

## 2. NORTH NEW BRIGHTON COMMUNITY FACILITY REDEVELOPMENT

<b>Officer responsible</b> Community Advocate – Dennis Morgan	<b>Author</b> Kevin Mara – City Solutions, DDI 372 2401
--	--

The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an outline of options for the North New Brighton Community Centre Redevelopment project and to seek agreement on a preferred option.

### REPORT PERIOD ENDING 31 MARCH 2003

### INTRODUCTION

At the March meeting of the Property and Major Projects Committee, the Committee requested that an in depth report on the facility be prepared for the purpose of providing sufficient information for the Committee to consider all the options relating to the facility and some background to issues surrounding refurbishment or a new facility.

### HISTORY/HERITAGE ISSUES

Records indicate that the North Beach Peace Memorial was opened in 1925. Following World War 2 the Government made available grants for the erection of war memorials in memory of those who died in the war. A second stage (the infill of the ground floor area) was added to the hall in 1958. The change in name is probably due to the grant being available from the Government for war memorials. At this stage it is not known if there are any conditions attached to the funding which might preclude any of the options listed in this report.

Discussions with people in the area indicate that, in the past, the facility was an important centre for young people. Public dances at the facility drew people from all over Christchurch and the facility provided a focal point for the local community. As leisure time activities have changed, the role of the facility as the venue for young people has declined.

Management of the facility has been undertaken by a number of organisations and specific sections of the community have been quite vociferous in their criticism of the management bodies and Council. From 1982 until 1993 the facility was managed by a Management Committee of the North New Brighton Residents Association. Since that time it has come under the control of the Shirley Service Centre.

A minor upgrade of the building was undertaken in 1992 at a cost of \$36,000, which included painting the exterior of the building.

In 1995 the NZ Fire service provided a report on the building which indicated deficiencies in the fire egress and safety (e.g. lack of a sprinkler or fire alarm system). As a result of this the Fire Service placed restrictions on the use of the building. In summary these restrictions are:

- limit the total occupancy of the building at any one time on the first floor to 99 people
- no alcohol to be consumed on site

Subsequent to the Fire Service report, the Property Unit engaged Thompson Wentworth Ltd to carry out a comprehensive building audit. This report deals with the building condition as well as the issue of what would be the drivers which would require seismic upgrading of the building to be carried out.

In May 1997, Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu carried out a review of the facility and produced a report which identified local community needs, trends and influences in the provision of community facilities, options for meeting community needs and some development options for what to do with the existing facility.

A working party has been involved with determining what was the best option to pursue. In October 2000 the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board resolved to pursue the refurbishment of the existing building. As a result City Solutions staff have been involved in developing designs for the refurbishment.

### SEISMIC STRENGTHENING

The following extract from the 1995 building assessment carried out by Thompson Wentworth report has been the driving factor defining what was to be done with any upgrade:

#### "2.1.4 Conclusion

**The building is not earthquake prone as defined in the Building Act. If the use of the building continues as is, then no seismic upgrading is required.**

*If there is a Change of Use then the building needs to be strengthened in the following areas:*

1. *Transverse frames*
2. *The ground to the first floor concrete columns would need to have their shear capacity increased*
3. *Remedial work is required to the East wall columns. Corrosion of the longitudinal column bars has caused longitudinal cracking in the column face. This is probably caused by the salt laden air corroding the reinforcing bars*
4. *The horizontal spans of the brick panels must be reduced by introducing steel vertical supports"*

Based on this information and given the decision of the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board to pursue a refurbishment of the existing building, work was undertaken to develop a design based around the existing structure and also deal with remedial work as identified in item 3 of 2.1.4 above.

The trigger for needing to implement seismic upgrading is defined as a Change of Use. Whether a new activity is a Change of Use is something which is assessed by planners at the time an application to include a new activity is made. The Building Act does not attempt to define Change of Use.

The seismic upgrade has been costed at \$380,000. This work can be split into internal and external works as follows:

Internal seismic upgrade costs	\$225,000
External seismic upgrade costs	\$155,000

#### **FUTURE OPTIONS**

There are five main options available for this project. They are as follows:

- (a) Upgrade the facility to the requirements of the Building Code. This is based on no change of use for the facility.
- (b) Upgrade the facility to meet the current seismic requirements.
- (c) Construct a new facility on the same site.
- (d) Construct a new facility at a different site.
- (e) Demolish the building and redirect user groups to other facilities in the area.

#### **Issues Associated with Options**

##### **Option (a)**

The City Solutions design team have been working on this option for some time and have completed a design for the facility. A considerable amount of money has already been spent on design fees as well as money having been spent on remedial works such as structural repairs to columns and sealing of the roof (refer to the budget section).

##### **Option (b)**

The City Solutions design team have reviewed the seismic upgrade requirements and have completed work to the developed design stage. The design has shown that seismic upgrading is possible. The indicative budget for the seismic upgrade is \$380,000.

##### **Option (c)**

In this option the existing building would need to be demolished and a new purpose built facility designed and constructed. This facility would not be limited by any seismic codes or change of use issues. There are issues associated with this option. These are as follows:

- Any materials chosen for the building need to be of the highest quality (e.g. stainless steel fittings instead of hot dip galvanised). Experience with the Pier building indicates that even the best quality suffers in what is a harsh environment.

- The cost of maintenance of new/modern buildings in this environment. Again the Pier building experience shows that buildings built using even quality materials must have a higher degree of maintenance than buildings in other parts of the city. Refer to the Section titled Maintenance for details on the maintenance costs for the Pier building.
- The building would need to be built within the existing footprint. If a new building goes outside the current building footprint a resource consent would be required. Although it is considered likely that a resource consent could be obtained, it does add another variable to the project if the Council needs to seek a resource consent.

#### **Option (d)**

This option involves constructing a new facility (similar to the Templeton Community Facility) at a different location. e.g. Thompson Park. The view of the Chairperson of the North New Brighton residents association is that this option needs to be considered on the basis that the community needs a facility that is durable and will last another 50 years. It does not necessarily need to be in the same location as long as some form of memorial is maintained at the existing site.

With this option it would be necessary to install some form of war memorial e.g. a fountain.

#### **Option (e)**

An assessment of facilities for hire in a 2.5km radius of the existing facility has shown that there are 20 other venues that are available for use for the various user groups currently using the North New Brighton facility. This assessment was carried out by Council officers in 1999. The situation may well have changed since then, but it is likely that a significant number of these venues are still available for bookings.

With this option it would be necessary to demolish the facility and reinstate a landscaped area and install some form of war memorial e.g. a fountain.

### **CITY PLAN/PLANNING ISSUES**

Advice has been sought from planners in relation to the options as detailed below. The basic issues covered are:

- What are the planning implications if we rebuild on the existing site within the existing footprint?
- What are the planning implications if we rebuild on the existing site with a larger footprint?
- What are the implications of building a new facility on Thompson Park?

Responses to the questions are as follows:

- A case could be established that 'existing use rights' under s.10 of the RMA applied. In general terms, the test is that the effects of the use are the same or similar in character, intensity, and scale to those which existed before the Proposed City Plan was notified (i.e. when the rules changed). However, the Council is generally reluctant to make a call on 'existing use rights', preferring for the applicant to seek a declaration before the Environment Court. The other option is to apply for resource consent with reference to the minor alterations in scale and argue that any adverse effects would be minor and that therefore notification is not required.
- In terms of constructing a single storey building of a larger footprint on the same site, a resource consent would be required, and, is likely to be notified. However, if it could be shown that the remaining parking area is of sufficient capacity; that the visual effects on the C1A zone would be less than the existing situation; and that overall the amenity of the area would be enhanced, there may be a case for non-notification. Additionally another land use consent from ECan for occupation of the coastal marine area would be required.
- Parks staff are very concerned about the prospect of losing sports fields or playing areas at Thompson Park. The area is zoned O2 - under the City Plan any built facility should only be used for recreation activities and subsequent accessory or support activities. It could be done, but it would be necessary to reclassify the area of the reserve needed for the community use, and Parks Unit would need to be supportive. At present there are a lot of buildings on Rawhiti Park, some of which are private, but a number which the Council owns such as the old Tennis and Bowling Club buildings, which have been inherited by the Council after the clubs folded. There is still 20 years plus life left in them according to Parks staff and they are under-utilised.

There is a current resource consent application in for the refurbishment. To date ECan have indicated they have no issues with the proposed works (including the proposed stairway leading to the beach). The process is on hold until a decision is reached as to which option is chosen.

### Heritage Issues

Council planners have advised that there are no heritage issues or restrictions associated with demolishing the existing facility. A review of the title also indicates that there are no expressly stated covenants relating to the use of the building.

### BUILDING CODE/CHANGE OF USE

Whether a new activity is a Change of Use is something which is assessed by planners at the time an application to include a new activity is made. The Building Act does not attempt to define Change of Use. It is not possible to predetermine (without reference to the opinion of a planner) whether an activity is classified as a change of use or not.

### OCCUPATION ISSUES

A proposal from Nga Ngaru Trust has raised a number of issues that need to be addressed if similar proposals are ever received in order that Council can make a clear decision on usage of the facility. The issues that need to be resolved are:

- (a) What sort of legal document should be used to allow the proposal similar to that from Nga Ngaru to proceed. The options are a standard lease over part of the facility or a licence.
- (b) How does the Council protect the interests of other user groups?
- (c) Should the Council allow commercial (albeit non-profit making) ventures to operate in Council owned community facilities, and if so, should they pay "market" rents?
- (d) What are the issues associated with maintenance and who is responsible for what if a group with a similar proposal to Nga Ngaru has a lease over part of the facility?

N.B. Nga Ngaru officially withdrew their application in February 2003.

### USAGE

There are 10 listed user groups who have regular bookings at the facility. The groups and their booking times are listed in the following table:

User Group	Booking Time/Day
Community Meetings	Last Wednesday of month 7.00 – 9.00pm
Line Dancing	Monday 11.45 – 12.30pm Monday 12.30 – 3.00pm Monday 6.30 – 7.30pm Tuesday 7.00 – 9.00pm Thursday 11.45 – 12.30pm Thursday 1.00 – 3.00pm Thursday 6.30pm – 8.30pm
Ballet	Monday 3.30 – 6.30 Tuesday 11.00 – 11.30am Friday 4.15 – 8.00pm Saturday 11.45 – 12.45pm
Indoor Bowls	Tuesday 12.45 – 3.45pm
Brownies	Tuesday 4.00 – 5.45pm
Bridge	Wednesday 1.00 – 4.00pm
Northshore Glory Church	Sunday 8.30 – 12.30am; 7.00 – 9.00pm
Sequence dancing	Friday 1.30 – 4.30; 1 <sup>st</sup> Sat of month 7.30 - 11.30pm
Dance practices	Saturday 9.30 – 11.30am
North-Wai boardriders	Permanent (Seaview room)

Allowing for an availability period of 9.00am until 9.00pm daily, and excluding the North-Wai boardriders, the facility is used for approximately 46% of the time.

## **MAINTENANCE**

When considering any building it is appropriate to consider what the ongoing operational and maintenance issues might be. Any building built on the eastern coastline of New Zealand will be faced with significant maintenance issues due to the predominant easterly wind. The Council has experience with such buildings (the Pier building at Central New Brighton).

The Pier building is built with robust materials (concrete, glass and stainless steel fittings). In the 2001–2002 financial year the building maintenance costs were \$96,092.

As a comparison, the South New Brighton Community Centre located in Beattie Street cost \$14,606 (including interior painting).

The current facility built of predominantly timber and brick is considered to be built with appropriate materials for such an environment. The building has survived reasonably well in its 77 year lifespan.

## **BUDGET**

The approved budget is: \$495,000

This includes \$35,000 from the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board and \$20,000 from the Lotteries Board. In addition to this Parks and Waterways Unit have agreed to put \$40,000 (from the 2003/04 financial year) towards landscaping around the facility. This money will come out of the Coastal Management budget.

To date the following amounts have been spent:

Building maintenance (incl roof, spouting and brick repairs)	\$25,000
Professional fees for design	\$57,000

N.B. The expenditure of fees is as a result of approval to proceed with the refurbishment option (October 2000 resolution of the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board).

The forecast total cost for the complete project under option (a) is: \$585,000.

The following items have been removed from the full design in order to fit the project to the budget:

- strapping and lining of existing walls
- new balcony, gantry, stairs and screens
- commercial kitchen fitout

NB: The commercial kitchen fitout was originally included as a result of the proposal from Nga Ngaru Trust which included a cafe in the facility.

The estimate for the works necessary to bring the building up to Building Code is \$495,000 (N.B. This is based on there being no change of use). This estimate does include landscaping, professional fees, resource consent and building consent fees.

N.B. The design is now at a stage where all documentation is complete and the job could be tendered.

### **Budget Costings for Options**

The following costings are based on Quantity Surveyor estimates and previous costs associated with similar facilities:

Option (a) – \$585,000. This cost is the complete cost required to refurbish the building in accordance with the current design. It allows for upgrade work required to meet Building Code requirements as well as the decking and stairs to the beach. It also allows for a good quality domestic style kitchen on the first floor. Consideration should be given to carrying out the internal portion of the seismic upgrade.

Option (b) – \$965,000. This cost is the cost of the complete upgrade plus the additional costs required for seismic upgrade work (approx \$380,000).

Option (c) – \$1,300,000. This cost is based around providing a two storey building with the same footprint as the existing building.

Option (d) – \$900,000. This cost is based on the cost to design/build a community facility at Templeton on an alternative site (not including the cost of land purchase).

Option (e) – \$150,000. This cost is based on demolition costs and the subsequent reinstatement costs associated with the vacant land (e.g. reverting to car park and/or a landscaped area).

NB: Should the option to upgrade the existing building be agreed to and the Council wish to pursue seismic upgrade of the building, it would be advisable to complete some if not all of the internal seismic upgrade work in order to avoid considerable re-work on the internal linings etc. This decision would of necessity require additional funds to be made available.

## **POLICY**

The Council currently has a policy for new capital projects. Funding of new capital projects must come by way of substitution. A similar approach would be appropriate to this situation where if any option other than that to upgrade the building within the existing budget is chosen.

NB: The Burwood/Pegasus Community Board would be required to substitute the additional costs for a similarly valued capital project in their Board area.

## **SUMMARY**

A decision on which option to be followed for the facility is now required. There are no significant planning/City Plan issues which would preclude any of the options noted. Issues which affect the decision are:

- (a) Budget - Additional money would be required for seismic upgrading or a new building.
- (b) Maintenance issues - The construction of a new building on the same site will lead to increased maintenance costs.
- (c) Money has already been spent on refurbishing the existing building as well as fees expended in the production of tender documentation for refurbishment of the existing building.
- (d) Facility usage - Figures show that the facility is used 46% of the available time by nine different user groups (excluding the North-Wai Board-riders who have exclusive use over the old library room (Seaview Room)).
- (e) User Groups - Is it essential that these user groups have this specific facility available to them, or could they be relocated.
- (f) Building Upgrade - What additional usage would the building get as a result of an upgrade or a rebuild.
- (g) Change of Use - In order to be able to accommodate "new activities" the facility needs either seismic strengthening or rebuild with significant budget implications.

A considerable amount of consultation has occurred with the community and although information to date indicates that the existing building should be retained, this view is not fixed.

- Recommendation:**
1. That the existing North New Brighton Community Centre building be refurbished in a way which:
    - (a) meets the requirements of the community with a wide range of uses;
    - (b) avoids Building Act restrictions as to uses;
    - (c) meets seismic strengthening requirements,and that the detailed design process involve representatives of the local community.
  2. That existing funding be carried forward and additional funding be sought in the appropriate financial year to cover the costs of a refurbished facility.