

MUCHEA RECREATION CENTRE REFERENCE (MRC) GROUP



AGENDA

Monday, 13 September 2021

Muchea Fire Station

Sandown Park, Cnr of Chittering Street and Granary Drive, Muchea

1. DECLARATION OF OPENING OF MEETING - Cr Ross

Meeting open at 5.05pm

We wish to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land we are meeting on, the Yued people. We would like to pay respect to the Elders of the Nyoongar nation, past and present, who have walked and cared for the land, we acknowledge and respect their continuing culture, and the contributions made to this region.

2. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE / APOLOGIES

2.1 MEMBERSHIP

Membership of the Reference Group shall consist of:

- The elected representative appointed to the Muchea Hall User Group (MHUG)
- Project Manager;
- 4 representatives of the existing Muchea Hall User Group – 1 (Cricket) 1 (Football) 1 (Netball) 1 (Judo);
- 3 independent Community representatives and;
- Other intermittent stakeholders as determined and invited by the Project Manager.

2.2 Attendance

Simon, Liz, Brian, Will, Matt, Cr Ross, Naomi & Stephen (Site Architecture Studio), Lisa (Note taker)

Late comers: Nathan, Lachie

2.3 Apologies

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

It is noted that the club representatives of Chittering Junior Football, Chittering Junior Cricket, Muchea Senior Cricket, Muchea Netball Club, and Muchea Judo Club have an inherent interest in this project as existing users of this facility.

4. PREVIOUS MINUTES

No amendments

5. ARCHITECT

5.1 Overall layout feedback

No feedback was received following the last meeting and therefore Site Architecture have assumed that it was a general consensus that everyone was reasonably happy with the layout, other than the changerooms.

Feedback provided by Brian at this meeting:

- Senior cricket club utilise the bar and kitchen in tandem where the kitchen and bar are central to each other. Would like to see a design layout that accommodated this need. If we have 2 function spaces would need to have capacity for access to the kitchen/bar that does not impact the other users.

Can consider this but may also need to consider some adjustment to management practices to accommodate amenity for all users

- Original design was drawn with the view that the original hall would be retained for the activities occurring in the main hall. Rebound floor would be considered the preferred flooring by judo and other exercise classes, which is provided by the existing hall.
- License agreement for alcohol needs to be accommodated including the potential for increasing from a Club seasonal license to a 12 month licence. Strong need to have the bar and kitchen co-located to service both function spaces.
- Hope to increase the use of the main function capacity of the facility. Doesn't make sense to lose this capability in the new facility.

Important that we get the design right at this stage. Site will take this on board and consider layout options. Over the past 5 years there has only been a handful of times where there has been a clash over the use of the kitchen by different users of the clubroom / hall areas. We could look at the possibility of sectioning off the main room to smaller spaces and enabling flexibility in both social space with the capacity to have the function and social space interchangeable with retractable doors so there is no defined rooms.

- Viewing window to oval from kitchen, at the moment there isn't one. This is due to the fact that the design will need wall space for equipment and by installing a window this would take up valuable wall space within the kitchen and impact the viewing space on the verandah.

5.2 Feedback on Changeroom design.

Following the last meeting Site Architecture Studio undertook to reconfigure the changerroom design and to look at James Miller oval as an example of a facility that is considered to have top class changerrooms. Based on drawings provided for James Miller, Site Architecture have offered an alternative layout for the changerrooms. As attached.

Interestingly the James Miller with amenities were 40m², not much different to what was proposed for this facility.

The new proposed layout has 2 toilets, showers and airlock per changerroom. Four dedicated fully separated changerrooms. Can accommodate 22 spaces into these changerrooms. Currently proposal of 33m² per changerroom. Total area is 237m² to accommodate additional showers. All services and ducts at the rear of the building. First aid at northern end provides ease of access. Overall floor area has increased. This will incorporate the treatment area rather than a separate space. Suggestion to have rear access doors to the netball courts would increase cost and would need to accommodate extra exit in changerroom that will compromise space in this area.

All in agreeance that proposed design presented at tonight's meeting suits the needs of all clubs.

5.3 Budget and QS estimate

Site Architecture have been working on the QS over the past week. As it doesn't make much sense to be progressing without an estimate of cost to measure against the budget.

Refer to attached summary of costs. The QS is based on square meter rates.

Please note other costs that are not included in their budget estimate are:

- Architectural Services \$300,000
- Shed \$25,000.

This is the quoted price to move the existing shed. However it is better value for money to build a

larger shed to allow garaging of shire machinery and a workshop. The balance of the funds will come from the Shire of Chittering Technical Services Department.

- Netball Lights Relocation \$23,000
Unexpected cost. Due to the new location of the building these lights will need to be moved.
- Netball court fencing relocation. \$25,000
Unexpected cost. Due to the new location of the building
- Bore decommission \$5,000.
- No Contingency for unexpected costs.

Current estimate cost \$2.843m includes size of building with changerooms, covered areas, estimate of cost for new ATU and disposal and the potable water system.

Repositioning of the netball lights and fencing where not considered in the original budget. The Shire will look at any activities that it can do to offset costs across this whole project. Geotechnical consult is currently being undertaken to understand the soil quality to influence build requirements. Structural solutions can be employed to address the outcomes of the Geotechnical report.

Site Architecture have also been investigating current services on site and those that would be needed for the facility. Have asked for indicative costs for these. Current proposal that no gas to site. Hot water systems far better served with gas, rather than electric. The power demand in order to service the showers etc., would require additional power to the site, very small margin in the existing transformer. Would recommend instantaneous gas with lower running costs. Solar panels require a booster and would still need reliance on gas or electricity and in colder months we couldn't really guarantee hot water to meet the needs of usage. Propose a bulk gas tank on site. Would need to consider potential fire concerns related to this storage. Concerns over water quality and impacts to the gas system were discussed Water has to be filtered to the facility. Nathan is organising water test for the facility and if this is ok then this may have some cost savings to the water filtration system to the new facility.

With no current contingency allowance in the budget we have some inherent risk to the project with increasing labour and material costs.

Currently \$150,000 over budget. This doesn't include other shire costs (Netball lights, fencing, moving the shed, decommission bore). Which would bring the overall costs to 2.9m with no contingency. Previous budget had a 10% contingency. \$80,000 has been considered separate to this project/ budget to knock down the old hall.

These additional costs mean that we would need to find approx. another \$250,000 towards the project. Council approved 2.7m. We need to look at what our options are.

General discussion highlighted the following:

- Getting the changerooms to the current plan is a priority as this is what started the conversation 3 years ago.
- At present the overall building has been increased by 60m² from the original proposal submitted to Site Architecture.

Carmel expressed that as a Councillor, she would be really uneasy knowing that estimates for the project were in excess of the budget prior to even going to tender for the build. Although we are currently working on a high level cost estimate, that provides a guide for expected costs throughout the project, there is a big risk going into a project that we already know is over budget.

General discussion:

- Want to be proud of what we have for the next 40years. Do it once, do it properly.
- With Council elections occurring in October, there could be the possibility a shift in priorities for projects, as seen with the previously proposed Lower Chittering Project at the last elections.

It could be that we focus on the Muchea Facility being set up to meet the needs of the sports clubs and direct any community based activities towards any new facilities developed in Lower Chittering. This could enable us to consider ways of reducing the m² and the need for function space in excess of club needs. Based on previous experience if we have considerable cost blow outs this wouldn't be looked at very favourably by the general public, as was the experience at Lower Chittering.

General discussion:

- With over 450 members who play sport on this oval, why is it that other facilities with less members have great facilities – most of these are metro based councils with larger rate base.

General consensus by all present that we need to prioritise what is important to the facility and find some reductions in the m² which will reduce costs.

All agree that the changerooms in their current configuration is the highest priority.

- Could save some money by challenging the size of the two function spaces. The size of the wet areas can't be reduced as these are proportional to the usage of the facility. Would need to reduce the floor area by approx. 60sqm.
- Capacity to remove the foyer as most people would be inclined to access via the oval side of the building rather than the foyer access.
- If we were going back to Council to seek increased funding for the project would need to provide a rationale and options showing costings and what we consider the priorities. It would also be important to define what would be lost if we had to work within the current budget, but if we received additional funding what would we stand to gain.
- Potential to look at reconfiguring the floor layout, removing foyer space, taking some area from function space and the office, but would still need some area for CCTV, and communications and building main switchboard.

Outcome: Site Architecture will try to squeeze down the floor space without impact on the amenity of the overall facility.

Next step - schematic design: where drawings have more details including materials that the building is made with. This will then provide a more detailed and considered cost estimate.

6. **NEXT MEETING** Confirmed for Tuesday 28th September 5pm at Muchea Hall Clubrooms
7. **CLOSURE** Meeting closed at 7pm.