

Greerton Maarawaewae Study - Multi-Criteria Analysis of Options

Prepared by SGL/BOON Consultant Team



For Tauranga City Council



March 2022

Contents

1.	Overall multi-criteria analysis approach and process	3
1.1	What is a multi-criteria analysis.....	3
1.2	Developing the MCA for the Greerton Maarawaewae Study	3
2.	Overview of Options	5
3.	Marking the MCA Scenarios	6
3.1	Scoring from the three different scenarios	6
3.2	Ranking of options based on the three scenarios	7
4.	The Criterion.....	8
4.1	The horizontal criterion	8
4.2	The vertical criterion	15
	Appendix 1: Further explanation on how the scoring system works	17
	Appendix 2: Passive and Active Green and Community Facilities Scoring by Option.....	20
	Appendix 3: Net Cost by Option.....	21

1. Overall multi-criteria analysis approach and process

1.1 What is a multi-criteria analysis

Multi-criteria analysis (MCA) is a tool that can be used to compare reform and investment proposals. When applied consistently and transparently, it is a suitable approach for filtering options before applying more detailed quantitative analysis, or to compare options where impacts are not easily quantifiable.

There are a range of ways to apply MCA, but in all cases the analysis should be robust, transparent and defensible. MCA uses objectives, criteria, measures, weightings and scoring approaches to rank and compare options.

It is important to test the robustness of the analysis results by understanding how options perform under different conditions. Sensitivity testing and scenario testing are relevant approaches for testing results.

The MCA process and outputs should be appropriately documented, to clearly demonstrate the development and application of the tool, the option performance, and the rationale for selecting options.

1.2 Developing the MCA for the Greerton Maarawaewae Study

The key challenge for this project was to develop an MCA process which **genuinely took into account community engagement** responses for each option as well as independently assessed the needs for Tauranga City at this site.

Consequently, a matrix approach was used to assess each option, with horizontal and vertical criteria developed and relative weightings applied.

As far as possible, the consultant team sought to remove subjectivity from the assessment process.

The horizontal criteria determined were:

- need for a health site
- provision of green space for 'broad' public benefit plus active recreation and community facilities
- city housing needs
- current site stakeholder requirements (Tauranga Racing, Tauranga Golf Club and Tauranga Equestrian Sports Association - TESA).

The vertical criteria (which were matched with each of the horizontal criteria) determined were:

- community engagement support
- need to occur on this site (ready choice of alternate options and/or challenge of relocation)

- importance of public transport corridor and urban spatial plan on this site
- overall importance to the city (with the following weightings assigned: health site 20%, green/active recreation – 25% or 30%, housing 30% or 25%, and existing stakeholders 10%).

The green/active recreation (passive and active green and community facilities) scoring by option is included in **Appendix 2**.

Net cost was also considered (as one of the horizontal criteria), with a relative weighting of 15% or 20%. Net costs by option are summarised in **Appendix 3**.

Please note, although the consultant team met with mana whenua representatives during the engagement and assessment process and have incorporated their feedback into the options development, this assessment process does not include the views of mana whenua. As a Treaty Partner with the Crown (the landowner), and recognising the partnership relationship between mana whenua and Tauranga City Council (TCC), TCC Commissioners and staff have separately discussed the options with mana whenua representatives and their views will be considered separately.

2. Overview of Options

A full outline of the options is contained within the “Study team options development and progress report” dated April 2022.

The table below provides a summary of the key elements that each option includes, across all the options assessed as part of this MCA.

GREERTON MAARAWAEWAE OPTIONS DESCRIPTION											
Provision Description	Commentary	Options									
		1	2	3	3plus	4	5.1	6.1	6plus	7.1	7plus
Health Site	.1 Options incorporate updated stormwater information; 'plus' options include public feedback re amenity improvements Y/N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Green Space for 'Broad' Public Benefit & of Recreation and Community Facilities (Passive & Active)	Separately scored										
City Housing Needs	Y/N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y (at Health Site)	Y (at Health Site)
	Additional dwellings #	0	0	0	0	0	729	1,117	1,117	1,000 (at Health Site)	1,000 (at Health Site)
Current Site Stakeholder Requirements:											
*Racing	Y/N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
*Golf	Y/N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
*Equestrian	Y/N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
	Enhance 1, Maintain 0.75, Reduce 0.5, Out 0	Maintain	Reduce	Reduce	N	Enhance	N	N	N	N	N

3. Marking the MCA Scenarios

To assist in analysing the robustness of the MCA process, three 'scenarios' were trialled and marked, with different weightings assigned to vertical criterion, 'overall importance to the city', for the provision of green space and active recreation/community facilities, housing, and for net cost.

All options developed throughout the study have been included within the assessment. However, from a ranking perspective, only one option for each number was considered ie. the options considered were options 1, 2, 3plus, 4, 5.1, 6plus and 7plus.

For each marking scenario each option was marked without, and then with a net cost weighting applied.

Notes: option 5.1 is adjusted based on updated stormwater information. All the 'plus' options are the original options updated to incorporate feedback from the community engagement process and 6plus and 7plus also include adjustments based on updated stormwater information. Option 3plus does not now include equestrian whereas option 3 does.

3.1 Scoring from the three different scenarios

The scoring from three different scenarios is shown below. In all cases the maximum potential score is 1.

For all scenarios, for the 'overall importance to the city' criterion, the need for a health site was marked as 20% and the requirements of existing stakeholders as 10%.

Green refers to the provision of green space for broad public benefit plus also to the provision of active recreation and community facilities.

For **Scenario 1** the weightings applied were green 30%, housing 25%, and net cost 15%.

For **Scenario 2** the weightings for green and housing were reversed, with green 25%, housing 30% and net cost 15%.

For **Scenario 3** the weightings applied were both green and housing at 25% and net cost at 20%.

From the table below you will see that option 7.1 scores higher because although 7plus has more amenity, 7.1 has more sports fields (which is given a higher relative weighting than amenity variety) and also option 7.1 is a slightly lower cost.

SCORING SUMMARY FOR DIFFERENT SCENARIOS																
Scenario	Weightings Applied			Options										Ranking		
One	Green	Housing	Net Cost	1	2	3	3plus	4	5.1	6.1	6plus	7.1	7plus	1st	2nd	3rd
Scoring without Cost	30%	25%		0.13	0.25	0.34	0.39	0.46	0.29	0.43	0.47	0.64	0.62	7plus	6plus	4
Scoring with Cost	30%	25%	15%	0.31	0.41	0.45	0.50	0.46	0.44	0.52	0.55	0.77	0.74	7plus	6plus	3plus
Scenario	Weightings Applied			Options										Ranking		
Two	Green	Housing	Net Cost	1	2	3	3plus	4	5.1	6.1	6plus	7.1	7plus	1st	2nd	3rd
Scoring without Cost	25%	30%		0.13	0.23	0.30	0.34	0.40	0.29	0.42	0.45	0.64	0.62	7plus	6plus	4
Scoring with Cost	25%	30%	15%	0.31	0.38	0.41	0.45	0.40	0.44	0.51	0.54	0.77	0.75	7plus	6plus	3plus
Scenario	Weightings Applied			Options										Ranking		
Three	Green	Housing	Net Cost	1	2	3	3plus	4	5.1	6.1	6plus	7.1	7plus	1st	2nd	3rd
Scoring without Cost	25%	25%		0.13	0.24	0.32	0.36	0.42	0.29	0.41	0.45	0.65	0.63	7plus	6plus	4
Scoring with Cost	25%	25%	20%	0.38	0.45	0.47	0.51	0.42	0.49	0.54	0.57	0.82	0.80	7plus	6plus	3plus

Appendix 1 outlines in further detail the approach to the scoring system.

3.2 Ranking of options based on the three scenarios

With the weighting variances applied as per section 3.1, in all scenarios the rankings were the same. The rankings are summarised in the table below.

OVERALL RANKING FOR OPTIONS, WITHOUT AND WITH COSTS APPLIED		
Ranking	Without Costs	With Costs
1	Option 7plus: Health and recreation	Option 7plus: Health and recreation
2	Option 6plus: Homes and community park	Option 6plus: Homes and community park
3	Option 4: Community spaces & active recreation destination park combined with equestrian	Option 3plus: Central park
4	Option 3plus: Central park	Option 4: Community spaces & active recreation destination park combined with equestrian

4. The Criterion

This section outlines the horizontal and vertical criterion, including background information and weighting basis.

4.1 The horizontal criterion

The criteria that were scored horizontally were:

- need for a health site
- provision of green space for 'broad' public benefit plus active recreation and community facilities
- city housing needs
- current site stakeholder requirements (i.e., Racing Tauranga, Tauranga Golf Club and TESA)
- net cost.

Below is summary discussion regarding the key information informing each horizontal criterion and consequently informing scoring against vertical criteria.

For the current site stakeholder requirements, the vertical criterion, the 'need (to be located) on this site' is also presented here.

Criteria	Background Information	Weighting Basis
Need for a health site	During the options community engagement process before Christmas, the BOPDHB expressed potential interest in a new health site at this location. The consultant team was originally advised a 14ha site was needed although this area requirement has subsequently been revised down to 12 ha. Essential site criteria for a health services site are understood to be centrally located and stable flat land, with very good transport connectivity. Hence option 7 showing a health services site was included as part of the engagement process.	From wider discussions and understanding, there are limited if any similarly centrally located flat sites on current and future transport corridors that could accommodate a 12ha health services site. Hence for the vertical criterion, 'overall importance to the city', a relatively high importance weighting of 20% was assigned. <i>Please see section 2 for the Greerton Maarawaewae Options Description, to see which options included a health site by a simple Y (yes) or N (no) marking. In the score sheet if N, then the option scored 0; if Y (which was only options 7.1 and 7plus) then scored 1, and the latter was then multiplied by the end percentage assigned to this horizontal criterion – see Appendix 1.</i>
Provision of green space for 'broad' public	Greerton Maarawaewae - Potential as a Community and Recreational Hub	Given the need and strong public support for a centrally located park which can provide a mix of passive and active recreation outcomes; the obvious advantage of co-location

Criteria	Background Information	Weighting Basis
benefit plus active recreation and community facilities	<p>A thorough background paper regarding active recreation and community facilities was prepared for the Greerton Maarawaewae project by Tauranga City Council's Spaces and Places team (8 February 2022). The key summary paragraph was:</p> <p>“The Maarawaewae site provides an excellent potential location for a community hub, with a focus on active living opportunities, including sports fields, indoor courts, hardcourts and a suite of outdoor play and leisure opportunities. It could also provide a suitable space for a ‘hub’ community centre. The catchment for these facilities would be the southern part of Te Papa, the Western Corridor, and a wider City West arc from Bethlehem through to Ohauti. Alternative locations for recreational spaces are very limited in the Western Corridor and are increasingly expensive due to demand for land for housing. It is strongly recommended that an option that includes these facilities be taken forward to the next phase of planning.” Please note this summary provided a cumulative summary of a large body of previous work reinforcing the challenges to be able to provide sufficient accessible reserve areas to meet future community needs.</p> <p>Value of green space</p> <p>See community engagement report for repeated and consistent feedback that reinforced the lack of a ‘Hagley Park’ for Tauranga and the strong public support for the retention of Greerton Maarawaewae as a passive and active reserve.</p>	<p>with the ecological and cycling/walking opportunities of the Kopurererua Valley to enable the creation of Tauranga’s own unique blend of passive, active, and wetland reserves plus community facilities; and the central location servicing the southern part of Te Papa, the growth in the Western Corridor and the City West, again the highest relative weighting together with housing were assigned to this criterion for ‘overall importance to the city’, with scenarios trialled with both 25% and 30% weightings.</p> <p><i>Please see Appendix 2 for the separate and detailed marking applied to the individual option scoring for this horizontal criterion which again were multiplied by the end percentage assigned to this horizontal criterion – see Appendix 1.</i></p>
City housing needs	<p>Tauranga City and the wider Western Bay of Plenty areas have a well-documented housing shortage and face supply challenges in addressing current and projected shortfalls. According to recent SmartGrowth projections (July 2020) there is a projected undersupply of new dwellings in the order of 6,000 dwellings over the next 10 years. There is a projected supply requirement of 35,000 homes over the next 30 years.</p> <p>In the immediate area in which the site is located the Te Papa Peninsula (TPP), of which the site forms a part, is identified as Priority Development Area (PDA) under the SmartGrowth strategy. TPP is</p>	<p>Given Tauranga’s and Ta Papa’s well documented housing needs, the highest relative weighting together with ‘Green’ were assigned to this criterion for ‘overall importance to the city’, with scenarios trialled with both 25% and 30% weightings.</p> <p><i>Please see section 2 Greerton Maarawaewae Options Description, to see which options included housing and estimated indicative dwelling numbers – options with Y only which were options 5.1, 6.1 and 6plus. N (no) options scored</i></p>

Criteria	Background Information	Weighting Basis
	<p>forecast to provide circa 9,000 dwellings over the next 30 years. It is reasonable to assume that TPP might deliver say an average of 200 new dwellings per year for the next 10 to 15 years as it takes time to ramp up a pipeline of planning and re-development activities – this would provide for 2,000-3,000 new dwellings to be delivered in that period.</p> <p>The study site, in particular the largely flat area occupied by the Tauranga Racing Club, is an option to make a meaningful contribution to this supply challenge. The site is/will also be well served by high frequency bus rapid transit along the Cameron Road corridor connecting to the Tauranga City Centre, as well as proposed walking and cycling infrastructure.</p> <p>For the proposed options with housing – options 5.1, 6.1 and 6plus, a gross yield range of 30 to 50 dwellings per gross hectare (applied to gross land area) was adopted as well as an average lot size of 175 m² to 250 m² applied to the superlot areas. For option 5.1 the average yield was estimated to be 729 dwellings; for option 6.1 and 6 plus an average yield of 1,117 dwellings; and for options 7.1 and 7 plus (on the assumption over time that the existing hospital site land could be released for medium to higher density housing).</p>	<p><i>0 for this criterion; Y options scored the number of estimated dwellings/ 2,000, again multiplied by the end percentage assigned to this horizontal criterion – see Appendix 1.</i></p>
Current site stakeholder requirements - General	The three current site stakeholders are Tauranga Racing, Tauranga Golf Club, and Tauranga Equestrian Sports Association (TESA)	<p>Requiring change of location for any stakeholder should never be proposed lightly, and consequently a weighting of half the 'need for the health site', and about 40% of the weighting applied to the overall city's needs for green and housing, was applied ie a total of 10%.</p> <p>Given the different land area of each activity (respective current land areas for Racing/Golf/TESA about 45/35/15 ha; and relative participant reach, after one considers that some Racing users could potentially participate at alternate venues in the future; and given quite different community engagement feedback and levels of support for each activity; on balance assigned this collective 10% for Racing, Golf and</p>

Criteria	Background Information	Weighting Basis
		TESA on a 2:2:1 ratio – in summary a weighting of 4% to Racing, 4% to Golf and 2% to TESA, %, which again was multiplied by the end percentage assigned to this horizontal criterion – see Appendix 1.
Current site stakeholder requirements - Racing Tauranga	<p>Further to the Messara report, New Zealand Thoroughbred Racing (NZTR) currently has an updated directions paper out for consultation with Racing Clubs. Specific directions for each region have been proposed. For the Bay of Plenty, the paper states:</p> <p><i>“Bay of Plenty</i></p> <p>NZTR has met with Racing Rotorua and Racing Tauranga and encouraged them to work together on what the future of racing will be for the Bay of Plenty region. While acknowledging the Bay of Plenty is a population growth hub, NZTR is of the view that thoroughbred racing in the region may be best sustained in the long-term if there is only one venue for racing in the region.”</p> <p>Racing Tauranga has historically held about 11-13 race meetings per annum and about 20 -25 horses train at the course daily. Based on information from Racing Tauranga (Nov 2021), estimated annual race day attendances is about 26,000; and about 92,000 people use the Tauranga Racecourse Event Centre annually (excluding race days) – in summary, the estimated venue is about 118,000 visits per year with racing accounting for about 22% of this total use.</p> <p>Racing Tauranga’s lease is for 35 hectares until June 2039 with no right of renewal. No recent structural assessment has been undertaken for the Public Stand and Members Stand, which the Club is currently undertaking. However, given the building age and types there are some NBS concerns.</p>	<p>The racing industry is currently consolidating nationally and NZTR has proposed racing may be best sustained in the region by one venue.</p> <p>With industry consolidation, the possibility of developing a joint solution with Racing Rotorua supported by NZTR; some likely NBS challenges with existing buildings; and one could argue some if not many of the existing non-racing users could be accommodated by some of the community facility options being proposed medium term on site or elsewhere; consequently the assigned score for vertical criterion, ‘need to occur on this site’, was 2 out of a maximum of 5 - Note when considering the ‘need on this site’ criterion, part of the consideration is the choice of alternate options - see Appendix 1.</p> <p>Note in the net cost summary – see Appendix 3 – a total \$50m racing relocation cost has been assigned but at this time it is assumed half of this cost can be met/shared with Rotorua and/or other parties.</p>
Current site stakeholder requirements -	<p>The Tauranga Golf Club has about 984 members (Nov 2021) and catered for about 46,000 total rounds in the 2021 year.</p> <p>Tauranga Golf Club’s main lease is for 45 hectares until 30 June 2039, with no right of renewal. The Club also has a lease for 6.65 hectares</p>	From review there is not an oversupply of golf courses, so if golf were to be discontinued on the site, to achieve a new 18-hole golf course within relative proximity to the city will be a high cost (a rough order estimate potentially about \$70m,

Criteria	Background Information	Weighting Basis
Tauranga Golf Club	<p>within the adjacent Kopurererua Valley Reserve area, which can be terminated with limited notice - this additional lease area assists the Club to address some of its irrigation requirements.</p> <p>At an early stage the consultant team sought to understand whether there was an undersupply or oversupply of golf courses in the Western Bay of Plenty.</p> <p>As a rough order estimation only (noting from several discussions there didn't seem to be clearly established benchmarking): There are currently five 18-hole courses and three 9-hole courses in the Western Bay of Plenty. Summerhills 9-hole course data was not available, but the combined membership of the other seven clubs (or for this indicative exercise, the equivalent of six equivalent 18-hole courses) was 5,349 members (Nov 2021), an average of about 900 members per 'equivalent 18-hole' course; and about a combined 240,000 total rounds for the 2021 year.</p> <p>The total Western BOP population in 2021 is about (WBOPDC 58,100 + TCC 155,200 =) 213,300. The current ratio of annual rounds/total population therefore = 1.125 rounds per person per year. Based on this data only, if 18-hole golf course average realistic maximum is about 50,000 rounds per year, and participation rates remain similar, the local network potentially could cater for 300,000 rounds per year, and if the TCC population is projected to grow to about 209,000 in 2048 (and say WBOP in total to about 290,000 – say 209k/155k x 213k), based on this indicative analysis there is not sufficient supply to lose one 18-hole course. In short, if Tauranga Golf Club was to discontinue at the current site then it would realistically need to be replaced, and if seeking to achieve a new 18-hole golf course within relative proximity to the city land costs will be very high.</p> <p>The other key discussion and approach is how to optimise expanded and broader public use of a golf course – not just golf but increasingly going forward to consider a golf course as a 'programmable area', including safe walking/cycling routes, say some holes regularly</p>	<p>based on a possible land cost of \$50m and hole development and amenity of about \$20m). Furthermore, the Club has been receptive to considering how future and broader public use could be achieved and accommodated</p> <p>Consequently, the assigned score for vertical criterion, 'need on this site', was 4 out of a maximum of 5 - Note when considering the 'need to occur on this site' criterion, part of the consideration is the choice (or lack of choice) of alternate options.</p>

Criteria	Background Information	Weighting Basis
	<p>programmed for frisbee golf, a school cross country venue, golf-related activities such as min-golf and driving range which attract different markets, etc; and last but not least as a multi-clubrooms/destination cafe for all users of the site and Kopurererua Valley.</p> <p>The Golf Club has indicated a willingness to consider expanded use. During the study process the Club also demonstrated total flexibility in considering the potential relocation of some holes to assist the accommodation of other future activities on the site. It is also noted there are a large level of mature trees and great views from the course that any future directions should value and optimise.</p>	
TESA	<p>TESA is an umbrella organisation for nine different groups currently based on the area inside Tauranga Racecourse. These groups are show jumping, dressage, Western Riding Club, A & P Association, Adult Riding Club, Tauranga Pony Club, Greerton Pony Club, Tauranga Show Hunter Group, and the Extreme Cowboy Association. There are about two and sometime up to four separate TESA activities each weekend, and currently TESA groups can use up to the whole infield area.</p> <p>From early review there was no equestrian strategy for the Bay of Plenty nor WBOP. It is clear the current infield site is fulfilling a valuable need for multiple equestrian groups. The development of bridle trails within Kopurererua Valley was also strongly supported.</p> <p>If to stay on site TESA realistically requires a similar area – an indoor arena potentially allows use of a more compact site but an indoor arena would potentially have about a \$7m build cost. Furthermore, one should probably not develop an indoor arena on a constrained site as future event potential would be limited by a lack of supporting area and facilities.</p> <p>Furthermore, neither TECT All Terrain Park nor McLaren Falls were regarded as acceptable alternate locations – both are too distant, and the TECT Terrain Park is also too steep and McLaren Falls presents major traffic access challenges and safety concerns with horse floats.</p>	<p>If future directions require relocation, then indicative costs to relocate at say Merrick's Farm could be approximately \$7m (about \$5m site works based on previous Aurecon work) and base facilities of about \$2m to \$3m. However, to meet future sub-regional and some regional event needs would require some infrastructure within a future racecourse site or similar. Therefore, in total at this time, if relocation is required, about a \$10m cost is likely to be required. This study has also highlighted the need for an equestrian strategy/solution to properly cater for these groups' needs.</p> <p>If the future Maarawaewae site is likely to have a much greater active recreation focus and/or be a health services site, co-location of horses is less compatible and relocation would probably be required. However, on a relative cost basis to the requirements for relocating a golf course, it is a much lower cost.</p> <p>Consequently, the assigned score for vertical criterion, 'need to occur on this site', was 1 out of a maximum of 5.</p>

Criteria	Background Information	Weighting Basis
	<p>From discussion, there are two needs – a venue say within about 10 km of the current site that can meet equestrian needs for the City West, and also the need for a venue able to cater for sub-regional and regional events (which can work well within a racecourse site as it currently does) – note hosting events assists the financial sustainability of the groups. Given the need for horse trailers, safe site access is also needed.</p> <p>At a preliminary level only, possible alternate site options and in particular the potential for Merrick’s Farm to provide an equestrian venue for the City West have been considered.</p>	
Net cost	<p>To inform the net cost for each option, Rawlinsons QS have provided cost estimates at different stages of the process as more information has come to hand and as options were refined. Similarly, land costs and housing information were provided, that informed revenue estimates for the sale of super lots for options 5.1, 6.1 and 6plus; sale of land for public purpose for options 7.1 and 7plus; and also land opportunity costs due to the need, for some options on an equitable basis, to potentially have to provide alternate venues to meet active recreation needs.</p> <p>For options some judgement and adjustment was made to how much community amenity needed to be provided at an early stage with some reductions of 5% to up to 20% applied to the upfront capital cost of some options. When relocation of an existing stakeholder is required, costs have been assigned.</p> <p>External revenue assumptions from other public funders (based on benchmarking) was also applied for community facility developments.</p>	<p>For any major project, one needs to be able to fund and so net cost is always a factor. If one starts to weight above 25% then net cost will dominate, however for this scale of development and on a relative basis to other criteria it realistically needs to be no lower than 15% and potentially as high as 20%. Hence for the vertical criterion, ‘overall importance to the city’, scenarios were trialled with net cost at both 15% and also 20%.</p> <p>The net cost of for each option and the basis for calculation is detailed on Appendix 3. However, the score is calculated by the following equation:</p> <p>[Specific Option Net Cost – Maximum Net Cost Option]/ [Maximum Net Cost Option – Least Net Cost Option], which again is multiplied by the end percentage applied to net cost.</p>

4.2 The vertical criterion

The vertical criteria which were matched with each of the horizontal criteria, were:

- community engagement support
- need to occur on this site (ready choice of alternate options and/or challenge of relocation)
- importance of public transport corridor and urban spatial plan on this site
- overall importance to the city (with the following weightings assigned: health site 20%, green/active recreation – 25% or 30%, housing 30% or 25%, and existing stakeholders 10%).

Criteria	Background Information	Weighting Basis
Community engagement support	Informed by the comprehensive community engagement process which has run from November 2021 to March 2022	Scored out of a maximum of 10. Scores provided by community engagement personnel.
Need to occur on this site		<p>As discussed in the horizontal criterion section, there are limited/no other understood suitable 12 ha health sites. Consequently, the health site scored 4.5 out of a maximum of 5.</p> <p>There is greater flexibility how green and housing solutions could be addressed but the demand and supply pressure on each is high, hence each scored 3.5 out of maximum of 5.</p> <p>Existing site stakeholders of racing, golf, and equestrian were discussed as part of the horizontal criterion section and scored 2, 4, and 1 respectively.</p>
Importance of public transport corridor and urban spatial plan for each service at racecourse location	The site is/will be well served by high frequency bus rapid transit along the Cameron Road corridor connecting to the Tauranga City Centre, as well as proposed walking and cycling infrastructure.	<p>A health site, major community and recreation hub and 'central park', and medium/high density residential all need transport connectivity. These services and housing provision are also important elements of the urban spatial plan and hence each scored a maximum of 5.</p> <p>The passenger transport corridor assists access for race day attendees but neither racing, golf nor equestrian must be located on a passenger transport corridor nor are service/infrastructure elements of the urban spatial plan, so hence each scored 1 out of maximum of 5.</p>

Criteria	Background Information	Weighting Basis
Need to occur on this site		<p>As discussed in the horizontal criterion section, there are limited/no other understood suitable 12 ha health sites. Consequently, the health site scored 4.5 out of a maximum of 5.</p> <p>There is greater flexibility how green and housing solutions could be addressed but the demand and supply pressure on each is high, hence each scored 3.5 out of maximum of 5.</p> <p>Existing site stakeholders of racing, golf, and equestrian were discussed as part of the horizontal criterion section and scored 2, 4, and 1 respectively.</p>
Importance of public transport corridor and urban spatial plan for each service at racecourse location	The site is/will be well served by high frequency bus rapid transit along the Cameron Road corridor connecting to the Tauranga City Centre, as well as proposed walking and cycling infrastructure.	<p>A health site, major community and recreation hub and 'central park', and medium/high density residential all need transport connectivity. These services and housing provision are also important elements of the urban spatial plan and hence each scored a maximum of 5.</p> <p>The passenger transport corridor assists access for race day attendees but neither racing, golf nor equestrian must be located on a passenger transport corridor nor are service/infrastructure elements of the urban spatial plan, so hence each scored 1 out of maximum of 5.</p>

Appendix 1: Further explanation on how the scoring system works

This section steps through the scoring system uses to achieve the score in section 3.1 above. The tables included are examples taken from scenario 3 (without costs).

Phase 1 – refer page 19 Example A

1. The scores have been applied for the vertical criteria of 'need to occur on this site', 'importance of public transport corridor and urban spatial plan on this site' and 'community engagement support'.
2. These three criteria are then summed to give a score out of a maximum score of 20 (column E), which is then shown as a percentage (column F).
3. The next column G assigns the percentage applicable to the vertical criteria 'overall importance to the city', as has already been discussed.
4. You will note the sheet shown is for scenario 3 based on green at 25%, housing 25%, and the scoring with cost based on net cost at 20%.
5. Column E, the score out of 20, is then multiplied by column G, the weighting for the overall importance to the city, to give the maximum score for each horizontal criterion.
6. The maximum scores in this column H are then added, and then for example the maximal score for the 'need for a health site' of 2.70 is then divided by the total of all maximum scores, in this case 11.27, to give a percentage out of 100% in column I.
7. So, because of the impact of the scores or the vertical criteria in columns B, C and D and in this case in particular the very high community engagement support for green, instead of the green criteria being 25% as per the weighting out of 100% for the 'overall importance to the city', the weighting is much higher at 41%.

Phase 2 – refer page 20 example

Then the marking for each option is treated as follows:

8. For option 1, for the horizontal criteria 'need for a health site', in the first column of option 1 (the column, how well does this option achieve this outcome) scores either 0 if the option doesn't include a health site or 1 if it includes a health site, as per the instruction in column J. Option 1 doesn't include a health site so scores 0. If it had scored 1 then to get the score one would multiply '1' by Column I (maximum expressed as a %)
9. To try the next row for option 1: for green horizontal criteria, the score for how well does this option achieve this outcome is 0.15 – note this score is coming through from the separate green marking for option 1 (see Appendix 2), to then be multiplied by the percentage in column I, to give the score i.e., $41\% \times 0.15 = 0.06$
10. And as one final example for option 1: for equestrian, option 1 is a maintain option with a 0.75 score as per the instruction in column J, multiplied by the percentage in column I of 1% gives a score of 0.01.

These scores for option 1 are then added to provide a total score for option 1 at the bottom highlighted in green i.e. in this case 0.13.

Example A: Applying the vertical criteria: 'need to occur on this site', 'importance of public transport corridor and urban spatial plan on this site' and 'community engagement support'

SCORING WITHOUT COST								
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Criteria	Need to Occur on this Site (Max 5) - Ready choice of alternate options and/or challenge of relocation	Importance of PT Corridor and USP for Service at Racecourse Location (Max 5)	Community Engagement Support (Max 10)	TOTAL (max 20)	TOTAL (E/20 as %)	Overall Importance to the City %	TOTAL 2 (Maximum Score for each Criteria)	Maximum Expressed as a %
Need for a Health Site	4.5	5	4	13.5	68%	20%	2.70	24%
Provision of Green Space for 'Broad' Public Benefit Plus Active Recreation and Community Facilities	3.5	5	10	18.5	93%	25%	4.63	41%
City Housing Needs	3.5	5	4	12.5	63%	25%	3.13	28%
Dwellings - Base max as 2,000								
Current Site Stakeholder Requirements:								
*Racing ₁	2	1	3	6	30%	4%	0.24	2%
*Golf	4	1	7	12	60%	4%	0.48	4%
*Equestrian	1	1	3	5	25%	2%	0.10	1%
						80%	11.27	100%

Example B: Applying the horizontal criteria: how well does the option achieve the outcomes.

I	A	J	1		2		3		3plus	
Maximum Expressed as a %	Criteria	Commentary on Assessment by Option of Maximum Score	How Well Does this Option Achieve this Outcome	Score (Max Score x Option Outcome)	How Well Does this Option Achieve this Outcome	Score (Max Score x Option Outcome)	How Well Does this Option Achieve this Outcome	Score (Max Score x Option Outcome)	How Well Does this Option Achieve this Outcome	Score (Max Score x Option Outcome)
24%	Need for a Health Site	In 1, out 0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
41%	Provision of Green Space for 'Broad' Public Benefit Plus Active Recreation and Community Facilities	See separate marking by Passive and Active	0.15	0.06	0.42	0.17	0.66	0.27	0.78	0.32
28%	City Housing Needs	Includes on-site and off-site outcomes	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Dwellings - Base max as 2,000	Formula is # new dwgs/2,000 dwgs								
	Current Site Stakeholder Requirements:									
2%	*Racing	In 1, out 0	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4%	*Golf	In 1, out 0	1.00	0.04	1.00	0.04	1.00	0.04	1.00	0.04
1%	*Equestrian	Enhanced 1, Maintain 0.75, Reduced 0.5, Out 0	0.75	0.01	0.50	0.00	0.75	0.01	0.00	0.00
100%										
	Net Cost		1.00	0.00	0.85	0.00	0.62	0.00	0.61	0.00
	TOTAL			0.13		0.24		0.32		0.36

Appendix 2: Passive and Active Green and Community Facilities Scoring by Option

PASSIVE AND ACTIVE GREEN AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES SCORING BY OPTION											
		Options									
		1	2	3	3plus	4	5.1	6.1	6plus	7.1	7plus
Accessible Passive Reserves for Broad Public Benefit											
Description	Score Applied										
Racing	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1					
Golf	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1			0.1	0.1
TESA	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1		0.1					
Enhanced Public Access to Golf Area/KV	0.2			0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Large Park Area (about 30 ha)	0.5					0.5		0.5	0.5		
Grass Sports Fields	Limited = 0.1, Greater 0.2 (>3)		0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2				0.2	0.1
School	0.1						0.1	0.1	0.1		
Passive Total		0.3	0.4	0.7	0.6	1	0.4	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.4
Active Reserves and Community Facilities											
Doesn't include Racing, Golf and TESA - own separate score elsewhere											
Multi-Cultural Community and Sports Centre/Community Centre	0.2		0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
School	0.1						0.1	0.1	0.1		
Fields/Courts/Play/Other:											
	*Description - # full field spaces or similar (not including items in immediate row below)		4	7	11	12			1	7	5
	*'Plus' Options additions #: Community gardens (1), fitness trail (0.5), basketball courts (0.5) open air events space (1), mini-golf (0.5), basic play (1) or destination play (2), pump track (0.5), Function and Events Centre (1)		1	1.5	4.5	4.5		3	5.5	1.5	3.5
	Total #		5	8.5	15.5	16.5	0	3	6.5	8.5	8.5
	*Relativity Score (#/16.5)		0.30	0.52	0.94	1.00		0.18	0.39	0.52	0.52
	Field/Courts/Play score (Max 0.8, based on Option 4 scoring 1.0)		0.24	0.41	0.75	0.80		0.15	0.32	0.41	0.41
Active Reserves and Community Facilities Total		0.00	0.44	0.61	0.95	1.00	0.30	0.45	0.62	0.61	0.61
TOTAL SCORE		0.30	0.84	1.31	1.55	2.00	0.70	1.25	1.42	1.11	1.01
FINAL SCORE (TOTAL/2)		0.15	0.42	0.66	0.78	1.00	0.35	0.62	0.71	0.56	0.51

Appendix 3: Net Cost by Option

NET COST BY OPTION											
All figures are \$m and GST exclusive											
Note showing costs as negative numbers, revenue as positive numbers											
Description	Commentary	Options									
		1	2	3.1	3plus	4	5.1	6.1	6plus	7.1	7plus
Capital Cost as per Rawlinsons Summary (as per 14 March 2022) \$m	All costs are based on present day costs and include 20% design/estimating contingency, 15% fees, 12% P&G, and 8% margin Note, no options include Multi-Cultural & Sports Centre/Community Centre nor Function Centre capital costs.		-31.3	-50.6	-39.3	-63.7	-100.5	-127	-130.6	-46.0	-46.5
Reduced Scale of Early Amenity Development Requirement (rough order estimate only)	For Option 4, suggest with relocation of existing users important to provide a majority enhanced replacement reasonably quickly Note, for this calculation assumes no phased housing development costs nor revenue which obviously will occur		0.90	0.80	0.90	0.85	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95	0.95
Reduced Capital Cost due to Reduced Amenity Development \$m			-28.17	-40.48	-35.37	-54.145	-100.5	-127	-130.6	-43.7	-44.18
Revenue from Land Sales (as per assessment 14 March 2022) \$m							113	173	173	27	27
Indicative External Public Funding for Community Facilities Only (Play + Active Recreation + On-Site Equestrian) \$m	From Rawlinsons cost summary have taken total Play, Active Recreation and on-site Equestrian facility costs only, and assumed one third of other external funding will be possible		4.3	3.1	3.2	4.9				2.2	2.2
Net Gain/Cost for Reduced Development before Relocation Costs			-23.87	-37.38	-32.17	-49.245	12.5	46	42.4	-14.5	-14.975
Racing Relocation Cost \$m	Assumes 50% of about a \$50m relocation/settlement cost - say \$10m track + \$30m land cost/siteworks/services/access/facilities + \$10m commercial investments for viable business			-25	-25	-25	-25	-25	-25	-25	-25
Golf Relocation Cost \$m	Assumes \$70m based on \$20m golf course and facility redevelopment + \$50m land/services/access					-70		-70	-70		
TESA Relocation Cost \$m	Assumes at this time \$10m relocation cost, based on \$5m site redevelopment at Merricks Farm and then a combined \$5m for base facility provision at Merricks Farm and also at new Racecourse site for limited eventing provision		-3	-3	-10		-10	-10	-10	-10	-10
	Options 2 & 3 are a reduced level of service and may require some contribution to facility development elsewhere										
Indicative External Funding for Equestrian Facilities Only (but not site development) \$m	Assumed one third of other external funding will be possible		1	1	1.7		1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7
Land Acquisition Required for Alternate Active Recreation Venue \$m	For Options 5,6 and 1 regard as 15 ha, for Option 2 8 ha	-15	-8				-15	-15	-15		
TOTAL NET COST AFTER RELOCATION REQUIREMENTS \$m		-15.00	-33.87	-64.38	-65.47	-144.25	-35.83	-72.33	-75.90	-47.83	-48.28