

<b>Officer responsible</b> Property Manager	<b>Author</b> Property Projects Manager, Angus Smith
Corporate Plan Output: Capital Output Asset Improvement 8.9.32	

The purpose of this report is to follow up on the recent Council and Community Board Seminars and public consultation process on this issue. The report contains the latest information on the accommodation options to meet the Spreydon Library’s demand for additional space and seeks approval to proceed with one of those options.

This report has been presented to:

- (a) The Community Board for information and comment.
- (b) The Community Services Committee for comment and recommendation in respect of the location/siting options as they relate to library service delivery.
- (c) The Parks and Recreation Committee for information and comment in respect of parks reclassification as it relates to one of the options.
- (d) The Strategy and Resources Committee with a view to it making a recommendation to Council on the preferred library accommodation option.

#### PROPERTY BACKGROUND

**Site:** The Spreydon Library is situated in the southern corner of Barrington Park next to the Barrington Mall complex.

**Legal Description:** Lot 1 DP 63938 Gazette Notice 72/2077 (Library) (1870m<sup>2</sup>)

**Designation:** By declaration that the land is a Public Reserve, pursuant to the Reserves and Domains Act 1953.

*“The Minister of Lands hereby notifies that the following resolution was passed by the Christchurch City Council on the 8th day of September 1972.*

*That in exercise of the powers conferred on it by Section 13, Reserve and Domains Act 1953. The Christchurch City Council hereby resolves that the piece of land held by the Mayor, Councilors and citizens of the said city, in fee simple and described in the Schedule hereto, shall be and the same is hereby declared to be a public reserve for library purposes within the meaning of the said Act.”*

**Park:** In 1923 at the request of Spreydon residents, the Christchurch City Council purchased 14 acres of land with a wide frontage on Barrington Street for the purpose of a park and recreation ground.

#### **UNIQUE COLLECTION OF TREES**

In August 1924 as part of the City's Arbor Day celebrations the well known nurseryman, the late Mr Robert Nairn, donated a valuable collection of weeping and horizontal-branched trees which were planted at the southern end of the park, now directly behind the library. This collection includes the weeping elm, the horizontal elm, the weeping ash, the weeping golden ash, the kilmarnock willow, the weeping rowan, the weeping birch, a horizontal thorn and a weeping thorn. A number of these trees occupy the land, which was gazetted in 1972 to be a public reserve for **Library purposes** (refer above).

#### **DISABLED CHILDREN'S PLAYGROUND**

Also occupying the northeastern end of the land designated for library purpose is a children's playground. Officers from the Parks Unit have advised that there was a budget provision of \$35,000 in the 1998/99 Annual Plan for the replacement/upgrade and relocation of this playground. This has been carried forward to 1999/2000 and the project is currently on hold awaiting resolution of the library issues.

#### **LIBRARY BACKGROUND**

In the early 1970s the Spreydon Library was built to meet the demands of the local community. The building contains a ground floor area of approximately 261m<sup>2</sup> and a mezzanine floor of 87m<sup>2</sup>. There is no off-street parking. Public toilets serving the park adjoin the library to the north.

The building was designed by Christchurch architect George Lucking of Lucking and Vial and at the time won a bronze medal from the Canterbury branch of the New Zealand Institute of Architects for design. The building has no national or heritage significance, although its local significance would not be in doubt. The building is well designed and well balanced.

The existing library is now too small to meet current and future service requirements; it does not meet national standards for suburban libraries. To meet this demand a far greater area is required (approximately an additional 500m<sup>2</sup>) as set out in the table below.

## PROPOSED SPREYDON LIBRARY – FLOOR SPACE ANALYSIS

<b>Space breakdown:</b>	
Public area: adult, children, reference, display and public desks, and circulation area	555 sq m
Activities room/media centre	45 sq m
Workroom and office	130 sq m
Service areas: staffroom, toilets (both staff and public), storage and cleaners cupboard	80 sq m
Council information and services	40 sq m
<b>Total</b>	<b>850 sq m</b>

<b>New Zealand Public Library Standards</b>	
Community Libraries serving populations of:	
15,000	<b>870 sq m</b>
20,000	<b>1195 sq m</b>
Spreydon's catchment: 18,000 population	

### HISTORY

Expansion of the Spreydon Library was first identified as a requirement in 1993 as part of a development and enhancement plan for suburban libraries. In 1996 budget provision was made and action initiated to fulfill this requirement. Subsequently, a report was developed in 1998 outlining nine options, the advantages and disadvantages of each, and associated issues.

The report was presented in May 1998 to the Parks and Recreation Committee and the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board, then again in June to the Community Services Committee. The latter seeking direction for further progression.

The options presented were as follows:

Option 1 – Extend the existing library to the rear of the existing building.
Option 2 – Extend the existing library to the rear with building alteration design allowing for unique tree retention.
Option 3 – Two storey development including existing and to rear of existing building.
Option 4 – Extension into park along Barrington Street.
Option 5 – Barrington Mall development.
Option 6 – Purchase of land from Mall developers.
Option 7 – Lyttelton Street yard.
Option 8 – Beckenham Service Centre.
Option 9 – Purchasing residential property adjacent to the Mall.

The Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board resolved 5 May 1998:

*“Members when considering the report agreed that there was a need to expand the existing premises but were also strongly in favour of retaining the trees.*

*The Board decided to advise the appropriate Standing Committees:*

- 1. That the Board accepts the expansion into Barrington Park (option 4) and the extension to the rear of the existing building (option 1 and 2) are not feasible options.*
- 2. That the Board prefers the library to be developed on a single level with a desired floor area of 850m<sup>2</sup>, alternative premises in the Barrington vicinity should be further investigated (option 9).*
- 3. That if the outcomes of the foregoing investigations were not viable then option 3 should be proceeded with.*
- 4. That when a decision had been made on a preferred option the views of the community should be sought.”*

The Parks and Recreation Committee considered the same report 13 May 1998 and resolved:

*“The Committee decided to recommend to the Community Services Committee that because the removal of unique trees will be required, the request to extend the Spreydon Library into Barrington Park be declined and the Property Unit be requested to look for an alternative site for the library.”*

Both reports were considered by the Council on 27 May 1998.

*“It was resolved, further that the Community Services Committee be requested to analyse the cost implications of the various options when it considers this issue.”*

A brief report was submitted to the Community Services Committee on 8 June 1998 outlining the above mentioned meeting results and sought the Community Services Committee’s recommendation as to the course of action the Property Unit should take. It was resolved:

*“The Committee noted the options detailed in the previous reports, in particular options 3 and 9 relating to a two storey development on the existing site or the option of purchasing nearby property for the construction of a new library.*

*The Committee decided:*

- 1. That the information be received.*
- 2. That the Property Manager and Libraries Manager be asked to investigate alternative options 3 and 9 so as to allow the retention of the unique tree collection and report back to a further meeting of the Committee.*

*In accordance with the Council resolution of 27 May 1998 cost implications of the various options would then be considered.*

#### **CURRENT SITUATION**

Option 9 has been exhausted. There are no opportunities due to some residents' unwillingness to sell. Notwithstanding this, purchasing developed residential properties can be an expensive way to obtain clear site(s).

Options 5-8 were also discounted in the original report for various reasons.

In December 1998 an opportunity presented itself to lease some space in Barrington Mall. A plan of the space available is tabled, along with a site plan indicating positioning within the Mall development.

It should be noted that this space is part of the original Barrington Mall and is the last stage for development. Accordingly it is not in the best condition for presentation and some vision is required to recognise its potential. Some tenants have recently taken up occupancy in the immediately adjoining spaces e.g. Hammer Hardware and a Steak House.

Over this last year staff have worked with a number of Councillors in discussing and resolving which options to pursue. This has been a frustrating and difficult process for everyone involved as there is no perfect solution; all options involve some form of compromise. In an effort to bring this matter to some form of conclusion and ensure all decision makers were familiar with the issues and had a common understanding, a joint seminar session of the Community Board and Councillors was held on 2 September 1999. This was followed by a lengthy meeting of the Community Board on 22 September 1999. This involved a site visit and culminated in the Community Board resolving to present options 2 and 4 below as options which encompass the significant local issues upon which community consultation was sought. This process involved public advertisements and displays in the library inviting community views. This programme ran for a three week period from 4 October 1999 to 22 October 1999 and included a public meeting on 11 October 1999. The outcome of this process is to be reported by the Community Board to the Committees by way of a supplementary report.

As a result of the last few years' work and more recent efforts the search for solutions has been narrowed down to four options that are considered the most practical for achieving the Council's library service delivery objectives, these are (plans tabled):

**Option 1**

Single level rear addition to the existing library.

**Option 2**

Demolition of the existing building replaced by a new single level library at the rear of the site.

**Option 3**

Demolition of the existing library to be replaced by a new two storey library in the same position.

**Option 4**

Moving to Barrington Mall

**Option 1 – Single Level Rear Addition to the Existing Building**

This option extends the existing building directly to the rear at a single storey level to provide the additional area. Although this option costs the least the Community Board considered it had significant disadvantages. Of all the options it has the greatest impact on the notable trees. Along with Option 3, it is the least desirable in respect of parking design, access and pedestrian safety.

<i>Advantages</i>	<i>Disadvantages</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The addition fits on to the existing building.</li> <li>• Parking would be provided on site.</li> <li>• Retains street frontage to library and an architecturally significant building.</li> <li>• Most cost effective options.</li> <li>• Minor disruption to current operation.</li> <li>• Operationally suitable for the library.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of other trees along southern boundary.</li> <li>• Increases building asset value on park land – limited future residual value.</li> <li>• Affects notable trees, two relocated and one removed.</li> <li>• A notified resource consent is required.</li> <li>• Engineering solution is required to protect tree roots in parking areas.</li> <li>• Stormwater drain to be built over.</li> <li>• Possible public reaction.</li> <li>• Continuation of pedestrian safety issues.</li> </ul>

## **Option 2 – Demolition of the Existing Building Replaced by New Single Library at the Rear of the Site**

Promoted by the Community Board as a basis for seeking community views, it is important to note that this would involve the reclassification and taking of park land at the eastern end of the existing library title. Under this Option the existing building is demolished and replaced with car parking to be exited and entered from a point between the library and the Memorial Gates.

<i>Advantages</i>	<i>Disadvantages</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking would be provided on site.</li> <li>• Retains library with a street frontage.</li> <li>• Second most cost effective option.</li> <li>• No disruption to current operation.</li> <li>• Operationally most suitable for the library.</li> <li>• Provides a good pedestrian solution.</li> <li>• Demonstrated commitment to tree retention.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of other trees along southern boundary.</li> <li>• Increasing building asset value on park land – limited future residual value.</li> <li>• Affects notable trees, two relocated and one, which is not considered a good specimen, is removed.</li> <li>• Requires taking of some park land and therefore reclassification process.</li> <li>• A notified resource consent is required.</li> <li>• Engineering solution is required to protect tree roots in parking areas.</li> <li>• Possible public reaction.</li> <li>• Existing building demolished.</li> </ul>

## **Option 3 – Demolition of the Existing Library to be Replaced by New Two Storey Library in the Same Position**

This Option was not promoted as one of the preferred options by the Community Board for public consultation. It is least desirable from a library operational and customer perspective. It has similar car parking and pedestrian safety issues as Option 1. It is the most disruptive operation to library services during the construction/development period. The existing building is demolished.

<i>Advantages</i>	<i>Disadvantages</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses less ground space with unique trees therefore remaining.</li> <li>• Parking would be provided on site.</li> <li>• Retains library with a street frontage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased maintenance and administration.</li> <li>• Engineering solution is required to protect tree roots in parking areas.</li> <li>• Library would need to relocate during construction.</li> <li>• Least attractive from library's operational perspective – least efficient. Additional staff resource required.</li> <li>• Stormwater drainage issue.</li> <li>• Notified Resource Consent required.</li> <li>• Continuation of pedestrian safety issues.</li> <li>• Existing building demolished.</li> </ul>

#### **Option 4 – Moving to Barrington Mall**

The property offered in the mall can be secured either under a lease or through purchase.

The space would be tidied up to bare shell ready for fitout. The available space is approximately 790m<sup>2</sup> on the ground floor with a further 226m<sup>2</sup> on the first floor if desired, total 1015m<sup>2</sup>.

<i>Advantages</i>	<i>Disadvantages</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good access and parking.</li> <li>• More space than required 166m<sup>2</sup> for future library or related growth.</li> <li>• Additional space provides flexibility and other possible opportunities.</li> <li>• Avoids notified resource consent.</li> <li>• Trees and open space retained.</li> <li>• No disruption to current operation.</li> <li>• Existing building or site available for alternative community use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leaves existing Spreydon Library surplus to requirements.</li> <li>• No street frontage.</li> <li>• Most costly option.</li> <li>• Ownership has constraints in respect of future flexibility for redevelopment.</li> <li>• Costs associated with conversion to alternative community uses.</li> <li>• Loss of identity and presence least attractive – not a focal point.</li> <li>• Purchase sees Council owning a building already substantially through its life cycle.</li> </ul>

In the public excluded section of this report are summarised the commercial details of the lease and purchase arrangements.

## CONSENT PROCESSES

It should be noted that Options 1-3 do not comply with some of the bulk and location requirements of the Transitional and Proposed District Plans and a resource consent would be required to deal with these matters. These options do not have sufficient onsite car parking to meet Transitional Plan requirements but do for the more recent Proposed Plan.

Non-notified consents should be processed in a 20 day working period. Any application that becomes notified could have a less defined period for conclusion. The notification process is to advertise within 10 working days of receiving the notification decision. This remains open to submissions for 21 days. There is an obligation to hold a hearing on submissions within 25 days, the decision of which should be released in 15 days. This is followed by a 15 day appeal period. Any appeals unless settled and withdrawn by negotiation will go to the Environment Court, where the timeframes for results are indeterminable. In summary non-notified applications can be processed in 20 working days, notified **no less** than 71 working days without appeal, 86 working days at best with appeals.

In addition Option 2 involves encroachment by a new library building on to park land, which is currently recreation reserve. It is important to note that no specific design work for a new library under this option has yet been commissioned, pending clarification of whether this option is one the Council wishes to pursue. Hence the degree of encroachment and the opportunity for compensatory “land swap” from that part of Barrington Park which is presently classified as reserve for library purposes, has not yet been determined.

The utilisation of recreation reserve for library purposes will involve a parks reclassification process under the Reserves Act and a variation to the City Plan to effect a zone change.

The process under the Reserves Act involves public notification, submissions and the consent of the Minister of Conservation.

The current library title is zoned Business 2, different from that of Barrington Park proper. A variation to the City Plan is required to reflect boundary adjustment so that the new boundary of the library title falls within the B2 zone. The Plan change process can run in parallel with the park land reclassification process.

From the date of resolution to proceed a minimum of five months would be needed to complete the process. Should there be submissions in opposition to the intended action a further 2–3 months would be required to allow for hearing procedures.

Under this scenario the chances of successfully achieving a larger library site are believed likely to depend on the public perception of the aims to be achieved. The additional land required under Option 2 does not involve notable trees per se but the attitude of actual or potential parties to the reclassification process will likely be influenced by how the Council addresses trees-related issues in the context of the existing library title land, the degree to which through siting and design it seeks to minimise tree loss and undertake compensatory planting.

## **FINANCIAL ANALYSIS**

To consider the viability of relocating the library to space in Barrington Mall we have considered the options utilising an “apples for apples” analysis and comparison.

Accordingly the construction costs of the various options have been comparatively costed by an independent quantity surveyor with input from Parks and Water Services where required. These costs have been used in a 10 year discounted cashflow analysis to provide comparable net present value accommodation costs of providing such service.

### **Assumptions**

- In analysing the service delivery costs for the Barrington Mall options the existing library, which would become surplus to requirements, is retained in Council ownership but no future income is derived from it.
- The asset value of either building is the same at the beginning and end of the analysis period i.e. there is no capital gain or loss.
- Library fit-out is common to all options and therefore not costed or included.
- The cash flows are discounted at the Council’s cost of capital 6%.
- No inflation on rents, operating costs, capital invested in assets.
- Operating costs exclude depreciation and cost of capital.
- Options 1 & 2 include costs assessed for lost tree value calculated using a formula provided for in the City Plan and a 50% probability of survival with the conception of the single tree under each to be removed which is put in at its full loss in value.
- Option 3 includes:
  - \$35,000 per annum for additional staff requirements.
  - \$100,000 for temporary relocation during construction.
- The option(s) assume the asset value of existing library is maintained, but generates no revenue.

## FINANCIAL SUMMARY

Option	Description	Cost NPV	Difference	Costs in First Year Compared to budget provisions	
				Capital	Operating
1	Single level rear addition	(\$791,753) <i>(\$732,600)</i>	Base Cost	-\$729,600	Same
2	New single level building at rear of site	(\$1,155,079) <i>(\$1,082,506)</i>	\$363,326 <i>(\$349,906)</i>	-\$358,700	Same
3	New two storey building	(\$1,515,792) “	\$724,040 <i>(\$783,192)</i>	-\$305,700	+\$35,000
4a	Move to Mall (lease)	(\$1,996,014) “	\$1,204,261 <i>(\$1,263,414)</i>	-\$1,914,000	+\$234,500
4b	Move to Mall (purchase)	(\$1,503,988) “	\$771,388 <i>(\$918,558)</i>	+\$86,000	Same

Figures in italics show the 10 year cost without an assessment of lost value (cost) in the event that the trees die.

## PERTINENT FACTORS

Should the library relocate to Barrington Mall the existing library facility will become surplus to requirements. It would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to create a fee simple title through revoking the reserve status. There is a possibility that the existing building could be used for an alternative community purpose or a complementary commercial use to the park i.e. cafe. Any non-complying activity will require a resource consent application, which would require public notification.

Should such alternative uses be unattainable the likely result is that the library designation would be uplifted and the underlying reserve status would prevail and therefore conversion back to park is highly likely.

There is a current budget provision of \$2 million for this project. Please note this report deals only with the building/property issues associated with sourcing suitable accommodation. The library soft fit-out is assumed to be equivalent for all options and the Libraries Unit has a separate budget provision for this.

The opportunity to obtain the space in Barrington Mall will only be available for a limited period. The developer claims to be deferring negotiations with other retail prospects, as he would prefer to secure the Council as a tenant but cannot do this indefinitely. Therefore, there is a risk that this space will not be available indefinitely.

The owners have intimated that they will be an objector for expansion of the current library on the park, on the basis of inadequate parking. We believe that this can be avoided through complying with planning requirements by supplying the required number of car parks in any of the on the park options.

Where possible the Council should avoid the development of substantial improvements on park/reserve land, as they invariably have no long-term residual commercial value. For these reasons, adding on to the existing library in this instance could constrain future options.

The plans of the options tabled show the effect on trees and park land.

It must be noted that pedestrian and traffic safety are significant concerns in relation to the existing library. A traffic impact assessment of library accommodation options has been undertaken. This is summarised in Appendix 1 (tabled). Also tabled as Appendix 2 is a summary of the design improvements possible to overcome deficiencies associated with the options. The full report by the traffic consultants is available. The conclusion from this assessment is as follows:

“Options 1 and 3 have had several deficiencies identified which would lead to under utilisation of the car park facilities. The major concern is the positioning of the car park at the rear of the site where it would be obscured from view from the road and would not be able to provide a good pedestrian link between the car park and the main entrance. The lack of separation between the Mall and Library access driveways and unsafe use of the pedestrian refuge would also be of concern.

Option 2 has been identified as the best option for continued use of the existing site as the off-street car parking and access are well placed relative to the library entrance and existing traffic facilities on Barrington Street, namely the pedestrian refuge and the Barrington Mall entry/exit driveway.

The options to move to the Mall, Option 4(a) and 4(b), have been identified as viable alternatives to Option 2 as surveys have indicated up to 50% of Library users also use Barrington Mall during the same visit. The Mall options are identical in terms of traffic function and both would increase convenience for common users, as well as enabling an increase in general pedestrian safety.”

It is possible that some of the deficiencies identified for Option 1 could be overcome through development of shared access/parking arrangements with the Mall. Pedestrian safety could be further improved by modifications to the Mall ingress/egress with Barrington Street. It has proved not practical to progress this issue until the Council’s position with respect to Option 4 is resolved, as it requires the active co-operation of the Mall owners.

## **STRATEGY FOR SUBURBAN LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT**

The strategy for the location and placement of libraries was first articulated by John Stringleman, City Librarian, in a report in 1968. It was revised and formalised by Dorothea Brown, Libraries Manager, as part of the enhancement projects in 1993-94. This strategy has seen the development of a ring of libraries surrounding the Central City Library at a distance of some 3.5 to 4 kilometres from the Central City. The rationale behind the strategy has a number of key points:

- Each suburban location is considered to serve a population within a 1.5 kilometre radius from the library, this being considered a maximum reasonable walking distance for the average person.
- Wherever possible the library has been sited adjacent to a significant suburban shopping complex so that customers can access other services at the same time.
- A catchment population of 10,000 is considered an optimum size for the location of a suburban library. However, where a community is identifiable by its geography, and is isolated from other parts of the city, a smaller population size would be considered for the siting of a community library, eg Sumner is a case in point.

The report “Suburban Service Delivery, beyond 1996” further confirmed the Library’s strategy for community library service development in bringing together the counter services function of the service centres and co-locating these with libraries wherever possible. The new joint library and service centre at Fendalton, currently under construction is part of the development resulting from this review.

In 1998 the City Manager, through an internal management review, further confirmed the work of the Suburban Service Delivery review by bringing together the management of libraries and of counter services into one unit.

The library strategy as it relates to the south area has resulted in an extended library in Spreydon, a full community library in St Martins, and a small extension to the Halswell Library some five years ago. The question of the location of the Beckenham Service Centre was to be considered in relation to the new St Martins Library, rather than the Spreydon Library which was awaiting its extension to an 850 square metre addition at the time of the Suburban Service Delivery report. The relocation of the Beckenham Service Centre was subject to community consultation before a final decision was to be made.

The size of the proposed community library at Spreydon is seen to be adequate to meet the population it is currently serving for a period of 15 to 20 years. It is not considered that its catchment will grow significantly during this period. Development on the Huntsbury Hill area is considered to be part of the catchment for the St Martins Library. Wigram developments are unlikely to have an effect on the Spreydon Library. It is considered that they are more likely to have an impact on Hornby, the new Upper Riccarton/Avonhead library – or even Halswell.

#### **SUMMARY**

The range for the ten year cashflow present values over the four options is \$791,753 (Option 1 – rear addition to the existing Spreydon Library) to \$1,996,014 (Option 4a – Leasing space in Barrington Mall).

The estimated initial capital outlay (excluding sunk costs i.e. the existing Spreydon Library value) are ranked as follows:

- Option 1 - \$1,270,400
- Option 2 - \$1,641,300
- Option 3 - \$1,694,300
- Option 4a - \$86,000
- Option 4b - \$2,086,000

Clearly there is inadequate capital budgeting provision to undertake Option 4b. Operationally there is also inadequate operating budget provisions to undertake Options 3 and 4a. These are estimated to be \$35,000 and \$234,500 over budget in the first year respectively.

Option 3 – the new two storey building, has not received support from any quarter and is the most expensive of the on-site options. Although it does not affect any of the notable trees, it does contain a number of other disadvantages. Therefore it can be readily excluded from consideration as a viable option.

We have not carried out a weighted value attributes analysis as would normally be the case in such exercises. The primary reason for this is that all options contain some form of significant compromise to varying degrees, these include:

- Impact on the park.
- Effect on notable trees.
- Operational advantages.
- Demolition of existing building.
- Pedestrian and traffic safety issues.
- Costs.
- Parking.
- Presence and identity.
- Development impediments.

It has been clearly evident from the years we have been involved in this project and the more recent seminars and public consultation processes that there is significant disparity among stakeholders as to what weightings these attributes/compromises would have.

## CONCLUSION

Because of the above mentioned matters it is obvious that a variety of conclusions and recommendations could be obtained depending on who the stakeholder making that recommendation was. There have been four main stakeholders in this project to date:

- Property Unit
- Libraries Unit
- Parks Unit
- Community Board representing the local community

**The Property Projects Manager comments:** From a commercial, financial and property perspective I would support Option 1. This is primarily because it is the most cost effective, retains the library with a presence and identity, and although the issue of trees will involve some public emotion and process, it is probably more achievable than the processes and public issues involved with Option 2. Additionally I find it difficult to rationalise the advantages of Option 2 with the additional cost in present value terms of \$363,326.

**The Libraries Manager comments:** Of the four options currently under consideration, only option 3 is considered to be unsuitable for library operations. A two story building with two distinct floors will require additional staff to operate and will waste valuable space in access ways of stairs and lift. For the type of service offered from a community library a single story option is preferable.

The mall options will provide an adequate space for library operations although some of the staff facilities will probably need to be located in the mezzanine area upstairs. The disadvantages of this option, whether purchase or lease, are the number of possible entrance and exits requiring monitoring, the loss of visibility from the street, the pressure on the car parking area immediately adjacent to the library space (which is full most of the time) and the impact of neighbouring lessees, particularly the new restaurant, whose facilities jut out into the space which the library would use. There may also be problems with heating and ventilating the space and the lack of insulation. At this stage we do not know the impact on library operation hours or whether there is any requirement by the Mall owners to open longer hours at the weekend. Locating the library in the might result in customer pressure and expectation to open longer at the weekend resulting in increased operating costs for the library.

The options on the park are probably most preferable from a library operations perspective. They retain a street frontage and a distinct presence for the library in the community. They also provide a particularly pleasant, ambient location for customers with a pleasant park vista. Option 2 will provide us with the required space on a single level location, whilst Option 1 will continue to utilise the mezzanine floor, probably for staff facilities.

Option 2 with the parking at the front of the building has the advantage for customers in that the parking is both visible and the access to the entrance close by. Option 1, with the parking at the rear will inevitably result in some customer complaint (as was experienced at Papanui library). Whilst safety for pedestrians is not particularly a library operational concern it is the library staff who will deal with complaints and issues. This being the case, and the traffic consultant having identified Option 2 as being preferable from a safety point of view, this is considered the preferred option for library purposes.

**The Parks Unit comments:** The existing library tucked into the far corner of the designated library land and surrounded by trees has never had any detrimental impact on the trees or general amenity values of the site which despite its designation, has always been considered and managed as an integral part of the park itself. Only continued use of the existing building or total relocation of the library to, say, the Barrington Mall would allow the unique collection of weeping trees, and other notable trees and amenity values to remain intact or unaffected in some way.

Of the options to extend the library on the existing site, the two storey Option 3 would have the least effect on trees and other amenity values. However, provision would still be required for parking which would still need to be designed to have a minimal impact on any trees to be retained.

Option 1, the rear addition to the existing library, is the least preferred option as it will involve the removal of up to 17 trees including three of the protected weeping tree collection. In addition to the immediate environmental disruption caused by the construction work, it is doubtful if this building and associated car park can be designed to be harmoniously integrated into the functions and amenity values of the park itself.

Of the single level library options on the existing site Option 2 has the least impact on trees and other significant amenity values. This option also takes into account the factors important to the visitation of the library and combined use of the park. The Parks Unit is convinced that Option 2 development can be successfully and harmoniously integrated into the Barrington Street and park environment with the least disruption to existing values and for these reasons is given as our preferred option.

Using City Plan formulae a financial value for tree loss has been included in the Financial Summary. At some \$59,000 it has been suggested that a sum of this amount be applied to compensatory planting, were an existing site option involving tree loss the preferred course of action. Parks Unit staff point out that such replacement planting will never replace 66 years of maturity.

Parks Unit staff advise that a small number of semi-mature specimen trees and other landscaping could be planted at the park. However, as Barrington Park is mainly used for active sports the Parks Unit believes that the replacement collection of notable trees would be better sited at Centennial Park. A redevelopment plan is currently being prepared for the park area. A sketch plan identifying a suitable site for the new notable tree collection is tabled.

#### **PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS AND COMMUNITY BOARD VIEWS**

A display was mounted in the Spreydon Library, which gave explanatory information on the four options and highlighting Options 2 and 4 as those illustrating the issues important for local community consultation. Over 200 flyers advertising this and the opportunity to attend a public meeting on the expansion were distributed to local community groups and adjoining businesses and residents.

The public meeting on 11 October drew an attendance of 24. Through the flyers, display and public meeting encouragement was given to complete a submission to the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board on views with respect to expansion options

156 submissions were received as follows:

- 62 definitely favoured Option 2
- 55 definitely favoured Option 4
- 19 stated they were definitely **not** in favour of relocating to the Mall but did not indicate Option 2 as an alternative. Of these 19:
  - 7 favoured Option 1, extending on to the back of the present building
  - 6 favoured a 2-storey option on the present site
  - 6 had no other option, just did **not** favour moving to the Mall
- Of the remaining 20:
  - 6 addressed the issue of the building but did not provide any clear direction
  - 14 did not address the issue of the siting of the building

In light of this consultation the Board met on 2 November and resolved to advise relevant Standing Committees and Council its views on the options as follows:

1. That the Board recommends that options 1 and 3 be excluded for the following reasons:

#### Option 1:

A single level addition at the rear of the existing property. Although this option costs the least, the Board considers it has significant disadvantages:

- Of all the options it has the greatest impact on the notable trees.
- Along with option 3, it is least desirable in respect of parking design, access and pedestrian safety.

#### Option 3:

New two-storey library where the existing library is. This option costs 92% more than option 1. The primary reasons for not considering it further are:

- This option costs 92% more than option 1.
- It is least desirable for the library from an operational and customer perspective.
- It has similar car parking and pedestrian safety issues as option 1.
- It is the most disruptive option to library services during the construction/ development period.
- The existing building is demolished.

2. That the Board considers the key determinants in relation to options 2 and 4 to be as follows:

Option 2:

- Would make a good library site and library.
- Insufficient account taken of the value of park land and trees.
- Seriously compromises a valuable tree collection.
- Concerns regarding traffic safety.
- There is scope for future upward expansion.
- Some concern regarding waste of an existing building.

Option 4:

- Would make a satisfactory library.
- Very expensive solution.
- Fewer traffic safety concerns.

3. That the Board is unable to fully endorse any individual option, but of the eight Board members present, support for the individual options was as follows:

- |                         |      |
|-------------------------|------|
| - Option 2              | Six  |
| - Option 4              | Five |
| - Explore other options | Six  |

#### **OTHER STANDING COMMITTEE VIEWS**

As stated above, the report was also before the November meetings of the Community Services Committee and Parks and Recreation Committee. None of the four options were supported by these Committees.

The Community Services Committee decided to recommend to the Strategy and Resources Committee:

*“That a report be sought on the provision of a combined service centre/library for the south Christchurch area, which would obviate the need for major upgrading of the St Martins and Spreydon Libraries.”*

The Parks and Recreation Committee decided to advise the Strategy and Resources Committee:

1. That the Parks and Recreation Committee’s first preference is for options that do not involve encroachment onto park land, or loss of notable trees.
2. That it supports the recommendation of the Community Services Committee.

The Chairman commented:

As the report states, “there is no perfect solution; all options involve some form of compromise”. On balance, however, I consider that the Council should adopt Option 1, for the following reasons:

1. It is successful in terms of library operation.
2. It retains an attractive, architecturally significant building.
3. The extension to the rear would be on land gazetted as “a public reserve for library purposes.” (Option 2 extends beyond the library reserve into the park.)
4. Access to the proposed car park and existing problems of pedestrian safety can be addressed through co-operation with the mall.
5. It is the cheapest option by \$363,000.

The major drawback with Option 1 is the need to remove three notable trees, with the probable loss of one of them. The cost of moving the trees has been included in the project cost. In addition, a notional sum of \$59,000 has been included to recognise the tree loss. This sum could be applied to the planting of specimen trees elsewhere at Barrington Park.

Even allowing for these costs, Option 1 is \$363,000 cheaper than Option 2, the next cheapest option. I appreciate the sincerity of those who argue for the retention of the trees at any cost, but I believe most ratepayers would consider the Council irresponsible to spend \$363,000 for this purpose. (The sum is equivalent to the cost of installing new irrigation schemes in a dozen parks.)

**Recommendation:** That Option 1 be approved, subject to:

- (i) Allocation of the notional value of the tree loss (\$59,000) being allocated for the planting of specimen trees at Barrington Park or a nearby park.
- (ii) Satisfactory arrangements with the mall for shared access, integrated car parking and pedestrian safety.