

TO: Town Hall Re-Development Sub-committee

FROM: General Manager Strategy and Development

MEETING DATE: 1 October 2008

SUBJECT: **OPTIONS FOR PROPOSED RE-DEVELOPMENT OF TOWN HALL COMPLEX**

SUMMARY

This report, and the supporting documentation, presents three options for the re-development of the Town Hall complex.

IMPLICATIONS FOR:

- | | |
|--|--|
| (i) Policy: | No |
| (ii) Approved Annual Budget: | Yes – whilst there is an amount of \$45.4m in the current Annual Plan and LTCCP for the upgrade of the Town Hall Complex, some of the options exceed this amount |
| (iii) LTCCP/ Funding Policy: | As above |
| (iv) Activity Management Plans: | No |
| (v) Community Boards: | No |

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the options presented in this report are considered by the sub-committee and a recommended option is referred to the Economic Development Committee for consideration.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

At its meeting of 16 June 2008 the Town Hall Re-development Sub-committee instructed the Project Control Group to evaluate two further options for the re-development of the Town Hall complex. Option 13 is a development within the existing building envelope and Option 14 is a development within the current planning designation. A further alternative option has also been evaluated which combines features of both options 13 and 14.

2.0 BACKGROUND

Re-development of the Town Hall complex has been included in the Council's Annual Plan since 2001. The intention was to address known problems with the venue and to address the future needs of the complex. It is noted that many of the current and possible future uses and users are quite different to when the Town Hall was built in 1929. At no time have any changes to the interior and integrity of the Town hall auditorium ever been considered. Since then the project has been through many iterations, with a number of different options explored.

Late last year the Council approved what was called Option 12a and commissioned a peer review which suggested some further improvements could be made and recommended the investigation of a further option. This sub-committee was tasked with investigating these. Options 13 and 14 are based on the Peer Reviewer's suggestions and the Project Control Group was asked to evaluate them against the requirements of the re-development project.

A key difference between earlier options and the options now presented is that the ability to provide for the necessary conference space has been made possible by the inclusion of three large conference rooms in the Municipal Chambers. In all of the current options the main purpose of the atrium is to improve way finding and to provide crush space, rather than to provide usable conference space.

Over the last eight years the estimates of the project cost have changed, as has the project scope and the extent of the regulatory upgrade required to the different buildings, for example provision of sprinklers to all three buildings.

2.1 Process

Concept drawings for options 13 and 14 were prepared and costed. These were then subject to a range of assessments, including planning, structural, fire safety, functionality, heritage impact, and project management. There was also consultation with the public during this stage, including focus groups and public meetings.

Some areas of concern with both options were raised through the professional consultant feedback. As a result a further alternative option was developed, which combines features of both options 13 and 14 and attempts to address the issues raised. In view of the public's concerns with the project, planning for this alternative option has been structured to allow the possibility of a staged re-development.

The current options can be briefly described as:

- Regulatory work only
- Option 13 - Manages the redevelopment within the existing building envelope. Major rebuild of the Glenroy Auditorium and new/enlarged basements under Town Hall and Dunedin Centre. Makes use of the ground and first floors of the Municipal Chambers. The Fullwood Room remains intact. New lift provides wheelchair and disabled access to the Windle and Linden rooms. Includes a new extension onto the Moray Place façade.
- Option 14 - Includes an atrium on Harrop Street, within the current planning designation. This would extend the Town Hall foyer/crush space and also provide improved wayfinding to the Fullwood Room conference facilities in the Dunedin Centre building. The Glenroy auditorium remains unaltered, and there is no extension into the Municipal Chambers building. Includes construction of new town hall entry on Moray Place. The atrium would include a new entrance to the Dunedin Centre (wind lobby). All extensions are linked

together and form a continuous wrap-around to the north and west elevations. A general upgrade of the Glenroy auditorium is not included in this scheme.

- **Alternative Option with Atrium** - This option includes an atrium on Harrop Street within the existing designation, a rebuild of the Glenroy auditorium and extension into the ground and first floors of the Municipal Chambers. Planning for this option has been structured so that it could potentially be done in stages, with the atrium deferred to a later date – see next option. Key features also include a new Town Hall entry on Moray Place, which is needed mainly to provide front entrance disabled access to the Town Hall. The transformation of the Glenroy auditorium will see it become a truly multi-use space primarily tuned for orchestral music, but equally suitable for conferences up to 350 delegates. The second floor Fullwood room remains intact, albeit with a slight reduction in capacity to 200+ people, with adjacent foyer being extended for an equal capacity.
- **Alternative Option without the atrium** - The planning for the alternative option has been structured so that a staged development is possible, allowing a decision on the atrium to be deferred. Under this scenario work could proceed on the rebuild of the Glenroy Auditorium, extension into the Municipal Chambers, new Town Hall entry on Moray Place, and new wind lobby entrance to the Dunedin Centre on Harrop Street without impacting on the functionality of an atrium if it was built at a future date. It has the disadvantage of reducing the amount of additional foyer/crush space for the Town Hall, and reducing the possible way finding improvements.

2.2 Design Features Report

The Design Features Report from Opus (Attachment Two) summarises the three options, including a summary of the technical feedback and public consultation. The full reports related to these topics are attached as appendices to the Opus report.

2.3 Business Case Analysis

A summary of the business case analysis of the three options which has been conducted by Howarth HTL is attached (Attachment Three).

The analysis makes the point that while the Town Hall complex is both a performance and conference venue, it is the multi-day conferences that are the most lucrative in terms of earning revenue to support the venue. This is, of course, important in maintaining the long term viability of the venue as a community asset and the benefits of hosting these conferences has been well traversed at the public meetings. It is also worthy of note that whilst there has been some comment on the possibility of the proposed new stadium being a major competitor in terms of multi-day conferences this is in fact not borne out by experience in other locations. It has been confirmed that stadia, largely due to their configuration and focus on single day events, cannot generally compete in guaranteeing availability up to two and three years ahead, or on a regular cycle, which is the main requirement for conference organisers.

The report looks at four scenarios: doing the regulatory work only; doing option 13 or 14, and doing the alternative option proposed. It finds that the complex will receive a declining share of the conference market if the regulatory work only is done and it will hold its own in the market under option 14, ie the revenues are not increased due to the fact that the conference facilities are not markedly enlarged in this option. However, it will improve its position with both option 13 and the alternative option. The alternative option delivers the best return. The earning potential of the alternative option is not substantially reduced without the atrium.

3.0 ANALYSIS

The table contained in Attachment One summarises the key features of the options, their advantages and disadvantages and whether they meet the key requirements of the brief for the project. There are a number of "givens" with all the options which have not been traversed in the table which are that all options include all the regulatory work required to upgrade the complex and that all options improve the problem of the current sound problems associated with

the kitchen by making it a self contained unit within the complex. All options also improve, to a greater or lesser degree, the way finding and legibility of the complex for users.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The Project Control Group believes that the three options presented are viable, but that each has different strengths and weaknesses. It is recommended that the sub-committee consider the options presented.

Prepared by:

Kate Styles
General Manager Strategy and Development

Date report prepared: 24 September 2008

Attachments

Attachment One – Analysis of Key Options

Attachment Two - Dunedin Town Hall Options 13 and 14 Design Features	Opus Architecture
Appendix 1: Drawings - Option 13	Opus Architecture
Appendix 2: Drawings - Option 14	Opus Architecture
Appendix 3: Drawings – Alternative Option	Opus Architecture
Appendix 4: Drawings – Alternative Option – no Atrium	Opus Architecture
Appendix 5: Planning Review	Dunedin City Council
Appendix 6: Structural Review	Hadley and Robinson
Appendix 7: Fire Safety Assessment	Cosgrove Major
Appendix 8: Functionality Review	Shand Shelton
Appendix 9: Heritage Impact Assessment	Jackie Gillies
Appendix 10: Project Management Issues	Octa Associates
Appendix 11: Public Consultation	Liz Rowe

Attachment Three - Business Case Summary

Horwath HTL

(NB: The following two reports have been previously circulated.)
Architectural Peer Review
Conservation Report

Dr Diane Brand
Jackie Gillies