

Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board EXTRAORDINARY AGENDA

Notice of Meeting:

An extraordinary meeting of the Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board will be held on:

Date: Tuesday 31 January 2017
Time: 4.30pm
Venue: Community Room, Upper Riccarton Library,
71 Main South Road, Christchurch

Membership

Chairperson	Mike Mora
Deputy Chairperson	Helen Broughton
Members	Natalie Bryden
	Vicki Buck
	Jimmy Chen
	Catherine Chu
	Anne Galloway
	Ross McFarlane
	Debbie Mora

26 January 2017

Gary Watson
Manager Community Governance, Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton
941 8258
gary.watson@ccc.govt.nz
www.ccc.govt.nz

Note: The reports contained within this agenda are for consideration and should not be construed as Council policy unless and until adopted.
If you require further information relating to any reports, please contact the person named on the report.

To view copies of Agendas and Minutes, visit:
www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/meetingminutes/agendas/index

Part A	Matters Requiring a Council Decision
Part B	Reports for Information
Part C	Decisions Under Delegation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

C	1.	Apologies.....	4
B	2.	Declarations of Interest.....	4
B	3.	Deputations by Appointment.....	4

STAFF REPORTS

A	4.	Consultation On The Location Of Library, Aquatic, Recreational And Customer Service Facilities In South West Christchurch January 2017	5
---	----	---	---

1. Apologies

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2. Declarations of Interest

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest they might have.

3. Deputations by Appointment

There were no deputations by appointment at the time the agenda was prepared.

4. Consultation On The Location Of Library, Aquatic, Recreational And Customer Service Facilities In South West Christchurch January 2017

Reference: 17/69308

Contact: Lee Sampson lee.sampson@ccc.govt.nz

941 6315

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to enable the Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board to consider options relating to the location and configuration of Library, Leisure Centre, Community and Customer Service facilities in South West Christchurch; and to make a recommendation to the Council to commence a community consultation and engagement process on the same.

Origin of Report

- 1.2 This report is staff generated at the request of the Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board.

2. Significance

- 2.1 The decisions in this report are of medium significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
- 2.1.1 The level of significance was determined in accordance with Council's Significance and Engagement Policy, by reviewing community interest, impacts and the particular sensitivity to the potential utilisation of land in a number of potential locations currently held under the Reserves Act.
- 2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board recommend that the Council:

1. Approve the commencement of a community consultation and engagement process regarding options for the location of co-located (combined) Library, Leisure Centre, Community and Customer Service Facilities in South West Christchurch.
 - a. Specific locations to be identified in community consultation include, Warren Park, Denton Park and Kyle Park.
 - b. The consultation process will provide the community with the opportunity to offer alternative locations.
 - c. The consultation process will provide the community with the opportunity to offer feedback on the co-location of facilities.
 - d. The finalised consultation process will be signed off by the Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board before it is launched.
2. That the broad scope of facilities to be provided are consistent with the 2015/2025 Long Term Plan and the resources set aside in this document for this purpose. However, within this broad envelope the community consultation process will seek community feedback on the form, function and nature of facilities that best meet the current and future needs and aspirations of the community.

3. Note that in order that the overall capital programme that supports this project is affordable to the Council, an ongoing commitment to divest local property that is deemed to be surplus to requirements, is needed.

4. Key Points

- 4.1 This report supports the [Council's Long Term Plan \(2015 - 2025\)](#):
 - 4.1.1 Activity: Libraries
 - Level of Service: 3.1.2 Residents have access to a physical and digital library relevant to local community need or profile
 - Level of Service: 7.0.1 Provide residents access to fit for purpose recreation and sporting facilities.
- 4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:
 - Option 1 - Approve the commencement of a community consultation and engagement process regarding options for the location of co-located (combined) Library, Leisure Centre, Community and Customer Service Facilities in South West Christchurch (preferred option).
 - Option 2 – Defer consultation due to substantially changing the nature of the locations or the project itself.
- 4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)
 - 4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:
 - The community are given the opportunity to become engaged in shaping a project they have shown considerable interest in.
 - The project has progressed to a point where community engagement is essential to it proceeding any further.
 - There is considerable community expectation to proceed.
 - The consultation format allows the community to identify sites not already considered.
 - 4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:
 - There may have been sites that have not been evaluated to date.
 - All of the identified sites will have drawbacks, there will not be a universally accepted ideal site.

5. Context

- 5.1 Council planning and community consultation has resulted in the Long Term Plan (LTP) 2015-2025 providing for Library, Leisure Centre, Community and Customer Service Facilities in South West Christchurch.

Scope

- 5.2 Specific Libraries, Recreation and Sports, Customer and Community Facility planning processes combined with the prioritisation of projects against resources city wide in the Annual Plan and Long Term Plan processes has established a higher level scope and cost of facilities than is included in the 2015/2025 LTP and the 2016/2017 Annual Plan.
- 5.3 At a high level, the scope of facilities envisaged includes:

- A co-located built area of between 4,100m² and 4,400m²
- Library Facilities
- Gym/Community Gym/Fitness Facilities or the like
- Leisure/Play Water, Lane Swimming Water, Swim Education Water
- Community Governance staff facilities
- Community Meeting Rooms
- Customer Service Facilities
- Works to minimise impacts on existing users of sites such as park users and sports codes.

Budget

- 5.4 The Council has set aside \$34,332,000 in the 2015/2025 LTP. This figure will be inflation adjusted to the year in which it is spent. An independent Quantity Surveyor has confirmed that on current assumptions and at this early stage, a co-located facility of this nature is affordable within this financial envelope.

Separate or Co-Located (Combined) Facilities

- 5.5 Consideration was given up front to co-located or separate facilities because this consideration would significantly steer the project going forward. Table 1 below illustrates some of the considerations covered:

Table 1: The Co-Location of Facilities		
Factor	Co-Location	Separate Facilities
Land Use	Requires less land as facilities are shared	Requires more land, sometimes duplicating services like car parks
Built Area	Smaller built area as many building functions are shared e.g. cleaning room, plant room, and foyer.	Larger built area, sometimes duplicating building functions
Multi-Function	Supports community requests for a greater degree of multi-function i.e. the ability to do more things in close proximity	Promotes specific trips to specific locations for specific functions
Site Availability	Potentially less sites available as the sites need to be larger	Communities tend to have a greater variety of smaller sites to choose from
CAPEX Cost	Current suite of facilities can be built for about \$2.5 M less if co-located	Current suite of facilities are about \$2.5 M more if not co-located
OPEX Cost	Current suite of facilities will cost about \$120K less to operate if co-located this figure may grow	Separate facilities tend to incur higher OPEX costs due to duplication and smaller quantity
Facility Distribution	Co-located facilities by their nature tend to be concentrated in one point	Separate facilities have the opportunity to be more spread around communities.
Accessibility	Co-located facilities offer more options more choice and are generally more accessible to more people	Separate facilities are often single purpose
Civic Heart	Co-located facilities tend to bring more people together for more reasons in one place, centralise communities around a focal point or points	Separate facilities tend to disperse people often where it is felt that an area may already be too crowded or another area may need a boost

Environment	Co-located facilities tend to be inherently more environmentally friendly in their construction, operation, nature of use but also in the reduction of multiple trips to access different services	Promotes specific trips to specific locations for specific functions and tend to be less environmentally friendly initially and in the long term
-------------	--	--

- 5.6 Applying the considerations in Table 1 to the project and the long list of potential locations available, the co-location option was preferred primarily for CAPEX, OPEX, environmental, multi-use and civic-heart considerations.

Location

- 5.7 The project team collated the criteria used by the Council for determining locations for its community facilities such as libraries and pools. The criteria were given weightings and a more robust definition. Under each of the criteria an “ideal site” was described in order to provide greater clarity. The criteria, weightings and ideal site are detailed on the South East Library, Customer Services and Leisure Facility Site Search Qualitative Assessment Document attached to this report as **Attachment A**.
- 5.8 The project team then undertook a structured (quantitative) assessment of a wide arc of locations predominantly based around the Hornby, Sockburn and Wigram geographic areas. The identified locations were cross-referenced and evaluated against weighted criteria and a detailed draft matrix was produced. The draft matrix was work shopped by the Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board on 24 January 2017 and further changes were made. The South West Library, Customer Services and Leisure Facility Site Search Qualitative Assessment Document attached to this report as Attachment A, details the results of this evaluation.
- 5.9 The Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board considered all locations on the matrix in order to establish a short list. Locations that were of insufficient size, needed to be purchased at significant cost, or involved the risk of a considerable time delay, were afforded a lower priority.
- 5.10 The three locations identified by the Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board to consult upon were, in order of ranking:
- Denton Park 80 per cent
 - Kyle Park 68 per cent
 - Warren Park 62 per cent
- 5.11 The Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board also asked that:
- The consultation process will provide the community with the opportunity to offer alternative locations.
 - The consultation process will provide the community with the opportunity to offer feedback on the co-location of facilities.
 - The finalised consultation process will be signed off by the Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board before it is launched.
- 5.12 The community consultation will be based on the Council’s best practice model customised to the needs and attributes of the local community. Following the consultation and engagement process, a report will be prepared for the Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board and the Council summarising the results and will recommend further action.

6. Option 1 - Approve Community Consultation

Option Description

- 6.1 Approve the commencement of a community consultation and engagement process regarding options for the location of co-located (combined) Library, Leisure Centre, Community and Customer Service Facilities in South West Christchurch.

Significance

- 6.2 The level of significance of this option is medium and is consistent with section 2 of this report.
6.3 Prior and planned community consultation meets the requirement for this level of significance.

Impact on Mana Whenua

- 6.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences

- 6.5 Community views and preferences have not yet been sought.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

- 6.6 This option is consistent with the Council's Plans and Policies.

Financial Implications

- 6.7 Cost of Implementation - \$5,000 (consultative process)
6.8 Maintenance/Ongoing Costs - Nil
6.9 Funding source – Operational budgets set aside for this purpose

Legal Implications

- 6.10 Nil

Risks and Mitigations

- 6.11 Risk of a lost opportunity due to a potentially suitable site not identified to date caused by a gap site analysis. This will result in a lost opportunity to locate on a suitable site.
6.11.1 Treatment: Invite the wider community to identify sites.
6.11.2 Residual risk rating: Low
6.12 A risk that none of the three sites identified is able to host a collocated facility of the scope described in this report. This will result in having to begin the site selection process again with time and cost implications.
6.12.1 Treatment: A high level feasibility has been undertaken on Denton Park as the highest scoring location. This has confirmed that a co-located facility of the scope and cost required can be built.
6.12.2 Residual risk rating: Low

Implementation

- 6.13 Implementation dependencies - None
6.14 Implementation timeframe – Three months

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

- 6.15 The advantages of this option include:

- The community are given the opportunity to become engaged in shaping a project they have shown considerable interest in.
- The project has progressed to a point where community engagement is essential to it proceeding any further.
- There is considerable community expectation to proceed.
- The consultation format allows the community to identify sites not already considered.

6.16 The disadvantages of this option include:

- There may have been sites that have not been evaluated to date.
- All of the identified sites will have drawbacks, there will not be a universally accepted ideal site.

7. Option 2 - Defer Consultation

Option Description

7.1 Defer consultation due to substantially changing the nature of the locations or the project itself.

Significance

7.2 The level of significance of this option is medium and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

7.3 Prior and planned community consultation meets the requirement for this level of significance.

Impact on Mana Whenua

7.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences

7.5 There is a strong will for the facility to proceed within the wider community.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

7.6 This option is consistent with the Council's Plans and Policies.

Financial Implications

7.7 Cost of Implementation - Nil

7.8 Maintenance/Ongoing Costs - Nil

Legal Implications

7.9 Nil

Risks and Mitigations

7.10 Risk of public discontentment. This will result in reputational risks and backlash.

7.10.1 Treatment: Comprehensive communication programme.

7.10.2 Residual risk rating: the rating of the risk is very high.

Implementation

7.11 Implementation dependencies - None

7.12 Implementation timeframe - None

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

7.13 The advantages of this option include:

- Provide opportunity to consider more locations or refine the criteria.

7.14 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Will delay the project.
- Will risk severe community discontentment and anxiety.

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A ↓	Southwest Library, Customer Services and Leisure Facility Site Search Qualitative Assessment	12

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

- (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
- (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

Author	John Filsell - Head of Recreation and Sports
Approved By	Lester Wolfreys - Head of Community Support, Governance and Partnerships Mary Richardson - General Manager Customer and Community

Southwest Library, Customer Service and Leisure Facility								
Site Search - Qualitative Assessment								
Site	Access/Transport (15%) <div><input type="checkbox"/> Convenient access for key user groups.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient pedestrian/cycling links (Green Star building elements to consider).</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Proximity to public transport and car parking (Green Star).</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Site access points for users and servicing.</div>	Size/Site Assembly (15%) <div><input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient size and configuration.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Potential for expansion.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Redevelopment of existing urban land rather than Greenfield (Green star).</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Opportunities for future proofing</div>	Citizen Proximity (20%) <div><input type="checkbox"/> Target demographic/user type/user densities (ability to serve existing suburbs as well as new subdivisions at Wigram and Awatea).</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Development is complementary to existing network.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Proximity to complementary activities and services (medical, social, community,retail)</div>	Config/Sustainability (10%) <div><input type="checkbox"/> Street frontage (extent and street type).</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate location of service areas.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Access to or ability to provide open space.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Visual outlook and orientation (Green star).</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Ability for co-location or future partnerships</div>	Profile (10%) <div><input type="checkbox"/> High profile location.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Good perception/acceptability across community.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Consistent with best practice and innovation.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Ability to increase participation levels (located at or near major destinations, has passing traffic).</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Facilitates multi-purpose trips.</div>	Planning/Urban Des (10%) <div><input type="checkbox"/> Alignment with District Plan, South West Area Plan (SWAP), Libraries 2025 Facilities Plan & Aquatic Facilities Plan.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Complements future growth of the city.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Compatibility with existing and/or proposed uses.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Constraints (incl. EQ related, land suitability).</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Low risk of natural hazards</div>	Cost/Availability (20%) <div><input type="checkbox"/> Cost of site purchase.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Availability of site (includes timeframe matters, alignment with rebuild plan, and reliance on completion of non-council processes if applicable).</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Cost to develop (i.e. ground conditions if known).</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Site infrastructure</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Minimal displacement of others.</div>	Total Score
Hypothetical “Ideal Site”	On numerous bus routes and close to suburban interchange/future rail link. Good walking links with main target areas. Close to arterial road links for car access. No local issues with road capacity or parking. Supports multi-purpose trips (many activities located in one area).	Large, undeveloped site with good building potential. Circa 8,000-12,000m2 Room for expansion.	Close to users and serves a wide catchment. Close to a range of other services and facilities. Limited overlap with other service provisions (e.g. other libraries and aquatic facilities).	Good outlook with potential for a strong street frontage on main road and/or high pedestrian use road. Provides opportunity to form partnerships and promote long term sustainability.	High profile location with many other services, facilities and attractions. Likely to encourage single trip/multi use activity. Would be at or near a major destination thereby increasing community participation, promoting overall community wellbeing.	Meets the objectives of the SWAP and the Libraries and Aquatic Plan, plus objectives and rules of the replacement District Plan. Within or very close to identified main centres for activity (e.g. Key Activity Centre (KAC). No issue with other planning legislation (e.g. Reserves Act).	Available for purchase and within budget. Minimal site preparation required (e.g. no demolition of existing structures/buildings and no remediation of the land required). Site acquisition not reliant on completion of non-council controlled processes.	N/A
Denton Park. (Within existing park area)	(70%) Central location convenient for a wide cross-section of potential users. Good access pedestrian links with nearby suburbs and schools. Potentially good PT links, in particular, close to suburban interchange and to any future rail connection. Existing parking in high demand (both that on site and that dedicated to adjoining uses). Main South Road remains under NZTA control. Issues to negate with intensifying use, its noted designs should limit the potential of vehicles performing unsafe U-turns on SH1. Close proximity to proposed new major cycleway.	(90%) Existing uses on site may need to be relocated (in part). Project timing may not align with the future of Denton Oval if this area was considered. Existing parking is well used, although this would depend on what other activities are taking place within the Park. Would reduce the need for dedicated land for open space connected for facility, maximising community use of all spaces. Land use 8,000m2 (+/-), incl. 4,000 m2 building footprint plus parking (i.e. rear Denton Oval 2,000m2, south of Denton Park 1,000m2 and to expand existing rugby provisions \$2,000m2.	(100%) Good location for target demographics and also to capture school traffic through to the mall area. Co-location with a wide variety of other activities with the KAC. Ideal proximity factors to existing network. Slightly removed from newer suburbs at Wigram and Awatea. On doorstep on medium density suburbs.	(100%) Street frontage possible along Main South Road. A generally high profile site within the main retail area of Hornby. Potentially excellent opportunities for outlook and integration into the park from the facility. Opportunity to promote partnerships with existing sport clubs (cricket/Rugby/football/ cycling), clear synergies with leisure functions.	(90%) High profile site within the Hornby KAC. Location near to retail and cultural activity creates opportunities for multi-purpose trips Site location may be perceived as good for access and location but may cause concern over loss of open space and/or existing buildings used by sports groups. Supports multiple-purpose trips (proximity to Hornby KAC). Proximity to McDonalds and SNAFU Bar may detract from profile somewhat.	(70%) Meets the objectives of the SWAP and the Libraries and Aquatic Plan. Reserve Act may apply and loss of open space would be a serious consideration/issue to address. Area is a recreational reserve. Meets objectives of the District Plan (maintain and support Hornby KAC). Zoned Open Space Metropolitan Facilities (proposed District Plan) which anticipates major sports facilities and co-location with community facilities.	(50%) CCC Ownership. High demand for open space and sports ground facilities. Park is a main focus for rugby for the wider area with a number of club buildings on site. Long-term future of Denton Oval to be determined. Current policy maintain as is, only facility of in Christchurch. Favourable ground conditions expected. Sub Option (not scored here) Commercial properties purchase (\$2,750,000 & \$2,700,000). Not Value for Money, but increases profile/access and further negates impact to the park.	80%
Kyle Park (Within existing park area)	(60%) Relatively central location Good access possible by all forms of transport, in particular close to suburban bus interchange and potential for future rail connection. Proposed major cycle way (to northern boundary). Waterloo Rd does have some heavy vehicle restrictions. Supports multiple-purpose trips (proximity to Hornby KAC).	(80%) Sufficient land capacity with potential for expansion. Provides the opportunity to resolve contamination issues from previous site landfill activities.	(80%) Good location for target demographics but also to increase participation from school and mall traffic. Co-location with a wide variety of other activities with the KAC. Good proximity factors to existing network. Slightly removed from newer suburbs at Wigram and Awatea.	(70%) Street frontage limited but still offers reasonable profile due to proximities to the Mall and School. Good potential for outlook onto remaining park area. Opportunity to promote partnerships with existing sports clubs (cricket/Rugby/football/ cycling), clear synergies with leisure functions.	(70%) Reasonable profile site within the Hornby KAC. Lacks strong frontage and passing traffic. May cause concern over loss of open spaces utilised by sports groups. Will facilitate multipurpose trips.	(70%) Reserve Act applies and loss of open space would be a major consideration/issue to address. Area is zoned open space (Resource consent for an activity not anticipated in the zone).Meets objectives of the District Plan (maintain and support Hornby KAC). Zoned Open Space Community Park (proposed District Plan) which anticipates multi-function use.	(50%) CCC Ownership of site. High demand for open space and sports ground facilities. Existing uses on site may need to be relocated (cricket/football) although this are a low standard. Contamination and previous landfill activities	68%
Warren Park	(50%) Bus links (Awatea Road) , offers pedestrian access from adjacent residential area (not centric to main residential suburbs however). Offers poor accessibility to the core service areas of Hei Hei & Masham, conversely, is just 5 km’s from Te Hāpua Halswell Centre. Would generate increased car movementa within catchment.	(100%) Sufficient space currently used as recreational reserve. Offers road access on two elevations (one through residential area however).	(60%) Not in a central location and particularly detached from suburbs to the north of Main South Road; also removed from existing Hornby Library catchment. Located just 5 km’s from Te Hāpua Halswell Centre (Library and outdoor pool).	(50%) Street frontage limited. Less likely to encourage multi-purpose trips. Opportunity to promote partnerships with existing sports football etc, clear synergies with leisure functions.	(50%) Lower profile location, somewhat removed from focus of activities within Hornby.	(50%) Outside of any identified activity centre. Zoned open space community park (proposed District Plan) which anticipates minor sports facilities and potential for multi-function uses in larger parks.	(60%) CCC Ownership of site. High demand for open space and sports ground facilities. Ground conditions unknown (possibility current levels formed through importation of fill).	62%
Sites to be put forward (not already assessed) i.e. from elected members, property consultancy team, consultation processes, agents & developers etc.								



Site	Access/Transport (15%)	Size/Site Assembly (15%)	Citizen Proximity (20%)	Config/Sustainability (10%)	Profile (10%)	Planning/Urban Des (10%)	Cost/Availability (20%)	Total Score
Old South Hornby School site (53 Shands Road)	(60%) Good pedestrian access from surrounding residential area. Bus availability fair.	(80%) Large slightly irregular site. 27,624m ² (would only require a proportion of the site only. Offers road access to 2 elevations.	(90%) Good location for target demographics and to catch some retail traffic. Co-location with a wide variety of other activities with the KAC. Ideal proximity factors to existing network. Has smaller retail hub adjacent (pharmacy etc.).	(40%) Site lacks Road frontage (may be more suited to aquatic functions than that of the Library and Customer service.	(40%) Site has a lower profile a significantly lacks frontage but is at least known as the location of the school. Could lack acceptance from immediate neighbours.	(70%) A large site. Meets the many of the objectives of the SWAP and the Libraries and Aquatic Plan. Zoned Specific Purpose School (District Plan).	(30%) Market value expectation \$5.5m (\$200 p/m ²). Site will be subject to offer backs. Council use would require more visibility from the street ideally further acquisitions. Potential for mixed development with medium density housing. Potential to impact timing due to land negotiation.	60%
452-456 Main South Road. Adjacent to Denton Park SW corner	(70%) Reasonably Central location, within walking distance of suburban bus interchange. Good walking connections to residential area to the west of the site (new medium density zoned housing area). Positioned where Main South Road narrows to two lanes but not located near to an existing pedestrian crossing which may limit pedestrian access from suburbs to the south. Potentially issues with intensifying the use of vehicle access onto Main South Road. Supports multiple-purpose trips (proximity to Hornby KAC).	(70%) Site size would depend on the number of properties acquired. For example, the church site plus motel would yield approximately 4,555m ² (assumed a further 4,000m ² acquired = \$8,555m ²). No opportunity to use existing parking facilities so space would need to be included on site.	(80%) Central location is well placed to serve existing suburbs. More distant from new subdivisions but partly mitigated by location near to a wide variety of other activities and good transport connections due to close proximity to retail centre and suburban bus exchange on Chalmers Street. (car/PT/pedestrian).	(70%) Street frontage potentially to Main South Road and also potential for a north east view across Denton Park. Size will depend of what can be included, which will influence the possible configurations for the site. Visual outlook to Denton Park would be a strong element to the building, particularly as this would be to the north-east.	(70%) Lower profile location, slightly removed from focus of activity within the Hornby KAC, however, location has good visibility on Main South Road and offers the potential to build a higher profile relatively quickly.	(70%) Although not centrally positioned, the site may still be considered as within the Hornby KAC and so meets the objectives of the District Plan and SWAP. Area zoned residential and a mix of Living 1 and 2 zones (requires plan change or at least a resource consent for an activity not anticipated in the zone). Potentially a question mark over replacement of residential properties with other activities from the perspective of residential property supply. Zoned residential (District Plan). Combined facility is not anticipated in the zone. Resource consent and/or plan change likely required.	(10%) Would require the purchase of private land. Availability and confirmed costs would be need to be determined. Estimated \$6,450,000 (\$2,750,000 + \$2,500,000+ \$1,200,000 for residential). Residential properties at 280 p/m ² Viability of acquiring a motel and church questionable. Potential to impact timing due to land negotiation.	60%
Hornby Library (plus acquisition of adjacent parcels (Shands Road and Goulding Ave)	(50%) Central location is accessible. Within walking distance of Suburban bus interchange (although on the south side of Main South Road – a significant physical barrier). Good walking connections to residential area to the south-west and proposed new medium density housing development. Supports multiple-purpose trips (proximity to Hornby KAC).	(40%) Site is of insufficient size to allow for building, car parking and landscaping (1280m ²) Would also require the closure of the existing library during construction. Small site would necessitate acquisitions) Lack of flexibility of how the Library site is used due to shared use of some spaces.	(90%) Central location is well placed to serve existing suburbs. More distant from new subdivisions but partly mitigated by co-location with a wide variety of other activities. Good proximity factors to existing network.	(60%) Street frontage acceptable but not a major road. Limited site size does not allow for sufficient space for service areas and landscaping. Visual outlook is urban. Some opportunity for outlook onto green area of the adjacent proposed housing development could be explored.	(50%) Low profile location behind Dressmart on a minor road. Perception that the existing facility is 'in the wrong place'. Redevelopment may help to raise profile.	(60%) Although not ideally positioned the site is within the Hornby KAC and so meets the objectives of the District Plan and SWAP. Zoned residential (District Plan). Combined facility is not anticipated in the zone. Resource consent and/or plan change likely required.	(30%) CCC Ownership of site (in part) necessitates further acquisitions (surrounding properties medium density residential. Estimated at \$220 p/m ² (7,000m ²) \$1,540,000+ Would most likely require early demolition of the existing facility to progress a new build. Potential to impact timing due to land negotiation.	54%
Waterloo Park (Islington Sq.)	(50%) Public Transport links fair. Templeton bus etc., (may improve post further development) but offers poor pedestrian access to key residential suburbs. Would increase traffic movements from the wider catchment.	(80%) Dependant on confirmed development and parcel available but appears to have sufficient size and scope to accommodate a combined facility.	(50%) Considered to be remote to key user groups.	(50%) Relatively Poor outlook onto main roads and commercial areas. Some potential for integration within wider development. May offer some potential for multipurpose trips dependant on other usages.	(20%) Lower profile location, somewhat removed from focus of activity within Hornby.	(60%) Projected to be mixed use, with commercial (offices, retail and entertainment). With leisure and recreational provisions. Subject to current Resource Consent application. Zoned Industrial General (District Plan).	(20%) Would require the purchase of private land. Availability will be need to be determined. Estimated value circa \$200 p/m ² (10,000m ² = \$2,000,000). Potential to impact timing due to land negotiation.	47%
Wigram Skies	(40%) Serviced by bus routes but distant from suburban interchange at Hornby KAC. Potential for good walking and cycling links within new neighbourhood centre.	(80%) Assumed a number of parcels still available to achieve a total of 10,000m ² , This size may be prudent for future proofing (as surrounding land is likely to be developed and unavailable over time).	(10%) Will serve new Wigram Skies subdivision very well but less so for existing suburbs, particularly those to the north-west of Hornby KAC. Particularly detached from suburbs to the north of Main South Road and removed from existing Hornby Library catchment. Co-location limited to other uses in the neighbourhood centre, not known and not close to established activities. Potential issues of 'ownership' of facility, particularly for residents of existing suburbs.	(30%) Good street frontage potential in new neighbourhood centre. Reasonable outlook's probable.	(50%) High profile within the new subdivision. Lower profile in south-west area as a whole. Risk of facility being perceived as a Wigram subdivision facility rather than for the wider Hornby and south-west area.	(50%) Aligns with District Plan. Less obvious alignment with Libraries plan or aquatic facilities plan, particular with reference to target client areas. Wigram is identified as an emerging Neighbourhood Centre, zoned Commercial Local (proposed District Plan). Community facilities are anticipated in the zone.	(70%) Site (to accommodate the building only) would be made available. Cost and conditions would need to be determined circa \$220 p/m ² also possible flexibility of tenure options (i.e. lease vs. freehold). Estimated freehold \$2,200,000. Potential to impact timing due to land negotiation.	47%

Site	Access/Transport (15%)	Size/Site Assembly (15%)	Citizen Proximity (20%)	Config/Sustainability (10%)	Profile (10%)	Planning/Urban Des (10%)	Cost/Availability (20%)	Total Score
Sockburn Park	(40%) Close to bus routes (one on Blenheim Road, two on Main South Road). Not close a suburban interchange. Walking environment is poor (access requires crossing one of two arterial roads) Walking routes to only one residential suburb, otherwise surrounded by industrial areas.	(80%) CCC controlled site (although subject to Reserves classification). Site compromised by overhead power lines. Large site so future expansion potential exists.	(10%) Not in a central location and in particular distant from some of the main client residential areas. Significant barriers to walking and cycling. Close proximity to Upper Riccarton Library and just 3-4km from Wharenui Swimming Club and sports Centre (Wharenui viability questionable post Metro Sports opening)	(70%) Poor outlook onto main roads and industrial areas. Some potential for configuration to landscaping within the site if the whole site is used.	(40%) Good profile location Located in relative isolation from other activities and likely to be a destination in itself rather than as part of the multi-purpose trip.	(10%) At the extreme edge of the SWAP area and outside of any identified activity centre. Within the catchment of the Upper Riccarton Library. A large site. Zoned open space community park (proposed District Plan) which anticipates minor sports facilities and potential for multi-function uses in larger parks.	(70%) CCC Ownership of site. High demand for open space. Although park could be considered underutilised. Has ground condition issues and contaminates present.	46%
Old Sockburn School site* (18 Springs Road)	(50%) Good pedestrian access from surrounding residential area. Bus availability fair.	(80%) Large slightly irregular site. 34,597m ² (would only require a proportion of the site. Offers road access to 3 elevations (Springs Rd, Garvin Rd and SH73a).	(50%) Not in a central location and in particular distant from some of the main client residential areas. Close proximity to Upper Riccarton Library and 3-4km from Wharenui Swimming Club and sports Centre (Wharenui viability questionable post Metro Sports opening)	(40%) Limited co-location so less likely to encourage multi-purpose trips. Likely to be more a destination in itself.	(50%) Site has a lower profile but is at least known as the location of the school.	(40%) Within the catchment of the Upper Riccarton Library. A large site. Zoned Specific Purpose School (District Plan).	(20%).Market value expectation \$6-7m (\$200 p/m ²). Site will be subject to offer backs; impacts to timing and project delivery period.	46%
Waterloo Park (Islington Sq.)	(50%) Public Transport links fair. Templeton bus etc., (may improve post further development) but offers poor pedestrian access to key residential suburbs. Would increase traffic movements from the wider catchment.	(80%) Dependant on confirmed development and parcel available but appears to have sufficient size and scope to accommodate a combined facility.	(50%) Considered to be remote to key user groups.	(50%) Relatively Poor outlook onto main roads and commercial areas. Some potential for integration within wider development. May offer some potential for multipurpose trips dependant on other usages.	(20%) Lower profile location, somewhat removed from focus of activity within Hornby.	(60%) Projected to be mixed use, with commercial (offices, retail and entertainment). With leisure and recreational provisions. Subject to current Resource Consent application. Zoned Industrial General (District Plan).	(20%) Would require the purchase of private land. Availability will be need to be determined. Estimated value circa \$200 p/m ² (10,000m ² = \$2,000,000). Potential to impact timing due to land negotiation.	47%
The old Sockburn Service Centre	(40%) Three bus routes pass site (one on Blenheim Road, two on Main South Road). Not close a suburban interchange. Walking environment is poor (access requires crossing one of two arterial roads) Walking routes to only one residential suburb, otherwise surrounded by industrial areas.	(100%) Relocation of some Council activities may be required. Large site so future expansion potential exists.	(10%) Not in a central location and in particular distant from some of the main client residential areas. Significant barriers to walking and cycling. Close proximity to Upper Riccarton Library and 3-4km from Swimming Club and sports Centre (Wharenui viability questionable post Metro Sports opening)	(70%) Poor outlook onto main roads and industrial areas. Some potential for configuration to landscaping within the site if the whole site is used.	(40%) High profile location and well known as the site of the former service centre. Located in relative isolation from other activities and likely to be a destination in itself rather than as part of the multi-purpose trip.	(10%) At the extreme edge of the SWAP area and outside of any identified activity centre. Also within the catchment of the Upper Riccarton Library. A large site with potential for good urban design outcomes.	(60%) Site currently controlled by Council (although the site is crown derived land). Possible interest from roading.	40%

Site	Access/Transport (15%)	Size/Site Assembly (15%)	Citizen Proximity (20%)	Config/Sustainability (10%)	Profile (10%)	Planning/Urban Des (10%)	Cost/Availability (20%)	Total Score
Hornby High School [Now Unavailable MOE moving fwd with site redevelopment]	(60%) Accesses constrained and sub-optimal connectivity; with school functions on site. On route of proposed major cycle way. Within walking distance of Hornby KAC.	(60%) Insufficient space to contemplate expansion and or a co-located facility.	(80%) Good location for target demographics and also to capture school traffic and that from the mall area. Potential for partnership with MoE. Good proximity factors to existing network.	(70%) Street frontage limited but still a high profile site within the main area of Hornby. Close to the mall. Potential for outlook and integration with school functions	(70%) Reasonable profile but some users may assume MOE ownership	(80%) Although not ideally positioned would meet many catchment needs. Zoned Specific Purpose School (District Plan).	(60%) Would necessitate partnership agreement with MOE & School. Land arrangement may delay progress.	68%
Chalmers Street (A) Old Bowling Club. [Now Unavailable — site has been developed for retail use]	(70%) Very well located for transport links of all types. Adjacent to suburban bus exchange. On main pedestrian route from Kyle Park and Hornby High School. Parking supplied for other uses in the area.	(90%) Sufficient size for co-location. Bowling green site (single lot) covers an area of 8,992m². Limited for future expansion.	(100%) Centrally located ideal to serve existing catchment for Hornby Library. Less ideally located for Wigram/Awatea neighbourhoods but mitigated by strong co-location elements. Good proximity factors to existing network.	(60%) Strong co-location element promotes sustainable transport options and habits (multi-purpose trips).	(40%) High profile site adjacent to major retail facility and community activity (Hornby working men’s club rooms). Close to main sport and recreation facilities.	(90%) Meets objectives of SWAP, Libraries Plan and District Plan. Zoned Commercial Core (proposed District Plan).	(20%) Site acquisition outright unlikely to be an option. Land owner (HWMC) likely to expect full commercial return from the land which may drive cost upwards. Owner may see the advantages of co-location of facility adjacent to their other holdings.	67%
350 Main South Road. (site comprising 6 Chappie Place and 350 Main South Road) Former Mitre10 Mega Site. Adjacent to new Countdown and new Mitre10 store [Now Unavailable as re-developed]	(60%) Long frontage to Main South Road with pedestrian links only. Vehicle access is via established access points to Chappie Place and Canterbury Streets which both connect to Main South Road. Chappie Place serves as the main access to new Mitre 10 and Countdown stores. Canterbury Street serves Potential to improve walking links across Carman Road as part of the NZTA planned work will improve access to Hornby Hub and bus interchange. The site is on a high frequency bus route.	(90%) Site area 12,000m². Main frontage to Main South Road, but also fronts Chappie Place and Canterbury Street. Currently in one land holding. Other land needs of Council could potentially be accommodated on site (e.g. library storage).	(80%) Central location is well placed to serve existing suburbs. Closer to new subdivisions at Wigram and Awatea. Potential for multi-purpose trips due to close proximity to supermarket and Mitre10 will make the trip more attractive and efficient (i.e. opportunity to combine multiple activities into a single trip). Close proximity to Upper Riccarton Library.	(20%) No opportunity for outlook to existing open space. The site is surrounded by industrial activity/retail activity and car parking. Site is of a sufficient size to potentially accommodate areas of open space within the development. Location near to supermarket and Mitre10 may encourage multi-purpose trips.	(70%) High profile frontage along Main South Road. Also high profile frontage along Chappie Place. This area has grown in profile and activity since the opening of the Countdown supermarket and new Mitre10 mega store.	(50%) Land is zoned Commercial Retail Park (proposed District Plan) and was previously used as large format retail. There should be no issues with the level of activity generated by the facility in relation to the neighbouring uses.	(10%) Site projected for development for retail use. This effectively involves using the site as a Business Retail Park zone, swapping the B4 zone with the new Mitre10 mega site to the north west. This application has now been completed and consent granted. (Consequently the value of the land has likely increased). A large site, not all of it would be required for this facility. Potentially only part of the site would need to be acquired.	64%
Branston Intermediate School Site [Now unavailable due to South Hornby Relocation]	(60%) Situated on a bus route (two services) and within walking distance of the suburban interchange (but some significant barriers). Good walking access to surrounding residential area.	(80%) Large and regular shaped site with access off two roads, including one main road. Whole site may not be required but there is the potential for expansion if appropriate.	(80%) Good location within residential areas of South Hornby but located more distantly from suburbs to the north of Main South Road and the high school. Good proximity factors to existing network.	(70%) Large site so there is the potential to establish a good outlook form the facility. Residential urban setting preferable to industrial setting. Limited co-location so less likely to encourage multi-purpose trips. Likely to be more a destination in itself.	(20%) Site has a lower profile but is at least known as the location of the school. Residents may welcome the facility following the loss of the school (if this eventuates).	(30%) Generally meets the objectives of CCC Plans. Located away form the core of the Hornby KAC but still within the 800m radius. Zoned Specific Purpose School (District Plan).	(20%) Availability of land is dependent on the outcome of the current education review. Land may become available but cost and process unknown at this stage. Likely to be subject to offer backs.	53%



