

---

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

## **JOHNSONVILLE LIBRARY EXPANSION SITE FEASIBILITY STUDY**

---

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

This report presents the results of the feasibility study for the expansion of the Johnsonville Library and recommends the next steps for the project.

### **2. Executive Summary**

Locating an expanded Johnsonville Library next to the Johnsonville Community Centre emerged as the best option from a site feasibility study. The rough order of costs indicates that co-location rather than an integrated hub is possible within the preliminary costings in the Community Facilities Policy implementation plan. However, co-location will not deliver the same outcomes or operational efficiencies as an integrated hub.

While the site feasibility study is an important step forward, there are a host of matters still to be confirmed through the concept design phase. The resolution of these matters rests on the Council's view on whether to pursue library co-location or a hub development. It is recommended that the Council supports in principle an integrated hub development because it is more closely aligned to the strategic intent of the Community Facilities Policy, better supports the land-use planning objectives in Johnsonville, and would generate greater value for users.

The next steps for the project would involve confirming a design concept based on the Council's guidance to pursue either an integrated hub or co-location and putting this initiative in the mix of projects to be prioritised through the long-term plan process.

### **3. Recommendations**

Officers recommend that the Strategy and Policy Committee:

- 1. Receive the information.*
- 2. Agree that the expanded Johnsonville Library should be located next to the Keith Spry Pool and the Johnsonville Community Centre.*



3. *Agree in principle to developing an integrated community facilities hub subject to receiving a formal design concept that addresses:*
  - *the optimal configuration of the hub;*
  - *the most efficient operating model;*
  - *the commercial viability of the retail space; and*
  - *legacy issues, such as the future use of current Johnsonville Library site.*
4. *Note that the timing for the Johnsonville Library expansion is for construction to be completed in 2017/18 and that funding for the project (\$750k in 2015/16, \$4.37m in 2016/17 and \$6.2m in 2017/18) will be placed in the mix of projects to be prioritised through the long-term plan process.*
5. *Instruct officers to explore options for decentralisation of some Council functions to a Johnsonville hub.*

## **4. Background**

The development of a larger purpose built Johnsonville Library is a priority initiative in the Community Facilities Policy implementation plan. The Johnsonville Library is the second busiest suburban library after the Karori Library. It was constructed in 1965 and was built for a suburb less than half its current size and is already perceived by residents to be inadequate. A new purpose built building is essential to take advantage of technology advances as well as have a customer driven community emphasis. An expanded library would also contribute to the outcomes of the Northern Growth Management Framework. As such, the implementation plan scheduled a new library to be constructed over 2016/17 and 2017/18 at a preliminary cost of \$11.6m.

## **5. Discussion**

### **5.1 Site Feasibility Study**

CCM Architects were commissioned to lead a team to undertake a site feasibility study for the relocation and expansion of the Johnsonville Library. Their brief was to identify appropriate sites in the Johnsonville Town Centre, ascertain whether each site was capable of meeting the minimum requirements for an expanded library, and evaluate their relative merits. The following table outlines the four sites identified and their overall scores (where the lower score is better).

	<b>SITE ONE:</b> Retain the library on the current site (Broderick Road)	<b>SITE TWO:</b> Co-locate library with swimming pool and community centre (Moorefield Road)	<b>SITE THREE:</b> Locate library within a redeveloped Johnsonville Mall (at first floor level)	<b>SITE FOUR:</b> Locate library on the Mobil Site (at intersection of Moorefield and Johnsonville Roads)
Suitability for Function	14	4	12	13
Image and Identity	6	4	7	5
Accessibility	14	7	11	11
Contribution to the Public Environment	8	2	9	5
Feasibility	12	9	11	11
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>45</b>

Appendix A contains the full summary table of the Comparative Site Analysis. It outlines that Site Two, co-locating the library with swimming pool and community centre, is the vastly superior option. This conclusion should not be unexpected given that some of the evaluation criteria, particularly under Suitability for Function, relate to the extent to which community facilities are co-located and Site Two is the only option where co-location is able to be achieved. It should also be noted that when shared services and operational efficiency-related criteria are removed, Site Two is still comfortably ahead of the other sites (22 points for Site Two compared to 36 points for Site One, 33 points for Site Three, and 28 points for Site Four).

The value of the analysis is that it provides the Council comfort about the extent to which Site Two meets the strategic direction of the Community Facilities Policy. If another site was in touching distance of Site Two then it should be seriously considered as the cost-benefit ratio would likely be superior. However, given this is not the case, it is recommended that the Council support further work on Site Two. This involves developing a concept design, as there are many potential configurations for a community facilities hub, and establishing more specific costings and operating model.

## **5.2 Johnsonville Hub rough order of costs**

CCM Architects developed a series of provisional options for how the co-location of a library with the aquatic centre and community centre could work. Appendix B contains notional floor plans. The purpose of this work was to provide assurance a community facilities hub could work on that site and provide the basis for the following rough order of costs could be developed:

	<b>Rough Order of Costs</b>	<b>Impl'n Plan estimate</b>
<b>Base library development:</b> Achieves a single-floor library with a sufficient floor area to meet forecasted demand, with a shared north-western entrance with Keith Spry Pool. It is contingent on being supported by a ground floor structure from Moorefield Road – a basement development – and includes a car parking deck (80 parks) costing \$1.92m.	\$10.89m	\$11.6m
<b>Basement development:</b> Creates a street entrance from Moorefield Road, 560m <sup>2</sup> of retail space (with associated commercial risk), and a community space for young people (208m <sup>2</sup> ) that assists connections to the community centre.	\$1.48m	-
<b>Community centre expansion:</b> Creates additional community centre space to complete a strong frontage on Moorefield Road and reconfigures the space for better integration with the library and the pool.	\$2.36m	-
<b>Residential development:</b> For completeness, CCM included an option where apartments were developed above the library to act as an exemplar in promoting the type of built form desired through recent plan changes and to assist off-setting the capital costs of the full project (which has commercial risk).	\$4.48m	-

The rough order of costs highlights that co-locating the library on a single floor, which is optimal for operational efficiency, is likely to be greater than the preliminary costing in the Community Facilities Policy implementation plan – being the base library development plus the basement totalling \$12.37m (excluding fit-out costs) compared to \$11.6m.

Undertaking the additional work to create an integrated community hub, which would generate additional operating efficiencies, is estimated to cost an extra \$2.36m (excluding fit-out costs) which would take the total project cost to around \$16m when fit-out costs are included.

### ***5.2.1 Co-location of the library***

It is possible to bring the project within the initial \$11.6m estimate by co-locating the library without physically connecting to the community centre or pool. The savings could be achieved by either:

- spreading the library over two floors, forgoing the retail and community space, and developing a fragmented parking solution (which would generate additional operating costs from servicing a library on two floors); or
- retaining the library on one floor, forgoing the retail and community space, and placing the car parking deck either below the library (which would mean there was a car parking building at ground level along Moorefield Road) or above the library (which would further separate the library from other the facilities on site and has poor urban design outcomes).

An initial rough order of costs indicates a co-location approach may cost around \$9.5m. However, co-location would not meet the strategic intent of the Community Facilities Policy to the same extent as an integrated hub nor would it deliver the same level of service delivery benefits and efficiencies.

### ***5.2.2 Broad options for the concept design phase***

As such, the Council is faced with two broad options when moving into the concept design phase:

- Library co-location – staying close to the 2009 estimate, which may exclude the retail development and may involve the library being housed on two floors (with diminished efficiencies); or
- Integrated hub development – expanding the budget to accommodate a single floor library, enhanced community centre space, and better integration between all facilities. It may include integration of the kindergarten if it creates a more efficient and cost-effective hub configuration.

While the site feasibility study is an important step forward, there are a host of matters to be confirmed through the concept design phase including:

- determining the optimal configuration of the facility spaces;
- establishing the most efficient operational model;
- verifying the commercial viability of the retail space; and
- determining the future of the current Johnsonville Library site

The resolution of these matters clearly depends on the Council's view on whether to pursue library co-location or an integrated hub development. It will also influence the proposed capex programme put forward as part of the deliberations on the content of the draft long-term plan, with the hub option being greater than the \$11.6m estimate from the implementation plan.

## ***5.3 Comparison between co-location and an integrated hub development***

### ***5.3.1 Operational savings***

While it is difficult to quantify potential savings without a developed concept, an integrated hub is expected to deliver greater operational efficiencies than co-located services. Some areas of potential savings from an integrated hub include:

- shared reception functions and payment services
- a streamlined management structure (such as a single facility manager)
- shared backroom services (such as a single staffroom), office equipment, and low-value assets (such as whiteboards)
- shared marketing and programming activity
- energy costs by redistributing heat from Keith Spry Pool

The value of these savings may be in the vicinity of \$250,000 per annum. However, these savings will only be able to be verified once there is a finalised concept design. These savings would be partially off-set by the additional costs in financing and maintaining a larger floor area.

In contrast, the co-location option would generate additional costs from servicing a library that was housed on two floors and very modest savings from co-ordinating activities between the facilities.

### ***5.3.2 Recreation services and community programmes***

An integrated hub would have strengths in service provision that would be difficult to replicate in a co-located model. First, there is likely to be greater scope in developing co-ordinated programmes between the library, pool, and community centre as the new spaces in the integrated hub would be designed with shared use in mind.

Second, the space needed to retain the library on a single floor in the integrated hub is the catalyst for pursuing a more comprehensive car parking solution. Developing a car parking deck will improve access to all facilities in the hub, whereas there is a possibility that a co-located facility will revert to a collection of fragmented parking spaces.

Finally, research has shown that people who are active in a particular area of community life are more likely to participate in new activities. Therefore, increasing the amount of shared space in an integrated hub, increases the possibility of reaching amenable non-participants for any other activities.

### ***5.3.3 Land-use planning and destination-making***

While both co-location and an integrated hub make substantial strides in supporting the land-use planning objectives in Johnsonville, an integrated hub goes further in creating a destination. The initial design work on an integrated hub identified the development a strong and consistent edge along Moorfield Road as an important component in building the identity of the facility and creating good connections to the town centre. In contrast, a co-location approach would have an inconsistent frontage, with multiple unconnected entry points, and a comparatively weak edge with poorer connections to the town centre.

## ***5.4 Fit with the Community Facilities Policy***

The Community Facilities Policy implementation plan outlined a staged approach to developing community spaces and libraries as follows:

- Aro Valley catchment (\$0.98m, completed 2015/16)
- Central library refresh & electronic systems (\$14.88m, completed 2015/16)
- Strathmore catchment (\$1.00m, completed 2016/17)
- Johnsonville Library expansion (\$11.6m, completed 2017/18)

- Newtown catchment (\$2.745m, completed 2018/19)
- Island Bay library and community space co-location (\$0.45k, study 2019/20)
- Kilbirnie catchment (\$3.78m, completed 2020/21)

The strategic intent of the policy is to encourage integrated service delivery across the community facilities portfolio (aquatics, libraries, community spaces) and to ensure there is a consistent provision of facilities across geographic catchments. While this project is a high priority, it is second to the Central Library refresh and implementation of RFID largely because the Central Library project will have impact across the network, has a stronger cost-benefit ratio, and positions the entire network for the future.

Having said that, the Johnsonville project offers some opportunities for a wider look at our service delivery options in the northern suburbs. There has been some concern that centralisation of our business functions is not ideal in the circumstances of a significant emergency that affects the CBD. The Tawa Community Centre is set-up for an emergency response but the Canterbury earthquakes have demonstrated that there is a need for both disaggregated service delivery and the ability to restore core business activities in alternative sites. This project offers the opportunity to explore the decentralisation of some services in a considered manner.

However, projects emerging from the implementation plan will not be the only initiatives in the community facilities portfolio that will require prioritisation as part of the long-term plan process. First, there are legacy issues that need to be looked at, such as the Band Rotunda which requires structural strengthening and refurbishment of the community space. Second, the Council will need to determine its approach to earthquake-prone buildings in the community facilities portfolio. While the Smart Newtown building, next to the Newtown Library, is the only known earthquake-prone community facility, it is unlikely to be the last. Finally, there are likely to be community-driven projects that will seek financial support from the Council through the consultation process, such as an expectation that proceeds from the divestment of St John's Hall in Karori would be allocated to the Karori Events Centre.

As such, the Council will be faced with the challenging task of prioritising a suite of strategic initiatives emerging from the Community Facilities Policy alongside a host of projects to address issues with existing facilities.

### **5.5 Next steps**

The next steps for the project would involve confirming a design concept based on the Council's guidance to pursue either an integrated hub or co-location and putting this initiative in the mix of projects to be prioritised through the long-term plan process.



## **5.6 Consultation and Engagement**

Officers have met with representatives from the Wellington Kindergarten Association, Johnsonville Tennis Club, and Johnsonville Community Centre about the feasibility study. They were all supportive of co-locating the expanded library with the community centre and pool and even though they had specific concerns, they all expressed a belief that these could be satisfactorily resolved in the interests of progressing a project they saw as being important for Johnsonville. The provision of adequate car parking was a concern shared by all the organisations.

There will be a comprehensive community engagement programme to support the concept design phase, particularly if the Council complete the integrated hub option.

## **5.7 Financial Considerations**

There are no immediate financial implications emerging from this report. There is adequate funding in the current financial year to undertake the concept design phase.

## **5.8 Climate Change Impacts and Considerations**

The concept design phase will incorporate sustainable design practices, such as exploring the redistribution of heat from Keith Spry Pool and incorporating energy efficiency features into the development.

## **5.9 Long-Term Plan Considerations**

This project is part of a suite of initiatives to emerge from the Community Facilities Policy that will be put forward as part of the deliberations on the content of the draft long-term plan.

## **6. Conclusion**

Locating an expanded Johnsonville Library next to the Johnsonville Community Centre emerged as the best option from a site feasibility study. The rough order of costs indicates that co-location rather than an integrated hub is possible within the preliminary costings in the Community Facilities Policy implementation plan. However, co-location will not deliver the same outcomes or operational efficiencies as an integrated hub. The next steps for the project would involve confirming a design concept based on the Council's guidance to pursue either an integrated hub or co-location and putting this initiative in the mix of projects to be prioritised through the long-term plan process.

Contact Officer: *Jaime Dyhrberg, Principal Advisor Strategic Projects and Advice*

## Supporting Information

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

*The development of an integrated community facilities hub would contribute to the People-centred City goal of Wellington 2040. In particular, it would support growing the unique identities of our suburbs and fostering active communities that support innovation and resilience.*

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

*The project is contained in the Annual Plan programme # C467. There is adequate funding in the programme to complete the concept design in the current financial year.*

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

*There are no Treaty of Waitangi implications emerging from this report.*

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

*This is not a significant decision. The report sets out two options that would inform the concept design phase of the project.*

### **5) Consultation**

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

*There has been consultation with representatives of organisations immediately affected by locating an expanded library with the community centre and pool. There will be a comprehensive engagement programme to support the concept design phase, particularly if the Council supports the integrated hub option.*

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

*There has been no consultation with Maori in preparing this report.*

### **6) Legal Implications**

*There are no legal implications emerging from this report.*

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

*This report progresses an aspect of the Community Facilities Policy implementation plan. It recommends the Council support in principle an integrated community facilities hub which is consistent with the strategic intent of this policy.*