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1. Introduction

The City of Prospect Library is currently housed in leased accommodation at Thomas Street Nailsworth. The lease expires in August 2019 and will not be renewed due to expansion pressures at the adjacent Nailsworth Primary School. Accordingly, City of Prospect has decided to explore options to establish a new library and potential related facilities (Digital Hub, Cottage, Toy Library, Local History and Art Gallery) at a different location within the City of Prospect.

Council has initiated a community engagement process seeking the views, ideas and involvement of the community and stakeholders regarding what a new facility should look and feel like, what services and programs should be run and feedback also touched on selecting a preferred location for the new library from the following short list of possible sites:

- Prospect Oval Precinct – Main North Road/Willcox Avenue
- Prospect Depot/Tram Barn on Main North Road
- Prospect Civic Centre (all services) – Prospect Road
- Northpark Shopping Centre – Main North Road
- Audley House – Prospect Road

In the context of this project, City of Prospect sought the assistance of inizio consulting in early June 2016 to assess and isolate the preferred site location or locations from which to commence the process of scoping, developing and implementing the project prior to the expiration of the Council’s current lease commitment. This report summarises the outcomes of an Elected Member Site Assessment Workshop on 14th June 2016, which made use of a specialised options assessment tool called icara (Integrated Criteria and Risk Assessment).

2. Project Background

Elected Member workshops held in February, March and June 2015 set the scene for a project to consider the future of library services in the City of Prospect. Discussions provided an overview of current services and programs, identified the gaps and started discussion about future opportunities.

In May 2015, specialist consultant, Libraries Alive, was engaged to work with Council on a service plan to evaluate the current functions at the existing Nailsworth library and to provide professional advice in relation to the future development of the library services that would respond to the needs of the community into the future. A report prepared by Libraries Alive established a service model for the proposed LibraryPLUS facilities, a project brief summarising the detailed project requirements and a preliminary cost framework for the new facilities. Subsequently the ‘Library Service to the Future’ project report and recommendations were adopted by Elected Members on 25 August 2015.

Since that time Council has been focused on identifying and shortlisting suitable sites for the project within the City of Prospect. Site selection criteria were developed with Elected Members and broadly based on the ‘site selection locational criteria’ from People, Places: a Guide for Public Library Buildings in New South Wales, 3rd edition, 2012 which was commissioned by The State Library of New South Wales. Some views of the Prospect community were also received through a series of community events in early 2016.

Through a number of Elected Member workshops, the first four site options identified above were shortlisted from a larger group of eight sites. As part of the current site selection process the Elected
Members decided to include site Option 5 – Audley House in the shortlisted group as it had recently been listed for sale and appeared to be a suitable option worthy of assessment.

3. MCA and the icara Process

3.1 What is Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA)

Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) is a simple technique to compare different solutions to complex problems. It is used in decision making where a range of possible outcomes or options can be described with respect to a series of differentiated assessment criteria. It is a technique that can be used in professional and non-technical settings where typically multiple conflicting criteria are evaluated in making decisions.

Assessing complex problems in the context of multiple criteria leads to more informed, robust and better decisions. Typically, a unique optimal solution does not exist or is not self-evident. Rather, it is necessary to use judgement and preferences to differentiate between solutions. Quite often there is a ‘trade-off’ between the various option assessment criteria. For these reasons the MCA process is well suited to a consensus approach to group decision making, particularly involving expert technical panels that are well versed in the problem at hand.

Commonly in multiple criteria problems some criteria will be more important than other criteria in assessing the value of the alternative solutions. To bring the assessment criteria into a common assessment base the MCA process allocates weightings to the various criteria. There are many different ways to allocate weightings but one common technique is called the ‘analytical hierarchy process’ or AHP. The AHP is often referred to as the ‘pairing process’. Essentially the AHP process orders assessment criteria in a hierarchy from most important to least important. It then uses this hierarchy, through comparative pairings, to establish the level of preference of one criterion over those criteria below it in the hierarchy. This process allocates numerical weightings to all the criteria.

Once all the criteria are weighted each of the solution options is assessed against the weighted criteria creating a weighted value assessment, and thus an overall ranking, for each option.

3.2 Application of MCA to the LibraryPLUS Project

The MCA process described above is most useful where teams of people are working on complex problems involving human perceptions, preferences and judgements as is the case for the LibraryPLUS project where the Elected Members were directly involved in the assessment process. Typical applications include making a choice within a set of defined alternatives, ranking within a set of alternatives from most to least preferable or assessing the relative merit (the scale of the value) within a set of options. The process is rigorous, structured and robust and analyses complex problems within a consistent value based framework.

3.3 Description of the icara Assessment Tool

inicio consulting has developed an options assessment tool called icara© (integrated criteria and risk assessment) that assists leadership teams and project teams to select the best option or strategy across a broad range of project types. The icara© tool:

- is a unique, team based options assessment process that combines enhanced Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) and Key Risk Analysis (KRA) techniques within one integrated decision tool;
can be applied to any options assessment task and will rapidly find the best solution or prioritize the comparative value of a suite of contributory strategies; and

- includes a feature that allows the risk profile of each option to ‘discount’ the MCA score for that option and so establish a more realistic and representative comparison of the target options.

This tool mixes traditional MCA processes with new functionality and automation features to allow rapid setting and weighting of assessment criteria and real time, team based sensitivity analysis, for a more complete comparative assessment of competing options or identifying the contributory value of a suite of complementary strategies.

An important unique feature of the icara© tool is the seamless integration of a traditional MCA assessment with a Key Risk Assessment (KRA) within the one integrated decision environment. The icara© tool allows the risk profile of a particular option to influence the MCA score for that option through team based settings. In essence, this process ‘discounts’ or ‘moderates’ the MCA score for an option based on the risk profile of that option to establish a more realistic comparative assessment of the options in the face of both value and risk based criteria.

It is noted that the KRA process has not been applied to the Elected Member Site(s) Selection Workshop but will be critical in the following concept design site assessment stage.

3.4 The icara MCA Process

The icara© process integrates the principles of Multi-Criteria Analysis into a single, interactive process screen. For some projects, the MCA process needs to be able to accommodate financial or cost based assessment criteria alongside non-monetary qualitative or technical criteria. To ensure an initial focus on assessing the value (and the technical or operational quality) of the various options under consideration, the icara© methodology separates the value assessment process from the financial assessment process. The monetary aspects are assessed at the end of the MCA process within the Value Chart to provide a clear graphic representation of MCA Scores versus the NPV of each option. The icara© methodology has 5 simple steps as follows.

Step 1: Identifying and prioritising the assessment value criteria

Possibly the most important step in the MCA process is identifying the key criteria that best describe the value of each option (noting some option groups can be quite diverse in their make-up) and then ordering the criteria from highest to lowest priority within the Value Criteria Window. Identifying the assessment criteria is best done by a panel of experts well versed in the technical, qualitative and operational aspects of the project space as well as the range of possible options. Typically, some investigation work is undertaken prior to the MCA assessment workshop to properly define the likely assessment criteria candidates so these can be confirmed, added to and prioritised in the workshop. The icara© tool incorporates simple process to identify and prioritise value criteria.

The MCA process work most effectively where the value criteria are mutually exclusive and do not cover the financial aspects of the project. These are picked up separate on the Finance Page which captures all CAPEX and OPEX project elements and reduces these to a single NPV value calculated over the project period.

Step 2: Weighting the assessment value criteria

The icara© tool has two forms of weighting the assessment criteria the traditional AHP or ‘pairing process’ and a simpler and quicker ‘relative process’ that sets the relative weighting of each criterion against the highest weighted criterion using the collective judgement of the assessing team. This ‘relative process’ was chosen for this project and is described below.
Relative Process

The icara© tool incorporates a new, judgement based process that can effectively and rapidly capture the value criteria weightings that are debated and agreed by the assessing team. As with the pairing process the value criteria are agreed and placed in priority order. The assessing team then progressively compares each criterion against the highest priority criterion (set at weighting 10) and sets the weighting out of 10 (using simply slider controls) of the next highest priority criterion relative to the highest priority criterion (Refer to Fig 1 below). The assessing team works its way down the list of criteria until all weightings are set.

Figure 1 MCA Assessment - Criteria Page (Relative)

Step 3: Assessing the options

Once all the Value Criteria have been ‘weighted’ the assessment team rates each of the Options against the weighted Value Criteria using the rating scores shown in Figure 1. For example, 1 represents a ‘poor’ response to the criteria through to a 5 which represents an ‘excellent’ response to the criteria. It is important that the assessment team has a good understanding of the scope and merits of each Option and typically a briefing is provided to the team to ensure a common understanding is achieved.

The rating process is undertaken in the Options Assessment Window (refer Figure 1). It is best practice to work down each criterion assessing each Option against that criterion and then move to the next criterion. The icara© tool automatically calculates the Weighted MCA Scores for each option and allocates an overall ranking.

Step 4: Mapping MCA value score against financial profile

The icara© tool uses Net Present Values (NPV) in establishing the financial profile of each option. Typically, this financial assessment is prepared prior to the MCA workshop and recorded on an independent spread sheet within the tool and then ‘switched’ into the Value Comparison Chart once the MCA Value Scores have been established. As depicted in Figure 1 the Value Comparison Chart graphically represents the relative cost-benefit value of each Option in one chart. Options with a high MCA Score and a low NPV provide the best value Options ie the top left corner of the Value Chart.
Step 5: Sensitivity analysis
As a means of ‘truthing’ the analysis and assessments done in the above steps it is usually important to test the assumptions, priorities and preferences captured in the tool with various types of sensitivity analysis. An important feature of the icara© tool is that any entry, rating or preference can be adjusted at any time until the assessment team has fully tested and confirmed the outcomes of the assessment. The sensitivity analysis typically involves:

- Re-ordering, re-preferencing or adding new Value Criteria
- Testing the impact of removing Value Criteria from the assessment
- Reviewing and testing alternative cost data assumptions
- Adding and testing new Options

The icara© tool is a flexible and interactive tool that allows for the quick assessment of ‘What if?’ queries. Importantly the tool does not deliver a decision on a preferred option selection but rather provides robust and structured advice into the decision making process.

4. Options Overview and Description

4.1 Overview
While the Council had short listed the following site options the development approach for each site had not been established. The site options are depicted in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2 – Site Options Location Diagram
- Option 1 – Prospect Oval Precinct (Blue)
- Option 2 – Prospect Depot/Tram Barn (Red)
- Option 3 – Prospect Civic Centre (Green)
- Option 4 – Northpark Shopping Centre (Purple)
- Option 5 – Audley House (Light Blue)

To assist in assessing the relative merits of each site option it is necessary to first identify an outline approach to developing each site in accordance the requirements of the LibraryPLUS facilities brief which established a range of components with a total floor area of 2400m².

The first step involved a site inspection of all sites followed by a consideration of the development options for each site as well as some of the implications of each approach. Finally, an indicative cost framework was established for the likely development approach for each site. This information was recorded in a series of Site Option Information Sheets which are included in Appendix A of this report.
4.2 Option Descriptions and Potential Development Approach

Each site option is discussed below and more detailed information sheets are provided in Appendix A.

4.2.1 Option 1 – Prospect Oval Precinct

Site Description

The Prospect Oval Precinct is between Prospect Road and Main North Road, is situated within the central part of the Council area and includes the Prospect Oval, the Prospect RSL, the Northern Adelaide Croquet Club, Prospect Tennis Club and Prospect Memorial Gardens. The precinct’s open space is generally well maintained and has good quality public amenity.

Outline Development Approach

Two broad approaches for siting the LibraryPLUS have been discussed within Council. The first involves finding a suitably large and accessible space at the periphery of the Prospect Oval and the second involves siting the new facilities on the site of the current Northern Adelaide Croquet Club. It is likely that any of the sites at the edges of the oval will be constrained and require two storey, odd shaped buildings therefore the Croquet Club location is considered the most practical for this Site Option. It is important to note that discussion with the Croquet Club have not occurred at this stage as any discussions will wait for the outcome of this further assessment process. There is sufficient area for the required on-site car parking within the Croquet Club area.

Figure 3 Northern Adelaide Croquet Club

4.2.2 Option 2 – Prospect Depot/Tram Barn

Site Description

This site, located centrally within Prospect, houses the Council’s current works depot and includes the heritage listed (State) Prospect Tram Barn. The majority of the site incorporates an open hardstand area surrounded by various maintenance, storage and depot administrative buildings. The north east corner (owned by Council) is leased to a private business. The Tram Barn building is substantial and appears to be sound. The site is located in a relatively busy commercial area but many of the
businesses rely on passing trade from the busy Main North Road and are based on drive to/drive through car based services and therefore the current pedestrian amenity is low quality.

Figure 4 Tram Barn Building

Outline Development Approach
Three broadly different site development formats would be possible. The first would involve a single storey development in the area to the west of the Tram Barn, the second would involve a two storey development in the NW corner of the site and the third approach would involve a single storey development incorporating the Tram Barn building and thus putting this important heritage structure into an active community use. This is a desirable outcome for any development on this site. There would be adequate space for on-site parking and possible potential for a private mixed use component to the development.

4.2.3 Option 3 – Prospect Civic Centre

Site Description
The Civic Centre is located centrally along Prospect Road and incorporates the heritage listed (Local) Prospect Town Hall, the administrative offices and meeting rooms and an open lot parking area to the west. The site is located within an active and vibrant part of Prospect Road with high pedestrian amenity and a large number of new mix-use developments underway and proposed. The site falls away to the west approximately 2 metres from Prospect Road to the western boundary.

Outline Development Approach
The Civic Centre site is reasonably constrained but could incorporate the proposed LibraryPLUS facilities if there was a major redevelopment of the site over at least two levels with the library on the ground floor and redeveloped civic and administrative facilities on the first floor. On-site parking could be incorporated by way of a second level of parking over the existing parking. The slope across the site may assist in managing the different levels of the development. The four storey development capacity of the site may allow a mixed use approach to the redevelopment with some private funding.
4.2.4 Option 4 – Northpark Shopping Centre

Site Description
The Northpark Shopping Centre is located close to the northern edge of Prospect at the intersection of Main North Road and Regency Road. It is a standard format centre with an enclosed shopping arcade, supermarket anchor stores and a smaller, direct access tenancy cluster at the southern end of the site. The development is served by a large open lot car parking area surrounding the centre. General public amenity is average to poor.

Outline Development Approach
Three potential development approaches have been discussed. The first involves building a second storey facility over the current shopping arcade, the second would involve building on the site of three
existing dwellings on the southern edge of the site and the third approach would involve expanding and redeveloping the currently vacant Dick Smiths tenancy on what is known as the ‘pad’ site. This third option is considered the most practical but would involve the construction of an area of decked parking to service the net increase in parking demand.

4.2.5 Option 5 – Audley House

**Site Description**

Audley House is a heritage listed (Local) two storey Victorian mansion on Prospect Road at the southern end of Prospect. Set in well maintained and extensive grounds the house is positioned for sale as a luxury residence close to the CBD. The mansion has a typical symmetrical layout floor plan of the Victorian period with generous rooms but with no large, integrated spaces. A second smaller, modest residence within the site is also listed for sale.

![Audley House](image)

**Outline Development Approach**

The heritage status of the Audley House setting will constrain the redevelopment of the property as a library facility. A substantial building addition would be required but even with this and allowing for on-site parking, the library facilities would fall well short of the required 2400m2 floor area. Parking too would not meet the requirements of the brief.

4.3 Indicative Cost Framework

In order to provide some comparative development costs for each Site Option an indicative cost profile has been prepared based on the outline development approach for each site. The cost estimates were based on area rates (Rawlinson Construction Cost Guide) and are summarised as a Net Present Value (NPV) over a 10-year period incorporating capital costs (land purchase, construction, fit-out) and operating costs (lease and outgoings). Refer to Appendix B for a summary of the cost framework for each Site Option. These NPV's are used in the icara® tool site assessment process.
The cost frameworks relate to the LibraryPLUS facilities only and are exclusive of any costs associated with re-accommodation of those activities dislocated by the LibraryPLUS proposal. This would apply to Site Options 1, 2 and 3 and will be assessed further once the preferred site(s), and a particular development strategy(s), has been identified.

It is important to note that these are indicative costs frameworks and are only intended to provide broad comparison across each of the Site Options. The cost frameworks should not form the basis of any development strategy decision, which will be subject to a more rigorous site audit, concept design and cost estimate approach for the recommended Site Option(s).

5. Criteria Prioritisation and Weighting

5.1 Criteria Identification and Prioritization

The Council had undertaken considerable work, prior to this site selection project, in identifying a broad range of options assessment criteria drawing on suggestions from *People, Places: a Guide for Public Library Buildings in New South Wales*, 3rd Edition, 2012 as well as input from community consultation and Elected Member workshops. The Council list of site selection criteria is included in Appendix C.

The Elected Members used this broad list, through discussion and debate, as the basis of a more consolidated and focussed set of site selection criteria. These criteria where then prioritised from 1 to 10, again through considerable discussion, debate and agreement around the table.

5.2 Criteria Weighting

Criteria weighting was then applied to the criteria list using the *icara*© tool relative assessment process as described above. This process allows the assessing team to make refined judgements regarding the relative weightings of the various criteria including selecting equal weightings for some criteria pairs where this was seen as appropriate. The finalised weighted list of assessment criteria is shown below.

Figure 8 Weighted Assessment Criteria - Final
6. Options Assessment and Analysis

6.1 Options Assessment

Prior to the Elected Members Site Selection Workshop, the short list of possible sites was 4 but with some discussion of the inclusion of Audley House. In the workshop the Elected Members decided to include Audley House and put it through the rigors of the *icara*© tool assessment process.

The Elected Members worked through the assessment process progressively assessing each option against each criterion and allocating a score from 1-5. The finalised Multi Criteria Assessment (MCA) scores and option rankings are depicted in Figure 9 below. A full depiction of the site assessment outcomes is provided in Appendix D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project: Prospect Library Site Selection</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>MCA Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTIONS ASSESSMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Option 1 Prospect Oval Precinct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Option 2 Depot-Tram Barn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Option 3 Civic Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Option 4 Northpark Shopping Centre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Option 5 Audley House</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Analysis

The above assessment results place the Civic Centre Site a clear number 1 on the assessment rankings followed by the Depot-Tram Barn as ranking 2 and then closely followed by the Northpark Shopping Centre Site as ranking 3. The Prospect Oval Precinct Site and the Audley House Site are a distant 4th and 5th on the ranking scale respectively.

These rankings might suggest that Option 3 Civic Centre would be the prime target for the LibraryPLUS site but the comparative assessment provided by the *icara*© tool Value Comparison Chart (refer Figure 10 below) shows that while Option 3 ranks highly Option 2 ranks well and has a lower cost profile. Option 4 is closely ranked to Option 3 but has a considerably larger cost profile.
In this context it is also worth noting that Option 3 Civic Centre will require a considerable re-development of the existing civic accommodation which would involve a higher construction cost profile for a full development outcome. By contrast the cost scope of Option 2 is relatively contained and, in fact, Option 2 has greater potential to explore compatible integrated commercial developments which could generate sales or lease income.

In the context of this analysis, which was discussed in the site assessment workshop, the Elected Members chose to select both Option 2 and Option 3 for further development and consideration and the report to full Council proposes this direction.

7. Conclusions and Recommendation

7.1 Conclusions

The City of Prospect began planning the development of a new library and related community facilities (the LibraryPLUS project) approximately 18 months ago in the knowledge that the existing Nailsworth Library lease would expire in August 2019 and that upgraded library facilities, in line with current best practice, would be required in any case.

A report prepared by Libraries Alive in May 2015 established a service model for the proposed LibraryPLUS facilities, a project brief summarising the detailed project requirements and a preliminary cost framework for the new facilities. Subsequently the ‘Library Service to the Future’ project report and recommendations were adopted by Elected Members on 25 August 2015.

Through early-to-mid 2016 Council identified a series of potential LibraryPLUS development sites and a broad set of possible site selection criteria. This set up quite a difficult site selection process requiring a robust decision framework to assimilate and process the facts and evidence surrounding this significant community infrastructure decision, one requiring the broad support of the Prospect community.

To this end Council chose to use the icara® options assessment tool to provide the kind of rational and evidence based decision making rigor required for this important project. An Elected Members Site Assessment Workshop was conducted on 14th June 2014 using the icara® tool and the Members quickly embraced the analysis and decision framework.

At the conclusion of the thorough workshop process the Elected Members selected two site options for further development: Option 3 Civic Centre Site and Option 2 Depot-Tram Barn site. These sites were chosen because they provided the best options to meet the LibraryPLUS project brief as well as provide a range of other community development benefits.

While both these options provide good potential there are a number of important technical, design, operational, financing and project delivery challenges and risks that will need to be explored and analysed before the Council is in a position to select the preferred site.
7.2 Recommendation

In this regard *inozio consulting* recommends that this analysis should:

1. Undertake an outline building and site condition and structural survey to define and understand the key site constraints and opportunities of the two preferred sites;
2. Consider, in more detail, possible site development scenarios/options for each site including the development mix, potential development partnering and likely procurement strategies;
3. Prepare preliminary concept designs in response to the agreed development scenarios for each site;
4. Prepare a detailed cost and financial analysis of each preliminary concept design;
5. Consider likely implementation programs for each site; and
6. Undertake an *icara*® tool assessment of Civic Centre and Depot-Tram Barn sites based on the above more detailed analysis and incorporating both a Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) and Key Risk Analysis (KRA) from which to choose a preferred development site and strategy.
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Option 1 – Oval Precinct Information Sheet

Oval Precinct Flora Terrace – Potential Development Formats

Outline Development Description
While the Prospect Oval Precinct is a large area there is not sufficiently large enough areas to properly house the proposed library footprint, even over 2 storeys as shown above. The existing croquet courts area could provide sufficient space in an appropriate format but it would displace the existing facilities.

Development Implications
1. For the croquet club site there is sufficient space for the library development but the existing site activity would be displaced and would potentially require relocation. There could be cost and construction program risks in this regard.
2. There would be potential circulation and safety issues around the northern edge of the Prospect Oval if the cricket club environs area was considered for the library development.
3. The new library facilities could create an increased parking demand at the Prospect Oval Precinct however parking demand could be absorbed in part given the staggering of event times and parking demand timing. In any case there would be space available to provide additional parking.

Relative Site Locations Diagram

- Option 1 – Prospect Oval Precinct
- Option 2 – Depot-Tram Barn
- Option 3 – Civic Centre
- Option 4 – Northpark Shopping Centre
- Option 5 – Audley House
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Option 2 – Depot-Tram Barn Information Sheet

Depot-Tram Barn Prospect Road – Potential Development Formats

Outline Development Description
Two options are available on the Depot-Tram Barn site, a Prospect Road frontage over two floors (Site A) and Johns Road frontage over one storey (Site B). The single storey site is considered best suited to the library requirements. An alternative to Site B would be to have a single storey on Site A but include the use of the Tram Building (Blue dashed option above).

Development Implications
1. The single storey Johns Road site location will not have a direct main street address however a covered walkway through to Main North Road could be provided.
2. Some care will be required in the siting and design of the proposed library given the local heritage status of the Tram Barn building.
3. A single storey incorporating the Tram Barn would activate the site but could have a cost premium.
4. The new library facilities will create a parking demand at the site. Whichever option is considered adequate space is available.

Relative Site Locations Diagram
- Option 1 – Prospect Oval Precinct
- Option 2 – Depot-Tram Barn
- Option 3 – Civic Centre
- Option 4 – Northpark Shopping Centre
- Option 5 – Audley House
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Option 3 – Civic Centre Information Sheet

Civic Centre Prospect Road – Potential Development Format

Outline Development Description
Redevelopment of the existing Civic Centre with a new ground floor library facility of approximately 2400 m² consistent with the 2015 Libraries Alive report. Council administrative facilities would be housed in a new first floor development.

Development Implications
1. The development of the library facilities in a redeveloped ground floor of the existing Civic Centre will require the temporary relocation of the existing administrative and civic facilities while the library and revised administrative facilities are developed. The approach will have relocation cost and lease cost implications.
2. No structural assessment of the existing Civic Centre has been undertaken however, to rehouse the administrative offices on the first floor is likely to require additional structural capacity and there is likely to be a cost premium as a result.
3. The new library facilities will create an increased parking demand at the Civic Centre. Site limitations may mean a parking deck over the existing car park may be required.

Relative Site Locations Diagram
- Option 1 – Prospect Oval Precinct
- Option 2 – Depot-Train Barn
- Option 3 – Civic Centre
- Option 4 – Northpark Shopping Centre
- Option 5 – Audley House
Prospect Library Site Selection Project
Option 4 – Northpark Shopping Centre Information Sheet

Northpark Shopping Centre Main North Road – Potential Development Formats

Outline Development Description
Three potential sites could be available as shown above. A significant extension/rebuild of an existing first floor area in the shopping centre building (Location A), a full re-development (larger footprint) of former Dick Smith’s tenancy (Site B) and the site of 3 existing dwellings in the SW corner (Site C). Site B best meets the assessment criteria in terms of practicality and location close to the shopping centre.

Development Implications
1. The existing Dick Smith’s tenancy is only about a quarter of the library area requirement so it will require a full re-development as a new library facility. Some retention of the existing structure may be possible.
2. The new library facilities will create an increased parking demand at the Shopping Centre. Depending on the availability of any existing car park surplus, an additional decked parking area could be required adding cost and potential construction program risk.

Relative Site Locations Diagram

- Option 1 – Prospect Oval Precinct
- Option 2 – Depot-Tram Barn
- Option 3 – Civic Centre
- Option 4 – Northpark Shopping Centre
- Option 5 – Audley House
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Option 5 – Audley House Information Sheet

Depot-Tram Barn Prospect Road – Potential Development Format

Outline Development Description
This site offers limited development formats for the library facilities given the constrained site and heritage setting limitations. One possible approach would be to adapt and redevelop Audley House as well as provide a substantial 2 storey addition in the NW corner of the site which is likely to get some opposition from neighbouring properties. Car parking would be on the site of the smaller residence.

Development Implications
1. The development footprint shown above is constrained by the heritage status of Audley House and would generate only 1500-1700 m² of space vs the requirement of 2400 m². This would mean some elements of the library development may not be possible on this site. There would be concerns regarding development approval of this scale of development given the heritage issues.
2. The cellular format of Audley House and the 2 storey format would mean the development would be inefficient and relatively impractical to operate.
3. The new library facilities will create a parking demand at the site. The maximum number of onsite parking spaces given the heritage impacts, is approximately 28 vs a 70 space requirement.

Relative Site Locations Diagram

- Option 1 – Prospect Oval Precinct
- Option 2 – Depot-Tram Barn
- Option 3 – Civic Centre
- Option 4 – Northpark Shopping Centre
- Option 5 – Audley House
## Appendix B: Site Options Indicative Financial Framework

### NPV Cost Estimates ($000) - 10 yr project life (Excludes existing use displacement costs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>8400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discount Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7891</td>
<td>8563</td>
<td>9432</td>
<td>9753</td>
<td>13228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NPV Cost for Option**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$8,007</td>
<td>$8,644</td>
<td>$9,467</td>
<td>$11,905</td>
<td>$13,062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix C: Council Site Selection Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATIONAL MATRIX (SELECTED AS SCORED OUT OF 3 PREFERRED)</th>
<th>WEIGHTING PRIORITIES</th>
<th>SITE - PROSPECT OVAL PRECINCT</th>
<th>SITE - DEPOT / TRAM BARN</th>
<th>SITE - CMIC CENTRE</th>
<th>SITE - NORTH PARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATE SIZE</td>
<td>MAIN STREET OR SHOPPING CENTRE LOCATION</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHLY VISIBLE LOCATION</td>
<td>MAIN STREET OR SHOPPING CENTRE LOCATION</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTENTIAL FOR ICONIC DESIGN</td>
<td>HIGHLY VISIBLE LOCATION</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDMARK TO TRANSFORM LOCATION</td>
<td>GROUND FLOOR AND STREET FRONTAGE</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS</td>
<td>OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH LEVELS OF PERSONAL AND PROPERTY SAFETY (LIGHTING, PARKING, ACTIVE LOCATION)</td>
<td>HIGH LEVELS OF PERSONAL AND PROPERTY SAFETY (LIGHTING, PARKING, ACTIVE LOCATION)</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULLY ACCESSIBLE</td>
<td>FULLY ACCESSIBLE</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNERING OPPORTUNITY - PRIVATE SECTOR</td>
<td>PARTNERING OPPORTUNITY - NEIGHBOURING COUNCIL</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESSIBLE FROM LOCAL SCHOOLS</td>
<td>ACCESSIBLE FROM LOCAL SCHOOLS</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROXIMITY TO RETAIL/COMMERCIAL SUMMER</td>
<td>ACCESSIBLE FROM LOCAL SCHOOLS</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROXIMITY TO OPEN SPACE/RECREATIONAL AREAS</td>
<td>ACCESSIBLE FROM LOCAL SCHOOLS</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROXIMITY TO EXISTING LIBRARIES</td>
<td>PROXIMITY TO EXISTING LIBRARIES (NOT TOO CLOSE)</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTENTIAL FOR OUTDOOR SPACE</td>
<td>POTENTIAL FOR OUTDOOR SPACE</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIORITY PEDESTRIAN ACCESS (SAFETY &amp; EASE)</td>
<td>CONVENIENT AND SAFE PARKING</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALK TO PUBLIC TRANSPORT</td>
<td>CONVENIENT AND SAFE PARKING</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONVENIENT AND SAFE PARKING</td>
<td>CONVENIENT AND SAFE PARKING</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESSIBLE FOR ALL VEHICLES (DELIVERIES, PERFORMERS)</td>
<td>ACCESSIBLE FOR ALL VEHICLES (DELIVERIES, PERFORMERS)</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKELY DELIVERY WITH INFRAS</td>
<td>ACCESSIBLE FOR ALL VEHICLES (DELIVERIES, PERFORMERS)</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCIES FOR COUNCIL</td>
<td>POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCIES FOR COUNCIL</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE EXPANSION OPTIONS</td>
<td>FUTURE EXPANSION OPTIONS</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL SCORE</td>
<td>OVERALL SCORE</td>
<td>46,000M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB)</td>
<td>5,500M2 (INCL. CROQUET CLUB, schönrath 700M2, 400M2)</td>
<td>5,000M2</td>
<td>45,000M2 - MAIN CENTRE (EXCL. CMIC CENTRE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROXIMITY FROM CENTRE OF PROSPECT TO OTHER LIBRARIES INCLUDING CONSIDERATION OF NOT BEING TOO CLOSE TO E. WALKERVILLE OR EMBELLISH LIBRARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO OTHER LIBRARIES</th>
<th>INDIcATORS ARE LESS FAVOURABLE</th>
<th>INDIcATORS ARE MORE FAVOURABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMBELISH LIBRARY</td>
<td>3.71M 3.51M 4.01M</td>
<td>3.71M 3.51M 4.01M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH ADELAIDE LIBRARY</td>
<td>3.41M 3.21M 3.91M</td>
<td>3.41M 3.21M 3.91M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKERVILLE LIBRARY</td>
<td>2.91M 3.01M 3.41M</td>
<td>2.91M 3.01M 3.41M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: *icara Option Assessment Diagram*

### Criteria Setting & Weighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of access to city of Prospect Community (including local schools)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly visible, street frontage location (main street/shopping centre)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High amenity/character area or setting</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for outdoor spaces</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient and safe parking &amp; property safety</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for comparable/synergistic commercial activity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographically fills gaps in library service</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Options Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Criteria 1</th>
<th>Criteria 2</th>
<th>Criteria 3</th>
<th>Criteria 4</th>
<th>Criteria 5</th>
<th>Criteria 6</th>
<th>Criteria 7</th>
<th>Criteria 8</th>
<th>Criteria 9</th>
<th>Criteria 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>