## NZS3916 Contract approach

# Separable Portion 1 = Design & Cost Plan – Fixed Fee of \$1,423,155 3 June 2025 – 20 August 2026

# Stage 1: Project Setup, Design & Build Parameter Setting, Geotech/Soil/Asbestos Review

**Aim:** To ensure the design team are clear on the boundaries they are working within and to resolve the biggest risk (at this stage) to the budget.

**Maycroft Outputs:** Final Design QMP, Staging Plan, Consenting Plan, Communications Plan, Project Risk Register, Baseline Programme v1, Updated Budget

**Rangitīkei District Council Outputs:** Agreed Design Parameters (including floor area reconciliation), Geotech & Soil Contamination Reports, Confirm HRC involvement, Confirm EOC details.

Review and Approvals: Design Brief, Baseline Programme v1 & Updated Budget

## Stage 2: Concept Design

**Aim:** To provide 1 concept design (including rough floor plans, elevations, site plans and illustrative sketches/3D views) in a manner that allows for stakeholder engagement and modular decision making on the final scope of the building, prior to moving to preliminary/developed design.

**Maycroft Outputs:** Concept Design, Draft Construction Methodology, Updated Budget **Rangitīkei District Council Outputs:** None

Review and Approvals: Concept Design & Updated Budget

## Stage 3: Preliminary Design

**Aim:** To expand and develop further detail around the Concept Design and start to finalize spatial definition (consider the use of an RDC nominated interior designer/furniture supplier to support), solutions and test alternative options regarding structural approach, cladding types, roof forms and significant building services. Commence preliminary engagement with the supply chain to confirm market availability and cost. Commence resource consenting.

**Maycroft Outputs:** Preliminary Design, Resource Consent Applications (Change of use – if needed)

**Rangitīkei District Council Outputs:** Confirmation of EOC building interface requirements with MOCH (if any) and EOC delivery programme.

Review and Approvals: Preliminary Design & Updated Budget

## Stage 4: Developed Design & Final Estimate

**Aim:** To ensure that all design decisions (from all consultants including structural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing & drainage, fire and landscaping) are finalised and incorporated (including materials and finishes), allowing for a clear understanding of how

the construction will be managed, a reasonably accurate estimate of the final cost and an understanding of the potential subcontractors that could be involved (we'd recommend a meet the buyer style event in this stage, to try and support the inclusion of local suppliers). Confirmation that the design meets all the required codes, regulations and commence building consenting.

**Maycroft Outputs:** Developed Design, Final Construction Methodology CMP, Draft Construction QMP, Draft Environmental Management Plan, Subcontractor Shortlist, Baseline Programme v2, Final Estimate (including fixed P&G), Resource Consent Applications (NES / Earthworks)

## Rangitikei District Council Outputs: None

Review and Approvals: Developed Design, Subcontractor Shortlist and Final Estimate

## Stage 5: Detailed Design & Final Price

**Aim:** To ensure the construction team have all the information they need to commence the build and that consents can be issued.

**Maycroft Outputs:** Detailed Design Documentation (including specifications), Producer Statements, Final Construction QMP, Approved Consents, Final Programme v3, Fixed Lump Sum Price

**Rangitikei District Council Outputs:** Instruction to proceed with construction (Separable Portion 2)

Review and Approvals: Detailed Design, Fixed Lump Sum Price

## Separable Portion 2 = Construction & Handover – Provisional Sum of \$13,576,845 20 August 2026 – 23 December 2027

Stage 6: Site Establishment & Procurement

Stage 7: Demo & Groundworks

Stage 8: Main Construction

Stage 9: Practical Completion & Handover

Stage 10: Defects Liability & Final Completion

Stage 11: Warranty/Guarantee Period

## Exclusions:

- Works associated with the EOC.
- Contaminated ground
- Removal of underground tanks
- Changes in levels within building or site retaining walls
- Loose FF&E, AV equipment and Security & CCTV
- Contract bond
- Insurances
- New Transformer
- Development Levies

46-59 High Street, Marton

## Rangitikei District Council Marton Offices, Community Hub & EOC



19 May 2025



Site location

#### Site analysis

The 5,640m<sup>2</sup> site fronts High Street between William Street and Grey Street. Although part of the General Residential Zone, the site has hosted council offices since 1876 and presents as the western extremity of Marton's town centre.

With a sequence of free-standing heritage buildings, High Street can be seen as a 'civic axis', which complements the continuous facades and commercial character of nearby Broadway.

The old Courthouse, Women's Restroom (now Plunket) and Library have landscaped forecourts that give a leafy appearance to High Street's southern frontage. Intermittent vegetation merges with the front gardens of residential properties, which provide a consistent edge condition west of Stewart Street.

In contrast, High Street's northern frontage is almost devoid of planting. Properties are only partially built-up, but forecourts are paved for vehicular use. Within this relatively open fabric, spatial definition relies on one and two-storey structures that occupy the street edge and are seen in-the-round. The present Rangitikei District Council offices continue this pattern one block further to the west.

In this context, the three houses at 40-44 High Street appear anomalous, and the subject site provides the real interface between 'civic' and residential character. To some extent, this relationship is mediated by the exceptional size of 64 High Street. Comprising at least three standard residential lots, this property introduces a heavily planted 50m wide open space on the western side of Grey Street. Conversely, the juxtaposition across High Street is unmediated by landscape. Street trees are absent, and the EOC and RDC offices confront a row of dwellings with mostly open frontages.

The site's other sensitive residential interface occurs at shared mid-block boundaries with 53 Grey Street and 10 William Street. Both properties are exposed to development at the rear of the RDC land.

On the southern side of High Street, the width of residential lots varies from 12m to 40m. However, recurring 16m and 20m wide lots bring a noticeable rhythm to the streetscape. Front setbacks are relatively uniform. If outliers at numbers 57 and 61 are excluded, houses are typically located 9-10m from the street edge. Frontages are fenced and planted. However, landscape treatments differ markedly. Some properties are open to the street while others are almost fully concealed by vegetation.

Dwellings are predominantly single-storey, although 45 High Street is a prominent exception to this pattern. Most street elevations are composed of a primary form and a projecting secondary volume with relatively consistent measurements. When added to common lot sizes, these building dimensions allow a typical High Street property to be described. Notionally, a parcel measures 20m by 33m and includes a dwelling with 5m and 10m modules.

The Design Parameters Diagram summarises relevant dimensions and relationship (see below).



#### **Design principles**

1. Organise buildings and open spaces in an orthogonal composition that aligns with High Street and encompasses the entire site.

#### Rationale:

- Site and context are already strongly gridded.
- Consistent alignments aid efficiency and promote visual unity.
- Landscaped forecourts are an integral part of High Street's heritage sites.
- Buildings and open spaces interact in mutually supportive ways.
- 2. Create a strong architectural statement by building on (or near) the street edge at the corner of High Street and William Street.

#### Rationale:

- Council offices have occupied this corner site since 1876.
- A built-up corner continues a pattern on the northern side of High Street.
- A prominent corner volume helps to create a public threshold to the site.
- Corner features can include cultural elements associated with local iwi.
- 3. Elsewhere, set buildings back behind landscaped frontages that relate to the forecourts of heritage buildings and the front gardens of residential properties.

#### Rationale:

- A landscaped setback mediates between 'civic' and residential characters.
- Perimeter planting helps to mitigate the visual impact of new buildings.
- A strong 'buildings-in-grounds' tradition exists for civic campuses.
- A cultural marker can occupy the corner of Grey Street and High Street.

4. Ensure that the complex's main public entrance directly addresses High Street. Locate this entrance at or near the William Street corner.

#### Rationale:

- High Street is Marton's 'civic axis' and principal route of approach.
- The corner of High Street and William Street is an obvious point of arrival.
- An atea can be incorporated into the landscaped setback on High Street.
- The residential character of Grey Street and William Street should be respected.
- 5. Locate intensively occupied spaces and publicly relevant activities along High Street ensuring that active building edges turn the corner into Grey Street and William Street.

#### Rationale:

- Important internal spaces should be recognisable on the exterior.
- Internal activity provides a reliable source of visual interest.
- Visitors and passersby feel safer when there are 'eyes on the street'.
- Buildings are seen 'in-the-round' because the site has frontages on three sides.
- 6. Ensure that site plan, building massing and facade articulation acknowledge the recurring dimensions found within nearby residential fabric.

#### Rationale:

- Existing residential fabric has modules measuring 5m, 10m and 20m (approx.).
- Combining small, medium and large units provides visual interest.
- Different sized modules help to produce sympathetic scale.
- Composite massing can express distinct components of accommodation.
- 7. Ensure that some plan-based modules and units of surface articulation are echoed in the building's roof forms or profile.

#### Rationale:

- Long unbroken horizontal lines are uncharacteristic of Marton streetscape.
- Hip and gable roofs help to articulate existing residential fabric.
- A building's profile is often its most memorable feature.
- Congruence between plan, section and elevation increases unity.
- 8. Use site planning, landscape and if necessary building massing to achieve a sympathetic relationship with residential properties on the site's northern boundary.

#### Rationale:

- o Grey Street and William Street each have a cohesive residential character.
- The site's relationship with its northern neighbours is not mediated by a street.
- During summer evenings, sun access is important for neighbouring properties.
- o If most buildings address High Street, the north of site can be relatively open.

#### **Development scenario**



#### **Benefits**

- 1. Eventful High Street frontage.
- 2. Strongly defined public entrance.
- 3. Prominent corner location for Hub.
- 4. Synergy between Governance and Hub.
- 6. Open space at residential interface.

#### Challenges

- 1. Exposed location for utilitarian EOC.
- 2. Building adjacent to William St housing.
- 3. Single identity for Governance / Hub.
- 4. Reduced setbacks on High St and William St.
- 5. Compact footprint / efficient circulation. 5. Unbroken expanse of parking at rear.
  - 6. Vehicle movement adjacent to housing.

#### Summary and conclusion

- 46-59 High St can accommodate RDC's MOCH / EOC campus.
- The site occupies a transitional location between the town centre and residential streets.
- The design needs to balance efficient land use, on-site amenity and off-site impacts.
- It is important to design buildings and open spaces together.
- EOC and associated landscape must respond to prominent corner location.