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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Overview

This Post-Occupancy Evaluation (POE) aims to gather and examine key insights about the facilities' technical performance, functionality and operational processes. This information can be then compared against the project’s original design intentions in order to determine how effectively these goals were met. POE can therefore help the Ministry of Education (MoE) to collect relevant, and well-disseminated evaluation information to impact the design and functionality of future facilities.

There are various levels of POE, ranging from a very high level review to a detailed diagnostic study. There is a widely accepted POE process model that sets three levels of POE that can be undertaken, ie indicative, investigate, and diagnostic:

Indicative

Indicative post-occupancy evaluations provide information on significant successes and problems and can be as simple as a walk-through evaluation. Selected interviews can also be included as part of the walk-through, or separately. Generally, indicative post-occupancy evaluations involve simple surveys of occupants to establish their views on the physical project outcome, and in some cases, the project process.

Investigative

Investigative post-occupancy evaluations are more detailed and require formal data collection techniques. These interviews need to be structured and unambiguous. More time and resources are required for this type of review than for an indicative review. Questionnaires (standard or customised) can be used to survey the occupants. Structured interviews and recording of responses can also be included for analysis, together with responses to questionnaires. Investigative post-occupancy evaluations can be used for detailed evaluation of both the physical project outcome and the project process.

Diagnostic

A diagnostic POE is more detailed than both of the previous types. These reviews are comprehensive and generally initiated for large-scale project reviews, or when serious problems have developed, or when the review is part of a rigorous research project. A diagnostic POE requires expert advice and management. The scope of these types of post-occupancy evaluations can be designed to encompass all aspects of projects according to needs.

The following POE report is based on indicative and some investigative processes and techniques. Further diagnostic evaluations may be required to understand the findings in greater detail and context.

POE Team

The assessment for this evaluation was carried out by a team composed of professional architects, education designers, project managers, and construction experts.
2.0 POE METHODOLOGY

The POE was comprised of indicative and investigative techniques carried out by the POE team. The process of the design/delivery of the project along with the overall facility was evaluated, with more indicative focus given on the learning environments. Multiple methods of data collection were used such as:

- Architectural documentation
- Full project walk-through evaluation
- Benchmark data compilation
- Interviews with key stakeholders i.e. leadership team members and staff members
- Students, parents and families were not interviewed

The POE process started with an introduction meeting held with the kura to discuss the process and the requirements from the kura during the POE. There were four key stages in the evaluation:

- **STAGE 1** Distribute Surveys
- **STAGE 2** Site Analysis/Interviews
- **STAGE 3** Prepare and Issue Draft Report
- **STAGE 4** Final Report Issued

The project was evaluated under 10 categories to gain a holistic view of the project:

- Identity/Context
- Site Plan
- Kura Grounds
- Organisation
- Buildings
- Interiors
- Energy and Services Strategies
- Feeling Safe
- Long Life, Loose Fit
- Successful Whole

The evaluation team asked standardised questions about the facility during the on-site investigations along with specific surveys for the users. The data from these strategies form the basis of the evaluation. We have standardised the questions, metrics and on-site analysis with the view to form better comparable cross-project data, and to be able to draw more accurate conclusions overall.
3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a summary of the findings presented in this report. The evaluation team considered the responses to the on-site interviews to be positive and constructive, and it was evident that the kura is pleased with their new facilities.

**Conclusions and Recommendations for TKKM o Pukemiro Facilities**

Our recommendations below aim to highlight valuable lessons and insight in order to benefit and improve not only this kura but future kura developments:

1. It was stated during the interviews that the Wharenui was an excellent facility for the kura. The Wharenui is well equipped with a large multi-purpose space, a stage area, showers, toilets and changing facilities. The positioning of the Wharenui on the site is ‘inclusive’, which was an important aspect for the kura. The close proximity between the Wharenui and the Wharekai, was another important aspect that the kura wanted to achieve as they stated that it was an important relationship which adds to the quality of the facility.

2. There are a number of ongoing ICT issues which the kura need to have investigated. Many of the systems are not functioning as intended, including: a number of data points, the kura-wide PA system, security cameras, power outlets appear to be on a ‘loop’ (and can be switched off if a student switches off an RCD), the Wi-Fi system, which is challenging to connect, and servers which over-heat. It is recommended that these items are investigated further.

3. It was noted during the evaluation that some of the external fixings and the exposed steel portals were showing signs of rust. The kura stated that they had replaced the downpipe clips as they had rusted, and that some areas of the roof and gutters ‘were showing signs of rusting’. It is recommended that this is investigated to ensure that potential health and safety or durability issues can be mitigated.

4. It was stated during the interviews that the external and internal sliding door hardware does not lock correctly, requiring considerable time being spent locking the kura manually. It is recommended that the problematic hardware, and doors, are reviewed by a specialist.

5. It was stated during the interviews that, at certain times during winter, there is ‘ponding’ of surface water on the central grass area. It was also stated that the storm water grates can be ‘smelly’, particularly in summer. It is recommended that this is investigated further to ensure that potential health and safety issues can be mitigated.

6. During the POE evaluation, interview participants were asked which parts of the kura they were most pleased with and which aspects were the most useful to them or the students. They stated that the students enjoyed the open learning spaces in the learning centres and the specific design features of the Wharenui, in particular, the ‘shower area’. The landscape design and the positioning of the Atea space within the site was also noted as a positive feature.

7. Overall, the evaluation team concluded that the kura facilities were pleasant and well maintained. The design of the learning environments reflected sound design principles based on the BoT visions and the ILE guidelines. The new facilities were light, spacious, safe and secure and were stated as being enjoyed by both staff and students alike.
4.0 PROJECT OVERVIEW

TKKM o Pukemiro was built on a greenfield site, located on Norman Senn Ave, Kaitaia. Students, whānau and staff have a strong affiliation to Te Rarawa and Muriwhenua while acknowledging inter-tribal connections and identity. The kura is currently situated on ancestral land at Moumoukai, which provides a rich historical environment for learning. The new kura complex is comprised of six single-storey buildings which include the multi-purpose gym, administration area, the learning environments and a caretaker’s shed.

The Kura Establishment Board consulted with the design team extensively to develop and form the guiding philosophy and concept of the learning environment and the kura as a whole.

The kura is located in the Kaitaia community within a residential suburban context. The kura operated in temporary off-site buildings during the project. The kura was designed and constructed in one stage and opened in 2013.

**Benchmark Data**

- **Kura Profile Number:** 3114
- **Type:** Full Primary (Year 1-8)
- **Location:** 14 Norman Senn Ave, Kaitaia
- **Site Area:** 10.08 ha
- **Definition:** Kura Kaupapa Maori
- **Staff Numbers:** 20
- **Student Numbers:** 131
- **Environmental Rating Credentials:** Greenstar 5 rating
- **In-use Performance:** 61kWh/m²/annum (estimated, incomplete data available)
- **Decile:** 1 (ERO report 2013)
- **Total Floor Area:** 2,374m²
- **Capacity:** 180
- **Project Cost:** $6,455,000 (2011/12)
- **Facility Opened:** 2013

**Project Team**

- **Master Planning:** Brewer Davidson
- **Architect:** Brewer Davidson
- **Contractor:** NZ Strong Construction
4.0 PROJECT OVERVIEW

Project Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November 2011</th>
<th>March 2012</th>
<th>January 2013</th>
<th>February 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Starts (estimate)</td>
<td>Construction Starts (estimate)</td>
<td>Construction Completed</td>
<td>Kura Opens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No project programme available

Master Plan

[Diagram of the Master Plan]

[Diagram showing layout and details of the project site]
4.0 **PROJECT OVERVIEW**

*Learning Environment Floor Plans*

Junior Learning Environment (Typical)

Multi-purpose Hall
4.0 PROJECT OVERVIEW

Learning Environment Floor Plans

Senior Learning Environment (Typical)

Learning Environment Diagram (Junior)

Withdrawal Space (large)
Withdrawal Space (small)
Wet Area
Common Learning Space
Outdoor Learning Area
Outdoor Learning Area

INTERNAL CIRCULATION
to other learning ‘Hubs’

EXTERNAL CIRCULATION
5.0 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

**Introduction to Findings**

Surveys were issued to the Kura on November 4th, 2015. Staff participation for this report was limited with zero staff completing the individual surveys. The staff interviews and on-site evaluation were carried out on November 5th, 2015. Four of the staff were interviewed during the on-site evaluation. The site visit was performed on a clear, sunny day with light winds and the kura was operating under normal conditions. The kura’s new facilities were evaluated during one site visit over a five hour period.

**Demographic Profile**

All four personnel interviewed were full-time staff, and stated that they spent 6-7 hours in the facility each working day. Respondents stated that their time was spread across a wide range of spaces during the working week.
TKKM o Pukemiro was built on a greenfield site, located on Norman Senn Ave, Kaitaia. Students, whānau and staff have a strong affiliation to Te Rarawa and Muriwhenua while acknowledging inter-tribal connections and identity. The kura is currently situated on ancestral land at Moumoukai, which provides a rich historical environment for learning.

The entrance to the administration building is well defined and inviting to the community. The car park (for cars only), is well laid out and provides safe pick-up and drop-off areas, and it was stated by the kura as being ‘an asset’. The site has a moderate gradient running the length of the site, with all kura facilities positioned at the higher level and the playing fields at the lower level. Accessible ramps and well-defined steps provide good circulation around the kura. The administration and reception entrance is clearly defined, accessible and welcoming. Although the evaluation team noted that, upon arrival, initially there was limited evidence which expressed the kura’s unique identity.

The kura occupies a wide catchment area with students attending from a variety of locations. In order to facilitate this, the kura utilise a commercial bus system, and their own designated mini-vans.

On the whole, there is a well-defined hard-landscaping strategy which supports the kura pedagogy. The soft-landscaping design is well developed and is seen by the staff as a positive attribute of the kura. The kura has well defined outdoor learning environments situated within the surrounding landscape.

The buildings are visible from the street and are, in general, of a residential scale, which is appropriate to its suburban, residential context. The larger buildings are positioned away from the street.

The Wharenui building, positioned at the back of the kura, is visible from the arrival car park by a visual line of sight through the kura buildings to the Wharenui entrance. Glimpses of learning can be seen upon arrival. The learning environment buildings are positioned around the central landscaped area, which includes an Atea space in front of the Wharenui. The cladding and the exterior colour scheme are both welcoming and sympathetic to their surrounds, complemented by bright coloured highlighted areas of interest.
5.0 Analysis and Findings

5.2 Site Plan

The appointed architect developed the new Master Plan for the kura during the design phases. The kura operated in existing off-site facilities during the design and construction phases of the project. The kura’s current Principal and BoT were established prior to the design stages commencing. This allowed strategic input from the outset, enabling the kura to voice and align their clear educational vision with the built environment, which has been an advantage in this project.

The new kura complex comprises of six single-storey buildings which include: the multi-purpose gym, administration building, the junior and senior learning environments, and a caretaker’s shed. The buildings are positioned in a semi-circle around the central landscaped area and the pathway to the Wharenui and Atea space. These conceptual ideas, which form the basis of the masterplan, have been well defined. During the interviews, staff stated that the way in which their vision was represented within the master plan and layout of the kura was “particularly pleasing”.

The Master Plan has created legible circulation patterns, with all-weather cover provided to the learning centres (in most instances). These covered ways are multi-functional and well utilised for outdoor learning, assembly and performance gatherings. The kura commented that it would be an advantage to have clear roofing over the uncovered, outdoor junior learning areas for weather and sun protection for the students. Fixed seating is provided outside all of the learning centres.

The gym’s positioning on a private lane (Trigg Memorial Drive), at the rear of the site, was based upon the intention that the kura would have access to this lane. However, the kura currently has not been able to negotiate access, and therefore it has to transport supplies to the Wharekai/Gym building from the main car park. The limited vehicle access to the gym, hard court area, and the Wharekai is a frustration for the kura. The facility therefore does not currently allow for efficient community use.

Generally, all of the new buildings are well orientated to take advantage of the sun, while providing a degree of wind protection to the central area and outdoor learning spaces.

A separate service entry, positioned to the side of the main car park, was created in the Master Plan for the removal of refuse, and storage of maintenance equipment. The evaluation team considered this strategy to be a positive attribute of the kura. Although, during the interviews it was stated that there is not enough storage for the care taker, which has resulted in an additional, temporary storage building being placed at the front of the kura.
5.0 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

5.3 Kura Grounds

The spatial relationship between the kura grounds and its buildings is positive. The kura presents a well-designed landscaping scheme which works with the topography of the site. The hard and soft landscaping utilises a variety of colours and shapes to good effect. However, the new Pohutukawa trees are planted in close proximity to the buildings which may cause damage to the facilities as the trees mature.

The external canopies, which connect the buildings, provide outdoor shaded areas and are seen as a positive attribute of the kura.

The outdoor play and learning areas have been designed in conjunction with the buildings and are well defined on the whole. The static play structures have been positioned closely to the learning centres. This strategy provides good visibility over the play area from a number of teaching and kura vantage points.

The hard courts are positioned behind the main kura facilities. This means that the courts are a considerable distance away from the main parking area. If these were positioned in closer proximity it would make for a more efficient facility. It is important to note that if the kura had access from the side road, as originally planned, (which is located on the kura’s boundary) as originally planned, the facility would be more accessible.

It was noted during the evaluation that some of the external fixings were showing signs of rust. The kura stated that they had replaced the downpipe clips as they had rusted, and that some areas of the roof and gutters ‘were rusting’. The evaluation team did not access the roof to verify this.

During the on-site interviews it was stated that at times during winter, there is surface water ‘ponding’ on the central grass area. It was also stated that the storm water grates can be ‘smelly’, particularly in summer. It is recommended that this is investigated further.
5.4 Organisation

The spatial organisation of the learning environment is generally repeated throughout the learning centres, with the main changes occurring between the junior and senior kura learning spaces.

The junior learning environment is positioned on the north-western side of the site. It is elevated, and looks over the playing fields. There are two distinct learning environments (or pods) within the junior block. One for the year 0-3 students and one for the year 4-6 students. These spaces are identical in their layout, and are separated by a shared resource storage room, unisex toilets, and a wet area. In addition, there are designated outdoor learning areas, that are well defined and accessible from the indoor learning environment. These spaces are equipped (in most instances) with sinks and benches for water play activities and other outdoor learning opportunities.

The layout of each junior learning pod comprises a large common area, which is open, and has access to fixed computer stations, AV technology and flexible seating options. From this common space there is a dedicated wet-area breakout space (shared), two transparent breakout rooms, one larger (25m²) and one smaller room (9m²). It was noted during the interviews that the larger breakout room is the most utilised and functional for the kura’s pedagogy, and two breakout rooms of this size would have been beneficial. The large central space is able to accommodate whole-class type learning activities, while the larger and smaller breakout spaces offer flexibility with a sliding door between them. It was stated during the interviews that the flexibility of the space is a positive and functional aspect of the learning centre.

The senior learning environment is positioned opposite the junior learning environment on the south-east side of the site, and it looks out over the central landscaped space. Its layout is comprised of two large common areas (or ‘hubs’). Each hub is comprised of computer stations, AV technology, fixed and flexible seating options, and a larger and a smaller breakout room.

These two learning hubs are open and accessed via a larger common space (or ‘learning street’). This common space is the central circulation pathway to all of the senior kura teaching spaces. It is also utilised as a teaching space by the kura. Other specialist teaching spaces, such as: art areas, technology spaces, wet areas, a resource storage room and internally-accessed toilets facilities are also accessed off the learning street. All of these facilities are visible and accessed from the learning street via internal glass sliding doors.
5.0 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

5.4 Organisation (Continued...)

The Wharenui building is positioned at the ‘heart’ of the kura and is seen as a core facility of the kura. The building is well equipped with a large multi-purpose space, a stage area, showers, toilets and changing facilities. A clearly defined Atea space occupies the front of the Wharenui building, which is utilised by the kura for a variety of purposes.

The gym is connected to the Wharekai to form one complete facility. It is situated in close proximity to the Wharenui, which functions well when large groups of people utilise the facilities. The large internal sliding doors which connect the gym’s main court space to the dining/kitchen area of the Wharekai, creates an efficient and multi-functional space for the kura and community alike.

The administration building, which is located at the front of the kura, comprises the reception area, office spaces, health facilities and the teachers’ staffroom area with fixed computers and a large meeting room. This space is well equipped and allows teachers to collaborate, as required. In the kura’s view, this space is working well.
Main Learning Environments

The learning centres have been built using steel and timber frame construction. The external walls are, in most instances, supported by a structural steel system with an infill of timber framing. The buildings are generally clad with bevel-back weather board’s and a painted exterior finish. The remaining exterior walls are either metal clad (gym) or have a plywood finish (Wharenui). The roofs are constructed with lightweight metal cladding. The roofs are generally described as having a gable-pitch form, with good eave protection and external gutters throughout. The detailing of the cladding systems is robust, effective and is considered to be low-risk.

During the interviews, it was stated that the exposed steelwork on the canopies appeared to have rust forming. It was also stated that the downpipe brackets and the exposed fixings, which are on the canopies, have been replaced with stainless steel due to rusting. Despite the site being 6km from the coast, the kura stated that the coastal winds are strong and this may be affecting the exposed galvanised fixings. It is recommended that this is investigated further.

The kura also stated that the exposed steel work allows the birds to form nests and perch in the protected areas, causing additional maintenance for the kura. This particular issue may be due to the site bordering regenerative bush.

Toilet Blocks

There are unisex toilets located within each building, providing internal access from the learning environments. There are changing and shower facilities in the Wharenui and a number of disabled toilets well distributed throughout the kura. The administration building has a high-dependency unit. During the interviews, it was stated that the design and layout of the toilet facilities worked well for the kura.
Storage

The physical teaching resources are stored within Lundia systems which are positioned within the Library (adjoined to the junior learning environment), the senior learning environment, and one in the administration building. Teaching resources are centralised within these locations. However, it was stated by staff that the kura is now starting to hold the immediate teaching resources within each learning centre. It was stated that the Lundia, which stores the junior kura resources, is inconveniently located in the library away from the main learning environment.

The main learning hubs have limited fixed storage options (apart from the well-designed wet area storage), therefore the teachers have moved their resources to the learning hub spaces. The staff that were interviewed, recognise their storage shortfall and the kura is developing a more effective resource management strategy.

Internal and External Doors

During the interviews it was stated that the bottom guides of some of the sliding doors continually required realignment and ongoing management by the kura. The large sliding doors are too heavy for many of the students, and staff to manoeuvre. Due to the locks not working effectively (due to the doors not being correctly aligned), the kura has to, on occasion, manually lock down the facilities.

It was evident during the evaluation that the kura had made attempts to improve the performance of the sliding doors, however, this will be an ongoing maintenance issue for the kura. The most problematic areas being those where two external sliding doors meet at a corner junction.
5.6 Interiors

Learning Environment
Of those interviewed, staff stated that they were satisfied with the overall quality of their learning environment, and in particular, the staff in the junior learning environment were pleased with the breakout rooms and how they help with the delivery of the pedagogy.

The evaluation team considered the interior finishes to be light, bright, durable and suitable to the needs of the occupants.

Sports Facilities
During the on-site evaluation, it was evident that the multi-purpose gym/hall (building 3) was very well utilised by the kura for a variety of functions. It was also noted that the kitchen and cafe facilities (Wharekai) were well positioned next to the gym/hall. The gym building connects well to the Wharenui (building 4) and they are used extensively in conjunction for kura and community functions. This creates an excellent kura and community facility.

The hard courts are positioned at the back of the kura. There are fences around the space and this appears to provide the kura with a functional hard court space, albeit with no vehicle or close parking which can be awkward for the kura and visiting sports teams at times.
5.0 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

5.6 Interiors (continued)

Ventilation
The buildings employ a natural ventilation strategy, which utilises electric window openers to open high-level windows, in conjunction with low-level manually operated windows. Only natural ventilation is used to cool and ventilate the spaces, (i.e. no mechanical cooling) which is in-line with the project’s Greenstar principles.

The footprint of the learning centres is relatively narrow which allows for effective cross-ventilation. The learning centres appear to be effective, in most instances, at mitigating solar heat gain in the warmer months through appropriate eave overhangs, louvres, blinds, etc. However, some of those interviewed stated that at certain times during the warmer months the natural ventilation does not provide sufficient cooling and it can become ‘too hot’. It was stated that the junior learning environment (building 5) is exposed to the greatest amount of solar heat gain due to its long westerly-facing façade. It is recommended that opportunities for reducing the solar heat gain in the junior block are investigated further.

It is recommended that the natural ventilation system is reviewed to understand the effectiveness of the system, and for its occupants to gain understanding of how to manage it.

Internal Temperature/Heating
The internal heating is provided, in most instances, by radiant ceiling panels throughout the learning environment. These are controlled by thermostats, along with manual override.

From those interviewed, it was stated that the learning environment is comfortable in the cooler months of the year. The ceiling panels were effective and provided a reasonable amount of control for occupants. However it was stated that the kura is experiencing “higher than expected” electricity expenses and they are currently working on strategies to reduce their energy consumption.

Mechanical information was unavailable during our evaluation, therefore professional observations have been used to determine the system’s specification

Internal Temperature/Cooling
The kura utilises a natural ventilation strategy for cooling which is in alignment with Greenstar requirements. From those interviewed, it was stated that the administration building and the junior learning environment had a tendency to overheat and is ‘at times too windy’ to open the doors and windows for cooling.

It is recommended that this is investigated further, as previously discussed.
5.0 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

5.6 Interiors (Continued...)

Acoustic Environment

The learning centres were evaluated on a typical day, with the junior learning environment performing at approximately 70-80% capacity, and the senior learning environment at about 40-50%. The acoustics were controlled with a mixture of suspended ceiling tiles, pin-board panels on internal walls (Autex or similar), and carpet tiles. Transparent internal glass sliding doors in each learning centre enable teachers to divide the central space from the breakout and project room spaces when required. In most instances, the learning environments were well distributed with pin-board wall panels for acoustic purposes.

Of those interviewed, it was stated that the acoustic environment in their learning environment is ‘comfortable’. The evaluation team considered the acoustics within the learning environments to be generally well implemented. However, the concrete floor of the ‘learning street’ in the senior block, which connects the technology spaces and the learning hubs, may increase reverberation when it is used as a teaching space. Although the concrete floor will provide a robust and flexible space, the acoustic effects of the space will not be fully understood until the senior block is closer to its full capacity.

Artificial Lighting

Recessed ceiling lights provide artificial lighting within the learning environments. They appeared to be well distributed and effective at the time of our evaluation.

Of those interviewed, it was stated that the lighting levels in their specific area of the building were ‘sufficient’ and ‘worked well’.

Natural Daylighting

In most instances, the eave overhangs of the learning environment buildings, are well considered and appropriate. As the Master Plan positioned the learning environments around a central social space, each learning centre faces a different way in relation to north, therefore, users experience different levels of natural light.

Staff stated that the administration building and junior learning environment overheated the most due to them being the most exposed to the north and west daylighting. Although moderately large eaves have been utilised in these areas, there is a lot of exposed glass. The majority of the learning environments feature areas of well protected, full-height glazing which provides, what appeared to be, good quality natural light.
5.0 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

5.6 Interiors (Continued...)

ICT

The learning centres provide sufficient power, data, and AV outlets, and are in line with the MoE design guidelines at the time the project was built. However, staff that were interviewed stated that the kura is experiencing a number of issues with the ICT systems. These include:

- A number of the data points do not function
- The kura-wide PA system does not function as intended
- Security cameras do not function as intended
- The Wi-Fi system is, at times, temperamental and challenging to connect to.

These are ongoing concerns for the kura and it is recommended that these issues are investigated. It was also stated that due to the kura being relatively isolated, the specialist skills required are not always available when they are needed.

The kura installed SNUP technology once it was constructed, although it was stated that the fibre was still not functioning at the time of our evaluation. The learning environment appears to be well equipped with devices and digital resources.

ICT information was unavailable during our evaluation, therefore professional observations have been used to determine the system’s specification.
5.0 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

5.7 Energy and Services Strategies

The kura has been awarded a 5 Greenstar rating. The project adopts a number of environmental strategies, such as natural ventilation for cooling, potable water storage, a grey water system, and passive-design strategies which capture and control solar heat gain. These strategies combine to create a relatively average level of energy consumption for a kura of this size.

As noted previously, the kura is continually developing efficiencies regarding how its occupants utilise each space, which will combine to improve their energy consumption over time.

The evaluation team reviewed 12 months of the kura’s power usage and concluded that the kura used 61/kWh/m²/annum. During the interviews it was stated that the kura’s energy costs are higher than what was budgeted for and they are working with the Ministry on this item.

During the interviews the kura stated that the Greenstar rating scheme required considerable resource from the kura to implement, and more support is required regarding accreditation. It was stated that the kura is currently unsure of their responsibilities and how they need to manage the accreditation in the future.

Due to the parameters of the POE process, the evaluation team have not reviewed the Greenstar rating scheme.

5.8 Feeling Safe

The kura offers well designed circulation pathways which are open, wide and enable passive-surveillance. The kura’s boundaries consist of low-density residential dwellings on Norman Senn Ave, regenerative bush and the open sports fields which are shared with the college. The road boundaries are defined with metal fences and planting. During the interviews it was stated that the kura had a great relationship with the community and no vandalism of note had occurred. Of those interviewed, it was stated that the security system was at times difficult to use because of the door hardware being difficult to lock and latch.

The internal environments are open, transparent, and well organised for teachers to easily oversee most spaces. During our on-site evaluation it was noted that all spaces, equipment and building elements appeared safe and are unlikely to cause any health and safety concerns for their occupants.
5.0 Analysis and Findings

5.9 Long Life, Loose Fit

At the time of our evaluation, the kura had been operating within the learning centres for approximately two years. Since the new learning centres have opened, they have remained unchanged in their internal configuration (i.e. walls and ceilings). During the interviews, it was stated that the spaces have been relatively easy to re-configure or re-purpose as required and that the kura had developed a greater understanding of their ILE from the past two years. It was also stated that the junior learning environment is near full capacity while the senior learning environment has fewer students. Once the junior students progress into the senior facilities they will have a better understanding of how that learning environment will operate.

The learning environments are contained within relatively simple building forms. The spaces are open and airy. The structural design spans the width of the building, which effectively limits the amount of bracing or load bearing on internal walls. This allows the internal spaces of the building to be adapted (should the need occur). The ceilings are of an acceptable height, with the higher ceilings in the central learning space seen as a positive attribute.

The learning studios utilise adaptable furniture and are easily modified by their occupants to suit their pedagogical requirements.

Although the sliding doors have caused some maintenance concerns for the kura, they do allow staff and students to adapt the spaces to suit. During the interviews this was stated as being a positive attribute of the learning centres.

It is not known if the Master Plan has allocated space for future stages of development. Although there appears to be limited opportunities for new buildings should the need occur. The kura currently has some remaining capacity at the time of preparing this report, particularly within the senior learning environment.

Limited construction documents were available to verify our team’s observations therefore, in some instances, professional assumptions have been made.
5.0 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

5.10 Successful Whole

Overall the kura’s facilities were pleasant and well maintained. The outdoor learning spaces and landscaping are well defined and the Wharenui building is an excellent example of a facility functioning well. During the interviews it was stated that ‘the students enjoyed the open learning spaces in the learning centres and the Wharenui’.

The evaluation team asked those interviewed which parts of the kura they were most pleased with and what was most useful to them or the students. The top five responses were:

1. The ‘Wharenui design’, and in particular the ‘shower area’ which is adjoined to the Wharenui.
2. The ‘landscaping and junior playground’ is well defined and positioned on the site.
3. The ‘acoustics are working well’.
4. The ‘shape and layout of the learning centres’.
5. The ‘layout of the kura’ and the central position of the ‘Wharenui and Atea’ works well.

The shower area in the Wharenui is well utilised

The Wharenui is well designed and positioned on the site

The landscaping is well integrated into the overall design

The landscaping and junior playground