamilton City Council

Simon Battrick, Queenstown Lakes District Council

Chris Garside, Dunedin City Council

Disclaimer

Information, data and general assumptions used in the compilation of this report have been obtained from sources believed to be reliable. RSL Consultancy has used this information in good faith and makes no warranties or representations, express or implied, concerning the accuracy or completeness of this information. RSL Consultancy is acting as an independent consultant. In doing so, the observations provided do not necessarily reflect the intentions of the client. Interested parties should perform their own investigations, analysis and projections on all issues prior to acting in any way in regard to this project.

Executive Summary

The intent of this report is to provide a benchmark for comparison of sport and recreation facility operations across various different Councils in New Zealand. This is to help inform Tauranga City Council (TCC) decision making regarding options for the future ownership and operation of the sport and recreation facility network in Tauranga.

This report considers data from four other Council's regarding similar sport and recreation facilities to those provided in Tauranga. Each Council provided data on the basis that it would be treated confidentially by TCC.

The types of facilities considered are:

- Aquatic facilities
- Indoor Court/stadia facilities
- Community Centres/halls

The desire to benchmark Tauranga's facilities in comparison to others in the country is understandable and can provide some general guidance. However, it is crucial to understand that there is wide variation in the different facilities provided in each Council area, meaning it is not possible to make direct comparisons at a network level. Even direct comparisons on a facility by facility basis have limitations due to the variations between facilities.

Each Council area and facility considered in this report has key differences in terms of:

- the varying potential user base and population.
- different organisational structures and operating systems.
- numbers of courts / pools, meeting rooms, ancillary services and types of programmes provided.
- different methods of data capture and analysis.

These variations mean it is not possible to undertake direct comparisons between other Council facility networks and compare these to the Tauranga sport and recreation facility network. However, it is possible to provide broad observations and some general, facility by facility, comparisons for facilities of a similar type.

The pricing approach taken by different Councils and communities has a significant influence on the overall financial position of the various facilities. For example, some areas like Auckland provide free swimming for young people under 16 years at a projected cost of some \$5m per annum, other Councils provide free toddler swimming, and some charge all users for swim access. There is also significant variation in the cost per court per hour at each different facility. This report does not consider pricing other than to identify it as having a key influence on overall financial performance.

Sport and recreation facilities of the nature considered in this report have traditionally run at a loss, this is largely why these kinds of facilities are typically provided by Councils rather than the private sector. The trend in the last 15-20 years of developing multi-use facilities such as aquatic centres and indoor court/stadia with accompanying profit generating activities such as health and fitness (gyms) and programming, for example learn to swim, has helped reduce the loss and for some facilities even allows profit generation.

Typically more modern facilities provide a greater level of service and show investment in features that were not traditionally provided. Some of these elements are more costly to develop and operate but provide greater community benefits. For example, an older style community hall may have relatively low operating costs but is less functional, suitable or comfortable for participants, and generally less well utilised than a new, modern community centre. Increasing levels of service expectation from communities and the associated provision comes at a cost. Seeking economies of scale is one of the reason more community centres are becoming integrated with other amenities such as pool, libraries and indoor courts. There also ease of use benefits for the community, with multiple needs able to be satisfied at one location.

These factors, and a myriad of other considerations influence overall facility performance.

There are a range of factors that influence Council decisions as to how they own and operate sport and recreation facilities of the nature considered in this report. Total cost is only one of the considerations. The balance of community versus commercial use is another. Historical approaches taken to management, stakeholder relationships and funding for new facilities can also influence the choices that are made by Councils regarding ownership and management of such facilities. All impact on facility performance in some way.

With a mix of commercial and community use, Bay Venues Limited (BVL), appear to be running the Tauranga sport and recreation facility network, at a level of profit. This exceeds the financial performance of most other Council networks considered in this report. Even if Tauranga City Council's (TCC's) operating subsidy was excluded, all but the community centres and halls run at a profit.

General observations by facility type include:

- Aquatic – even without the benefits of the TCC's operating subsidy and the financial success of the Mount Hot pools, the Tauranga aquatic network out performs other aquatic networks considered in this report. It is the only aquatics network, of those considered, that runs at an overall profit.
- Indoor courts – even without the TCC operating subsidy, BVL has again managed to operate this network at a profit. On the data available, only Auckland Council was also able to achieve this in 2018/2019.
- Community centres/halls – with the TCC subsidy, Tauranga's community centre/hall network runs at a small profit. However, without it, there is a loss. This is in line with most other networks in this category.

Overall BVL managed facilities appear to fare well against other comparison facilities across the range of other Council sport and recreation facility networks considered. Keeping in mind the difficulties of comparing different networks and facilities with each other, TCC's subsidies for the operation of the Tauranga facilities are not unreasonable compared to some others and the cost per visit taking into account the annual subsidy and visit numbers for 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 seems reasonable. Based on these comparisons only, it appears Tauranga's network is demonstrating reasonable value.

Contents

Document Information and Acknowledgements.....	2
Acknowledgements.....	2
Project Team.....	2
With Thanks To.....	2
Disclaimer.....	2
Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction.....	6
1.1 Scope and Methodology.....	6
2. A Snap Shot of the Different Networks.....	8
2.1 General Observations.....	8
2.2 What the Different Networks Comprise.....	9
2.3 What Different Councils Contribute.....	10
3. General Observations - Facility Operating Costs.....	12
4. Network Comparisons Across Councils.....	14
4.1.1 Multi-pool Aquatic Centre Comparisons.....	14
4.1.2 Outdoor Pool Comparisons.....	16
4.2 Indoor Courts Benchmarking	18
4.2.1 Multi Court Comparisons.....	18
4.2.2 Single Court Comparisons.....	20
4.3 Community Centres / Halls Comparisons.....	21

1. Introduction

1.1 Scope and Methodology

The intent of this report is to provide a benchmark for comparison of sport and recreation facility operations across various different Councils in New Zealand. This is to help inform TCC decision making regarding options for the future of the sport and recreation facility network in Tauranga.

The scope of the report focusses on the sport and recreation facility network across five Councils and considers aquatic, indoor sports courts/stadia and community centres/halls. Where possible, comparisons of the revenue, operating costs and Council subsidies/top ups for the operation of these facilities, across four Councils are made to those of the facilities owned and managed by BVL on behalf of Tauranga City Council.

As no two facilities are the same, and the level of detail provided varies, an exact like for like comparison is not possible. However, the comparisons set out in this report are of similar facilities in the sense of scale and what they offer. Comparisons have been made of the following:

- Multi-pool aquatic centres
- Seasonal outdoor pools
- Multi-court indoor sports facilities
- Single court indoor sports facilities
- Community centre/halls

It is also important to understand that each Council and community has an individual approach to pricing for indoor recreation and aquatic facilities, to suit their particular communities and strategic imperatives. The pricing approach taken by different Councils and communities has a significant influence on the overall financial position of the various facilities. This report does not consider pricing.

The methodology used in the preparation of this report involved the following components:

Discussions with the following:

- Adam Ellmers, BVL
- Chris Garside, Dunedin City Council
- Garth Dawson, Auckland City Council

Collection, collation and consideration of financial data from the following organisations:

- Bay Venues Limited (BVL)
- Auckland Council
- Hamilton City Council
- Dunedin City Council
- Queenstown Lakes District Council

Comparison of the recent data collected against other data sources, including 2015/2016 data from the Sport NZ National Facilities Tool.¹

¹ 2015/2016 had a complete data set for each of the facilities considered. Due to lack of uptake by the sector this tool is no longer available.

2. A Snap Shot of the Different Networks

2.1 General Observations

Sport and recreation facilities of the nature considered in this report have traditionally run at a loss, this is largely why these kinds of facilities are typically provided by Councils rather than the private sector. The trend in the last 15-20 years of developing multi-use facilities such as aquatic centres and indoor court/stadia with accompanying profit generating activities such as health and fitness (gyms) and programming, for example learn to swim, has helped reduce the loss and for some facilities even allows profit generation.

Typically more modern facilities provide a greater level of service and show investment in features that were not traditionally provided. Some of these elements are more costly to develop and operate but provide greater community benefits. For example, an older style community hall may have relatively low operating costs but is less functional, suitable or comfortable for participants, and generally less well utilised than a new, modern community centre. Increasing levels of service expectation from communities and the associated provision comes at a cost. Seeking economies of scale is one of the reason more community centres are becoming integrated with other amenities such as pool, libraries and indoor courts. There also ease of use benefits for the community, with multiple needs able to be satisfied at one location.

There are also a range of factors that influence a Council's decision as to how they own and operate their sport and recreation facilities of this nature. Total cost is only one of the considerations that influences Council decisions regarding the management approach taken for their network. The balance between community versus commercial use is another. Historical approaches taken to management, stakeholder relationships and funding for new facilities can also influence the choices that are made by Councils regarding ownership and management of such facilities.

2.2 What the Different Networks Comprise

Due to the significant variation in the sport and recreation facilities network provided in each Council area it is not possible to provide like for like comparisons. To provide overall context, a summary of the facilities considered in each Council area is provided below

Table 1: A snap shot of the sport and recreation facilities network

Council	Management Approach	Aquatic Facilities	Indoor Sports Facilities	Community Centres / Halls	Comments:
Tauranga	Operated under a Council Controlled Organisation model (CCO)	5	5	12 (3 centres, 8 halls)	A wide range and scale of aquatic, indoor sport and community centre/hall provision.
Auckland	Mix of internally (Council managed and externally (contract) managed	26 (13 external)	14 (5 external)	No detail available	An extensive network of facilities either managed internally or through facility management companies.
Hamilton	Mix of internally (Council managed) and externally (trust or community group managed)	7 (2 internal, 5 school pools)	2	Number unknown	Council manages majority of network. Trust managed 4 court indoor sports venue. Council contributes to operational funding of 5 school pools that are open to the public.
Dunedin	Mix of internally (Council managed) and externally (Trust managed)	4	3	Number unknown	One large multi-court facility managed by a Trust and two single court community facilities managed by Council.
Queenstown	Council managed	3	3	4	All aquatic, indoor sport court and community centre / hall provision is managed by the Council

Note: Auckland has a mix of Auckland Council internally and externally managed facilities. The externally managed facilities are managed by three different providers, Community Leisure Management, YMCA and Belgravia Leisure. The management fee for these facilities is an agreed sum which is recorded in this report as the difference between revenue and operating costs for the externally managed facilities. Due to commercial sensitivity associated with these facilities very little data was available for the externally managed facilities, so reliable comparisons cannot be made.

2.3 What Different Councils Contribute

It is not possible to directly compare each different Councils contributions to the operation of their network, because of a number of factors, including the number and age of the facilities. However, a cost to Council per user calculation can be made on the basis of the overall contribution against the number of visits. Comparisons have been made on this basis in Tables 2 to 4 below, where sufficient data was available. On this basis, the cost to TCC across the sport and recreation facility network is not unreasonable and compared to Queenstown Lakes and Dunedin, it is significantly lower. Auckland's cost per visit was lower than Tauranga's because of the high volume of visits.

Table 2: Contributions to the Aquatics Network

Aquatics Network						
Area	Financial Contribution by Council 2018/2019	Financial Contribution by Council 2019/2020	Visits 2018/2019	Visits 2019/2020	Cost per Visit 2018/2019	Cost per Visit 2019/2020
Tauranga	\$1,334,981	\$1,334,981	902,443	811,322	\$1.48	\$1.68
Auckland	\$1,827,088	\$2,910,031	7,849,480	5,733,292	\$0.23	\$0.51
Hamilton	\$3,107,655	No data available	638,400	No data available	\$4.87	n/a
Dunedin	\$5,063,734 ²	\$6,251,956 ³	814,712	575,197	\$6.22	\$10.87
Queenstown	\$2,221,725	\$2,774,952	602,759	485,557	\$3.69	\$5.71

Table 3: Contributions to the Indoor Courts/Stadia Network

Indoor Courts/Stadia						
Area	Financial Contribution by Council 2018/2019	Financial Contribution by Council 2019/2020	Visits 2018/2019	Visits 2019/2020	Cost per Visit	Cost per Visit
Tauranga	\$1,014,929	\$1,033,425	891,268	598,516	\$1.14	\$1.73
Auckland	(\$544,226 profit return to Council)	\$40,778	1,014,961	775,360	0	\$0.04
Queenstown	\$2,083,699	\$2,175,328	159,005	128,259	\$13.10	\$16.46

² This includes a rates allocation of \$4.64m in 2018/2019

³ This includes a rates allocation of \$5.5m in 2019/2020

Table 4: Contribution to the Community Centres / Halls Network

Community Centres/Halls Network						
Area	Financial Contribution by Council 2018/2019	Contribution by Council 2019/2020	Visits 2018/2019	Visits 2019/2020	Cost per Visit	Cost per Visit
Tauranga	\$280,878	\$287,704	500,103	363,910	\$0.56	\$0.79
Queenstown	\$446,935	\$395,822	123,448	74,102	\$6.03	\$5.34

3. General Observations - Facility Operating Costs

3.1 Aquatic Facility Costs

A full breakdown of aquatic facility financial details for 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 was provided by BVL and Queenstown Lakes District Council. This enabled a comparison to be made across aquatic centres for both regions. As 2015/2016 data for both Tauranga's Baywave and Queenstown's Aqualand aquatic centres, was in the Sport NZ National Facilities Benchmarking Tool (NFBT) it was also possible to compare these with a number of other similar facilities in the NFBT.⁴

A comparison between the percentages spent on staffing and repairs and maintenance costs, of the overall expenditure budget, for the two Tauranga and two Queenstown Lakes' aquatic facilities, showed a similar percentage of expenditure was allocated to repairs and maintenance, with substantially less allocated to staffing at both the Queenstown Lakes' pools than the two Tauranga pools.

Table 5: Comparison of Staffing and Repairs and Maintenance Costs

Name of Facility	Staffing	Repairs & Maintenance
Tauranga		
Baywave	68%	4%
Greerton	76%	5%
Queenstown Lakes		
Aqualand	41%	3.5%
Wanaka ⁵	34%	2.2%

A direct comparison of Baywave 2018/2019 data to the 2015/2016 data sourced from the NFBT tool showed a substantial increase in the percentage of staffing costs from 50% in 2015/2016 to 68% in 2018/2019. It is not possible to make any other direct comparisons, as the data was not reported in the same way. In a similar comparison with Queenstown's Aqualand Aquatic Centre, staffing costs in 2015/2016 were 54% and in 2018/2019 41%. There was sufficient data for the Queenstown facility to compare energy costs (27% in 2015/2016 and 12% in 2018/2019) and cleaning/repairs/maintenance (1% in 2015/2016 when the facility was six years old and 8.5% in 2018/2019).

A 2015/2016 comparison of costs across five major aquatic facilities (including Baywave) record:

- Staffing costs ranging from 43% to 65%
- Energy costs ranging from 7% to 27%
- Cleaning/repairs and maintenance costs ranging from 1% to 26%

⁴ 2018/2019 data has been used for these comparisons

⁵ The new Wanaka Pool opened in June 2018, so required little investment in repairs and maintenance in 2018/2019

This data indicates that staffing costs for Tauranga's aquatic facilities is at the higher end of the range expected.

3.2 Indoor Multi-court Facility Costs

A separate, recent comparison of operating costs across a number of multi-court facilities in New Zealand has enabled approximate cost per court to be calculated. The findings are as follows:

- Staffing costs typically ranged from \$47,000 to \$64,000 per court per annum.
- Other staff related costs including annual leave, FBT, Staff Welfare, training and development, superannuation and recruitment added approximately \$3,400 per court per annum to facility costs.
- Repairs and maintenance ranged from \$4,300 to \$7,500 per court per annum.
- Cleaning costs varied significantly between facilities. These ranged from \$9,000 to \$17,000 per court per annum.
- Electricity/gas costs ranged from \$3,600 to \$9,700 per court per annum (variations between facilities based on geographic location (heating costs) can be significant).
- Security costs ranged from \$900 to \$1,300 per court per annum.

By comparison Trustpower Arena's staffing costs for both 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 sat comfortably within this range at \$47,531 and \$58,978 respectively per court. Whereas the Queen Elizabeth Youth Centre (QEYC) staffing costs of \$82,339 (2018/2019) and \$87,827 (2019/2020) per court exceeded the typical range.

While no repairs and maintenance costs were available for Trustpower Arena, the repairs and maintenance costs for QEYC of \$10,546 (2018/2019) were within the typical range. The costs of \$3,515 for 2019/2020 were below the typical range but that is to be expected with the impact of COVID-19 lockdown and reduced wear and tear on the facility.

4. Network Comparisons Across Councils

As each facility is located in areas with a varying potential user base, different organisational structures, operating systems, numbers of courts / pools and methods of data capture and analysis, it is not possible to undertake direct comparisons between facilities and compare these to the Tauranga sport and recreation facility network. However, where available, data relating to relatively comparable facilities has been set out in tables 4.1 to 4.3 below across each Council region, in each facility category.

For those facilities operated by external contractors in Auckland, the figure presented in the 'Difference' column is the agreed management fee paid to the contractors by Auckland Council. In all other cases, the 'Difference' reflects the difference between the revenue and operating costs. Where a Council subsidy payment has been itemised in the financial data provided, it has been referred to in the 'Revenue' column and taken into account in the second data line in the 'Difference' column.

4.1 Aquatic Benchmarking

4.1.1 Multi-pool Aquatic Centre Comparisons

Aquatic facilities on their own usually run at a loss as they require a high level of staffing for health and safety purposes and the humid environment, coupled with health and safety requirements increases the repairs and maintenance spend. However, those facilities that are combined with a fitness centre are more likely to run at a profit as it increases the revenue making opportunities, through retail, programmes and membership fees. The facilities considered in this section provide similar offerings and show the breadth of variance between profit and loss across facilities. Alpine Aqualand runs at a considerable loss. Moana is the only facility that specifically identified inclusion of rates revenue.

The commercial success of the Mount Hot Pools is a stand out against any of the other aquatic facilities across the regions considered in this report. Overall, Tauranga's aquatic network performed well against others in both 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 taking into account the number of visits compared to other facilities.

Table 6: Multi-pool Comparisons

Comparisons Across Similar Aquatic Facilities								
Name of Facility	Revenue	Revenue	Operating Costs	Operating Costs	Difference	Difference	Visits	Visits
	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020
Auckland								
Albany Stadium Pool (offers free admission for 16 yrs. & under)	2,798,359	2,367,695	2,085,667	2,294,335	+712,691	+73,360	513,456	407,130
Mt Albert Aquatic Centre (externally managed, also doesn't offer free admission for 16 yrs. & under)					+28,875 (Council's 50% share of profit)	+15,000 (Council's 50% share of profit)	367,836	295,018
Tauranga								
Baywave	3,708,674 (incl. TCC subsidy \$156,449)	3,467,634 (incl. TCC subsidy \$160,088)	2,822,869	3,012,455	+885,805 +729,356 (without TCC subsidy)	+455,179 +295,091 (without TCC subsidy)	403,068	379,496
Queenstown								
Alpine Aqualand	3,168,513	2,070,779	4,254,076	3,679,571	-1,075,563	-1,608,792	441,972	303,087
Dunedin								
Moana Pool	7,917,013 (incl. \$6.5 rates revenue)	7,872,043 (incl. \$5.5m rates revenue)	7,818,417	8,136,850	+98,596	-284,807	613,783	494,219

4.1.2 Outdoor Pool Comparisons

Outdoor aquatic facilities are generally aging and historically run at a loss. In the comparisons below Tauranga's Memorial Aquatic Centre seems to be an exception to that, however, once the TCC subsidy is taken into account, Memorial Aquatic Centre is shown to have also run at a loss. While that loss was smaller than the other facilities it was compared to, it also had fewer visits.

Table 7: Outdoor Pool Comparisons

Comparisons Across Similar Outdoor Aquatic Facilities								
Name of Facility	Revenue	Revenue	Operating Costs	Operating Costs	Difference	Difference	Visits	Visits
	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020
Auckland								
Parnell Baths (managed by external contractor)					-304,000	-316,000	78,008	97,542
Point Erin Pools (managed by external contractor)					-245,000	-254,000	66,885	66,416
Tauranga								
Memorial Aquatic Centre	246,573 (incl. TCC subsidy \$158,081)	269,620 (incl. TCC subsidy \$161,754)	186,332	154,371	+60,251 -97,840 (without TCC subsidy)	+115,249 -46,505 (without TCC subsidy)	34,626	31,804
Dunedin								

Comparisons Across Similar Outdoor Aquatic Facilities								
Name of Facility	Revenue	Revenue	Operating Costs	Operating Costs	Difference	Difference	Visits	Visits
	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020
St Clair Pool (outdoor summer pool)	170,841	164,645	300,432	306,330	-129,591	-141,685	96,491	43,883

4.2 Indoor Courts Benchmarking

4.2.1 Multi Court Comparisons

It is becoming increasingly more common for multi-indoor court facilities to be run by a Trust set up specifically to run the particular facility. That is the case for both Hamilton's Rototuna and Dunedin's Edgar Centre, along with many others across New Zealand. On the face of it multi-indoor court facilities appear to run at a profit, but that is generally because they receive annual subsidies from the Councils that own them. Of the facilities detailed below, Trustpower Arena is the exception to that and even without TCC's annual subsidy it would still have run at a profit in 2018/2019 and 2019/2020. This comes from the commercial/events component of the facility which generated 66.6% of the revenue in 2018/2019, before TCC's operating subsidy and 58.4% of the revenue in 2019/2020, before TCC's operating subsidy.

Table 8: Multi-court Comparisons

Comparisons Across Similar Indoor Multi Court Facilities								
Name of Facility	Revenue	Revenue	Operating Costs	Operating Costs	Difference	Difference	Visits	Visits
	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020
Hamilton								
Rototuna	539,642 (incl. HCC subsidy \$120k)		509,222		+30,419 -89,581 (without HCC subsidy)		241,252	
Tauranga								
Trustpower Arena	2,201,084 (incl. TCC subsidy \$781,702)	1,995,296 (incl. TCC subsidy \$794,688)	1,047,522	775,380	+1,153,562 +371,860 (without TCC subsidy)	+1,219,916 +425,248 (without TCC subsidy)	584,683	360,665
Queen Elizabeth Youth Centre	473,310	465,288	363,278	374,999	+110,032 -84,098	+90,289 -108,350	232,767	179,998

Comparisons Across Similar Indoor Multi Court Facilities								
Name of Facility	Revenue	Revenue	Operating Costs	Operating Costs	Difference	Difference	Visits	Visits
	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020
	(incl. TCC subsidy \$194,130)	(incl. TCC subsidy \$198,639)			(without TCC subsidy)	(without TCC subsidy)		
Dunedin								
Edgar Centre	1,981,239 (incl. \$840k DCC annual subsidy)		1,913,043		+68,196 -771,804 (without DCC subsidy)		683,000	

4.2.2 Single Court Comparisons

While historically single court facilities run at a loss because there are limited opportunities to secure revenue, other than through user fees. There was only sufficient data available to make a comparison between two facilities. Even taking the TCC subsidy into account, Mount Sports Centre still managed to run at a small profit in each of 2018/2019 and 2019/2020.

Table 9: Single Indoor Court Comparisons

Comparisons Across Similar Single Indoor Court Facilities								
Name of Facility	Revenue	Revenue	Operating Costs	Operating Costs	Difference	Difference	Visits	Visits
	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020
Hamilton								
Te Rapa Sportsdrome	62,000	38,000	92,000	96,000	-30,000	-58,000		
Tauranga								
Mount Sports Centre	63,082 (incl. TCC subsidy \$23,497)	57,547 (incl. TCC subsidy \$24,136)	29,170	31,984	+33,912 +10,415 (without TCC subsidy)	+25,563 +1,427 (without TCC subsidy)	36,479	27,333

4.3 Community Centres / Halls Comparisons

Community centres and halls provide a much needed community service, with little opportunity to secure revenue and usually run at a loss. Many are aging and the facilities they provide are often being included in the development or re-development of bigger community facilities, such as aquatic centres and libraries, as is largely the case in Auckland. Greerton Hall was the only facility in this category that appeared to make a small profit in 2018/2019. However, once the TCC subsidy is taken into account, it also ran at a loss. However, compared to the other facilities in this category, particularly Arrowtown Hall, that had fewer visit numbers in 2018/2019, Greerton Hall's loss was not extraordinary.

Table 10: Community Centres and Halls Comparisons

Comparisons Across Similar Community Centres/Halls								
Name of Facility	Revenue	Revenue	Operating Costs	Operating Costs	Difference	Difference	Visits	Visits
	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020	2018/2019	2019/2020
Hamilton								
Enderley Community Centre	22,000	15,000	58,000	60,000	-36,000	-45,000		
Tauranga								
Greerton Hall	88,875 (incl. TCC subsidy \$48,757)	84,001 (incl. TCC subsidy \$49,889)	78,751	84,109	+10,124 -38,633 (without TCC subsidy)	-108 -49,997 (without TCC subsidy)	28,387	19,880
Queenstown								
Arrowtown Hall	25,675	34,423	100,474 (incl.33k depreciation)	64,267 (incl.34.5k depreciation)	-74,799	-29,844	18,079	14,307
Lake Hayes Pavilion	46,113	33,544	47,418 (incl. \$15k depreciation)	40,985 (incl. \$15k depreciation)	-1,305	-7,441	18,244	8,274