

Accommodation update

Field Centre



Aerial perspective



View from dining area

ARCHITEXT
registered architects limited

PO Box 10 000 Grey Lynn Auckland 1362
Phone 011 838 8888
www.architext.co.nz
Chris JC

LAST REVISED: Feb 2011
Issue: PRELIMINARY ONLY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION



Field Centre

Original concept



- Purpose-built facility housing up to 30 general public, researchers, volunteers
- Replaces the bunkhouse
- Comfortable 2-person 'chalet' bedrooms, lounge, dining, ablutions, drying area
- Funded & built by SOTM
- Managed by SOTM, as profit-making venture

Current status

Positives:

- Drawings agreed on
- Resource consent in place
- Two independent assessments confirm its feasibility

But:

- Costs have escalated significantly – now over \$6m
- Funder crunch in past 2 years
- Less than 2 years until consent expires

So:

- Time to reassess – where to now?

Option 1 - full centre

Benefits

- Quality accommodation for all - more attractive for visitors
- Possible profit-maker for SOTM
- Frees up bunkhouse

Drawbacks/risks - building

- May be very hard to fund
- Cost escalation during building
- Huge time impact on SOTM to get funding

Drawbacks/risks - operating

- Significant SOTM management time
- Currently SOTM has no experience running an accom business
- Potential big risks if we lose ferry company/ another pandemic

Alternatives

- Build a smaller building
- Build full version, but give to another party to run

Option 2 – Research field centre

Build stripped down version for up to 8 researchers – no public etc.

Ablutions block and 4 chalets – 3 for sleeping, 1 as temporary kitchen/dining

Self-managed/cleaned under SOTM oversight.

Benefits

- Much cheaper to build – easier to fund
- Easier to manage in-house
- Meets core needs for researchers
- Frees up space in bunkhouse
- Allows for staged approach

Drawbacks/risks - building

- Building consent may not cover reduced plans
- Still have to build ablutions
- Still a significant cost- \$2m

Drawbacks/risks - operating

- Ongoing cost to maintain – without any offsetting revenue
- Still reliant on bunkhouse for most SOTM volunteers

Alternatives

- Build & hand over to DOC

Option 3 – do nothing

Status quo - SoTM 'sticks to its knitting', leaves accom to DOC and/or other operator.

Benefits

- No cost – initial or ongoing
- No admin/management time
- No risks to SOTM

Drawbacks/risks - building

- None

Drawbacks/risks - ongoing

- Ongoing issues with booking/ housing researchers
- Ongoing poor accom standard for SOTM volunteers, general public

Alternatives

- Work with DOC to find external party willing to build/own/ operate new accom

