

## 1.0 - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*“The debate on where to locate an indoor facility for indoor community sports has been going on for ten years – in the meantime rather than experiencing 20% per annum growth in numbers a whole lot of our kids from our city have missed out on being involved in these sports – it is time this is resolved.”*

There is significant opportunity to increase the participation of ‘everyday’ Wellingtonians in community court-based sports and activities. This is in the traditional sports of netball, volleyball and basketball, as well as other lesser known sports such as handball, korfbal, martial arts and athletics.

Experience has shown that this opportunity will only be realised if a dedicated centre is built to the specifications required by the sports and is available 365 days a year, 15 hours a day, with safe and secure access for users of all ages and abilities, and plenty of onsite parks.

If Wellington City is serious about increasing community participation in court-based sports and activities then the Indoor Community Sports Centre (ICSC) must be a single-purpose facility constructed to meet the critical needs of community sport users. Multipurpose buildings do not work. This has been demonstrated with the TSB Arena and centres found in other cities.

The decision on which of Cobham or Concourse is best for the ICSC ended up being very obvious. Of the two options, only the proposed Cobham facility can provide what is required by the sports, plus it will cost \$23.5 million less to build than the Concourse over the life of the building, and cost almost \$1 million less per year to run. In addition it provides:

- Easy, safe and secure access
- Plenty of onsite car parking at all times
- Easy drop-off and pick-up
- Meets all the Council’s requirements in regard to traffic congestion, urban design and sustainability.

The Concourse option is completely unsuitable as an ICSC.

In addition to the significant cost difference, the Concourse option can never be available 365 days a year, 15 hours a day, because of the activities and requirements of the Westpac Stadium. In addition there are two very significant potential ‘show stopper’ issues for where no solution has been found. They are:

- The fire egress arrangements for both the ICSC and the Westpac Stadium
- The entrance location and lifts to the ICSC.

In the worst case there may be no acceptable resolution to these two issues, or, at best, resolution will further undermine the functionality required for the ICSC.

In addition to the cost and these two major risks, there are numerous other issues which make the Concourse totally unsuitable for the ICSC. These include:

- Poor security and safety in regard to access
- Poor car parking
- Poor drop- off and pick- up
- A potentially hostile environment for Concourse users, as well as ICSC users on bikes and motorbikes
- Unresolved urban- design issues
- It would not be available for at least another four years.

The independent review is unequivocal in recommending to the Council the only suitable option for this ICSC is Cobham. Wellingtonians have already waited 10 years for this desperately needed community facility to be available.

Both the Cobham and Concourse ICSC proposals are totally unsuitable as multipurpose centres. If this is what the Council wants, then it needs to start again.

<b>1.0 - Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0 - Review Rationale, Terms of Reference, and Methodology .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.1 Review Rationale .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.2 Review Terms of Reference .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.3 Review Methodology .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3.0 - The need for an Indoor 12 Court Sports Centre for Wellington .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1 The Status of indoor community court-based sports facilities in Wellington .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.2 The Starting Point for the ICSC Project.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3.3 The TSB Arena (formally known as the Queens Wharf Events Centre) .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.4 Multi-purpose versus single-purpose for a Community Sports Facility .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3.5 Lessons From Other Centres .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>3.6 Projected Demand.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>3.7 How will players use the facility .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>3.8 Who will use the facility? .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>3.9 The Benefits of the Wellington ICSC.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4.0 - Consultation Requirements.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>4.1 The Consultative Process to date .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>4.2 The Future Consultation Requirements.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>5.0 - The Two Options under Review.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>5.1 The Brief for the new Indoor Community Sports Centre .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>5.2 Overview of the two options under consideration .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>5.3 Overview of the Cobham Option .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>5.4 Overview of the Concourse Option .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>6.0 - Review of Attributes of the Two Options .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>6.1 Location .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>6.2 Site Ownership and Land Cost .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>6.3 Design Layout and Functionality .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>6.4 Traffic Congestion and Access via Public Transport .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>6.5 Impacts on Westpac Stadium .....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>6.6 Engineering Considerations.....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>6.7 Building and Resource Consent.....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>6.8 Fire Egress.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>6.9 Construction Cost .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>6.10 Life-cycle Construction Cost Analysis .....</b>	<b>60</b>

6.11	<i>Operating Costs</i> .....	61
6.12	<i>Cobham Proposal Write-off Costs</i> .....	62
6.13	<i>Urban Design of the Concourse Option</i> .....	63
6.14	<i>Sustainability</i> .....	64
6.15	<i>Alignment of Council strategies and policies</i> .....	65
6.16	<i>Rugby World Cup (RWC)</i> .....	66
6.17	<i>Proximity and use by schools</i> .....	67
6.18	<i>Future expansion on site</i> .....	67
6.19	<i>Opportunities to enhance the Cobham project</i> .....	68
6.20	<i>Use of the ICSC at the Concourse for concerts</i> .....	68
7.0	<i>Conclusion and Recommendation</i> .....	69
7.1	<i>Conclusion</i> .....	69
7.2	<i>Recommendation</i> .....	76
	<i>Appendix 1 - Review Terms of Reference</i> .....	78
	<i>Appendix 2 - Independent Panel Supporting the Review</i> .....	84
	<i>Appendix 3 - Declaration of Interest for persons involved with the Independent Review</i> .....	85
	<i>Appendix 4 – Technical Experts and Parties Consulted</i> .....	87
	<i>Appendix 5 - Materials Sighted in the Independent Review</i> .....	89
	<i>Appendix 6 - Supporting Information for Sports Requirements for New ICSC</i> .....	100
	<i>Appendix 7 - Supporting Information on Consultation Process</i> .....	102
	<i>Appendix 8 - Expert Summary Reports</i> .....	105
	<i>Appendix 8.01 - Architecture</i> .....	106
	<i>Appendix 8.02 – Structural Engineering; Cobham Drive Park</i> .....	115
	<i>Appendix 8.03 – Structural Engineering; Westpac Stadium Concourse</i> .....	119
	<i>Appendix 8.04 – Environmentally Sustainable Design and Services Engineering</i> .....	125
	<i>Appendix 8.05 – Traffic Engineering; Cobham Drive Park</i> .....	135
	<i>Appendix 8.06 – Traffic Engineering; Westpac Stadium Concourse</i> .....	153
	<i>Appendix 8.07 – Quantity Surveying</i> .....	174
	<i>Appendix 8.08 – Property and Valuation</i> .....	187
	<i>Appendix 8.09 – Consultation and the Local Government Act 2002</i> .....	196
	<i>Appendix 8.10 – Resource Management and Town Planning</i> .....	206
	<i>Appendix 8.11 – Building Consents</i> .....	228
	<i>Appendix 8.12 – Fire Engineering</i> .....	239
	<i>Appendix 8.13 – Urban Design</i> .....	244
	<i>Appendix 9 - Glossary of Terms</i> .....	247