



LOWER CHITTERING HALL REPLACEMENT (LCHR) REFERENCE GROUP

MINUTES

5pm, Monday, 21 February 2022

ONLINE (ZOOM) MEETING

1. DECLARATION OF OPENING OF MEETING - Cr Angus

Meeting open at 5.01pm

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:

- Project Manager;
- 2 Council Representatives – 1 being the presiding member of the group.
- 2 representatives of the existing Lower Chittering Hall Users – 1 (Scouts) 1 (Chittering Home School);
- 4 independent Community representatives and;
- Other intermittent stakeholders as determined and invited by the Project Manager.

2.2 Attendance

Cr Mary Angus, Cr Mark Campbell, Cr Aaron King, Matthew Gilfellon, Amanda Adams, Carmen Jones, Anthony McConnell, Alison Reliti.

Site Architectural Studios – Stephen Hart , Rosalyn Baird.

2.3 Apologies

Simon Cox, Nathan Gough, Kerrie Read

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

It is noted that the existing hall representatives of Chittering Scout Group and Chittering Home School Group, have an inherent interest in this project as existing users of this facility.

4. SITE ARCHITECTURAL STUDIO – UPDATED PLANS and REPORTS

Introduction from Cr Angus:

Council are waiting for Schematic Design Report to create report to see where we go from here and how much we are able to find or not to proceed and when the likelihood is.

Stephen Hart – We were hoping to have the cost report ready but it has unfortunately it has been delayed. We are still finalising the infrastructure interface between bore – potable water – fire tank – irrigation. We are having a conversation with the Hydraulic Consultant and Irrigation Consultant to resolve the various methods that could be employed to cater for those three demands. Not quite

finalised. We have details of size required, details of the turning circle required, detailed capacity requirements from the hydraulic consultant. The Hydraulic Consultant has sent their cost requirements to Quantity surveyor.

Have not finalised irrigation information, report from irrigation consult needs to be considered and then transformed in to a report to be shared with Nathan and Graham to make sure meets the needs for Fire Brigade and Facility.

Bulk earth-works concept plan from civil engineer to show how site should be transformed to facilitate development of the site to suit the oval, building and overall site plan. Also, how the overland water can be handled on site and connected in the swale detailed in the Aspirational Plan.

Solar array – 30kw system could be accommodated on the building and has been included in the electrical consultant report and budget. Further detail needs to be done to determine the value in reducing the running costs with the solar array but certainly at this stage in the project it is a valuable contribution for consideration to assist in reducing the running cost of the facility.

We will put together a separate discussion report around the use of the solar bore pump. Concerns with use of solar pump for entire facility. Also have concerns whether the loss of power in a fire event, if Western Power cut off power we want to make sure that the Fire Brigade have a contingency plan for access to power, and worthwhile us putting commentary in the report to raise awareness to the possible solution.

Questions / Comments

Cr King – could we use diesel pump or generator backup. Will that be considered.

Steve: Yes, will discuss with Graham. They may have plans for backup power, but at this point we are not aware.

Cr Campbell – Graham had said that the solar bore pump will have mains backup - dual power. The trucks have the equipment to draft from the tank when power is not available. Confirm with Graham.

Draft Schematic Design Report

Draft will be issued to LCHR Reference Group for comment when available.

No Geotechnical survey – targeted report should be done further in to the project development. Plans created in consultation with the steering group.

Program – As we have not been given information on the intention of Council in regard to timelines for this project commencement, we can provide a guide only. A program will assist with any deliberation by providing scope of the time taken to complete the specific components, and the likely life of the project. Would you like us to include this in the Schematic Design report?

Cr Angus: it would give an idea of how long it would take for the whole project to be completed. Please include in schematic design for council to consider.

Final plan will show a budget which shows:

- Quantity Surveyors elemental break up with a summary identifying the various components of the project
- We have been asked to provide costs for the whole of the project – the whole of what is included in the aspirational plan, not just the building.

- Quantity Surveyor cost report will identify in components the cost of the building and the various other components, car parking, landscaping, site power infrastructure, building power, site water infrastructure civil works, etc so that the shire is given a clear understanding of what the various components are likely to cost for the development of the whole of the site so that the development of the whole of the site can be considered in priority against budgets and funding.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

Questions:

Cr Angus – when can we expect to have this report ready to take to council for review and comment.

Steve: When would you like it? The only things we are waiting on are the Quantity Surveyor cost report and the report from the irrigation consultant which will involve discussions with Graham and Nathan. Could hopefully wrap up by Wednesday close of business.

Cr Angus – Our next info session wed 9 March. Will it be available or would you like to come and present to Council.

Steve: We can certainly provide a copy well before that. Would be useful for reference group to view the report and comment, then Site Architectural Studio can respond and make alterations, then have available ready well before 9 March.

Cr Angus: do we need another meeting?

Steve: If feedback is clear and straightforward we can add it to the report to address comments, there is no need for another meeting, but if there are elements that need discussion then yes we will need another meeting. I think because of the level of consultation that's been done and attendees of the Reference group ability to review and discuss the information provided up to date, the report should be a result of the consultations and therefore there shouldn't be too much more required once Reference Group have had a chance to review the report in more detail.

Cr Angus: Matthew, are you able to make sure that all of Council have a copy of this in plenty of time before the next information session.

Matthew: Yes. It doesn't have to be rushed through anyway. Even if it was received on the 8th March we could have the discussion the next week. There are big decisions around Muchea facility. It would be nice to have this available before a discussion around LTFP when the Tender comes back for Muchea. Not need to rush and make a decision by the March Meeting.

Cr King: I would have thought the only thing council will be doing is receiving the SDR. It won't be making a decision at this point.

Matthew – not a decision on go ahead/not, but receive report, provide feedback on report and then it would feed back in to the LTFP. So I guess it would be nice to discuss it once the tender comes back. If its back by then it can fit in to that discussion.

Cr King – The tender for Muchea is not coming in for a while though.

Matthew – Yes, there is plenty of time.

Cr King: What is the plan going forward in terms of community engagement, mapping out the pathway forward for further discussions on the project.

Cr Angus: Depends on what council on a whole decides on where it fits within the LTFP or not fit in.

Cr King: We have brought this to a concept level. If we decide to produce a business case, we will need to do more work if going for funding. This program that Site Architectural Studio develop needs to include the next phase of further development to get to the business case point. Regardless of what it looks like it has to have steps so we can go out and get funding.

Cr Angus: Steve, do you have anything to add?

Steve: Our commission expires when we complete the Schematic Design report. We are happy to have that extended, but not sure how we would contribute the development of a business plan. What we are providing in the schematic design report is more detail regarding the nature of the community centre and the costed solutions of the design required to move forward with the development of the community centre. It is a more detailed report than a concept report. It provides Shire with the information they need in regard to the development of the site, so they can consider which elements of the site does the Shire wish to proceed with, and develop a business case for the development of the whole site, or part of the site, and also provide sufficient information to develop funding applications to State/Federal Government and Lotterywest. When you have a chance to review the report, if you feel something is missing to achieve that outcome we are happy to assist, but our commission was to produce a costed Schematic Design Report in consideration of the services, and infrastructure requirements to bring the Community Centre to an operation level and we are close to achieving that outcome.

Cr King: You mentioned, whether the council would like to stage this. I wasn't aware there was a staging opportunity. We can't build the facility without certain things like a carpark. How can we stage this?

Steve: Staging has not been considered in the plan. The staging plan would have to be developed in conjunction with the Council's ability to fund the project, once level of funding is known, then staging can be considered.

It may be possible to have the building without oval, or fully developed roads, car parking and recreational areas, sound shell, market place etc. Elements of the aspirational plan could be considered as future stages of the development of the overall site. It is difficult to develop staging plan until we know the priorities of the community for the area and the level of funding the Shire can attract.

Cr King: My understanding was that although there was an aspirational plan, the Reference Group focus was on the community centre only. I wasn't aware that you were costing the oval. Yes, position the oval, but my understanding was that we are only pricing the community facility at this point.

We've already been down the path of pricing a recreation centre and that was 9.7 million dollars, I think. It might not have been an oval, might have only been a hockey pitch.

Mary: My understanding too, was that it was the community centre, with the oval as a possible add on at a later date.

Cr King: at a later date yes but not necessarily costed. Include in the development so you can lay it out properly and price the community centre, that was what was understood. We know what this will cost if we put an oval in. Forget it, we don't have the money, we can't borrow enough money. Sorry, it might be my misunderstanding about what was requested. If you price the whole lot, we can look at it. So it's not a bit deal, just my misunderstanding.

Steve: We were asked to consider the community centre as part of the whole plan. Our focus has been on the community centre itself. The intent and aim of the Reference group was to define what the community centre is. That's what we have done, in consultation with the user groups. But in addition to that focus, the request was to provide a cost report for the all of the elements in the rest of the plan. I don't know the reasons behind the request, but I assume it's so that council can consider the future potential cost of development of the entire site. I can see no disadvantage in knowing the projected costs of the whole of the development of the site might be, because it helps council to identify the priorities for the development of the site, and allows them to do their forward estimate budgets, and determine what, if any of the other elements that are have been considered in the aspiration could be developed in the future.

Cr King: The question comes with those other aspirational elements, what is really required. At the moment you have an oval, who says it's not an indoor stadium, who says its not a hockey pitch. So it's great to have the costs, until we know what the real ultimate aspirational plan is for the rest of the facilities, and that is hinged on what happens at Muchea, we don't know what this might include. I would just hate to see us put a lot of effort in to something that may never be delivered.

Steve: I will need to defer to the Reference Group, but I assume that the aspirational plan was produced after a series of workshops and community consultations involved in creating a plan that services the community. We understand that there has been a lot of consultation and consideration done that sits behind the outcomes of the aspirational plan.

Cr Angus: Muchea have always wanted a second oval, and Lower Chittering was suggested as an alternative and that's why it was included in the plan.

Steve: One thing just to add. Aaron you referred to a previous scheme for the site. We are familiar with it and its size. The size of this project is considerably smaller than the previous plan. Not withstanding that project was costed 3-4 years ago, and we've had costs escalation since then, I expect the cost of this building will be considerably less than what was presented to council for the previous scheme.

This scheme is quite different than the previous one. It was evident to us that this scheme has been considered in context with the previous scheme, but is a much scaled down development of the site. We assume this was as a result of consideration by the stakeholders, and what is likely to be achievable by council in the future, and what is more likely to be beneficial for the community in consideration of the current size of the community and the anticipated growth.

Cr King: We'll wait for the information to come through but we have a good idea of what it would cost based on the size in comparison to Muchea. We know the square metre size of this plan, and then you have all the Greenfields costs.

Mary: We will now wait for the information to come through for us to look over. Any other comments or questions?

Carmen: Aaron hasn't been here for a lot of the meetings, but we have been making our main focus on keeping it scaled down, and the cost down. We understand that the community needs something and we don't want it to turn in to the WA Cricket field, we just want something for the community. So we have focused on keeping the costs down. I understand where Aaron was coming from. But I would hate to think that all this time has gone in to it. And it will just get thrown out. I'd hate to think that's the attitude the council will take.

Cr King: We'll wait for the architects to put their costs together, but my estimate is at least \$3 million as per the square metre rate. But we'll wait for the formal costs to come in. If you work out the per square metre rate, adding in services etc, you can come up with a price fairly quickly. \$3 million is on the light side. I'm just trying to set the scene of what it is likely to be, and that's excluding the oval. So it's going to be a significant contribution from council, which is hard to do without grant funding, impossible without a loan from treasury. Council has a LTFP that has all these projects and needs to assess all these projects together. And one of the big determinates will be what council decides with Muehea, which will have a big impact on what it can afford and when in regard to other projects.

Cr Angus – Its really important that we have ourselves in a position to be ready to be able to attract grant funding again and that will be the determining factor whether it happens or not or when.

Cr King: Council can do this project, dependent on what it decides with Muehea. That's what council has to decide. How much money does it want to spend on Muehea, or does it want to spend less at Muehea and go down the path of proceeding with Lower Chittering sooner rather than later. It will be interesting to see what council decides.

Cr Angus: Any further questions? - No

6. CURRENT / OUTSTANDING ACTIONS:

Action	Responsible	Status
Schematic Design Report	Site Architectural Studio	Supplied

Overall outcome of meeting: Waiting to see the final report and once Council have considered it we will meet again.

7. NEXT MEETING – TBA: wait to see the report.

8. CLOSURE: meeting closed by Cr Angus at 5.58pm