

MUCHEA RECREATION CENTRE REFERENCE (MRC) GROUP



AGENDA

Tuesday, 17 August 2021

Shire Chambers

6177 Great Northern Highway, Bindoon WA 6502

1. DECLARATION OF OPENING OF MEETING - Cr Ross

Meeting open at 5:04pm

Welcome back to Site Architects Naomi and Steve.

Welcome to Louise, in attendance for her first meeting and thank you to everyone attending.

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.

With some representatives of the Muchea Hall User Group (MHUG) represented on the MRC reference group it is important for us to recognise the difference between the two groups with the MHUG focus on now and its current users. Where the MRC reference group is being asked to imagine the future of the needs of the Muchea Community – our best imagining of the whole community and how they can best utilise the facility. Looking through a big picture lens that considers the long term use of the facility and for the community as a whole to get the best outcome we can.

2. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE / APOLOGIES

2.1 MEMBERSHIP

Membership of the Reference Group shall consist of:

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

2.2 Attendance

Cr Ross (Chair), Louise, Matt, Simon, Will, Lachie, Liz, Brian, Steve & Naomi (Site Architects), Nathan (Project Manager), Lisa (note taker)

2.3 Apologies

Nil

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

Amendment to section 3. Disclosure of Interest - MHUG noted at its meeting that Kylie Hughes, in addition to her role in the Muchea Netball Club, is also Shire President. Though it is Kylie's decision as to whether she has a conflict of interest, the group noted the potential for perceived conflict of interest among community members if she was to represent netball on the Reference Group.

5. ARCHITECT PRESENTATION OF PLANS

Currently in the design phase of the project. This is the most significant phase that determines a lot of decisions, based on feedback, input and briefing. Allows all parties to have input. Carefully considering information provided and providing design solutions to respond to our needs, wishes and visions.

A site feature survey has recently been undertaken. This informs the room available to build the facility, the relationship of the facility to users. It also enables us to consider how the community can take best advantage of the facility. The survey enabled site to look critically at the location and the proposed building.

Site Architecture provided 2 alternative site solutions to the placement and design of the building for consideration of the group. Once the group has determined the most optimal site, they will then commence work on the detailed planning of the facility. Refer to site plans as attached.

Option 1: Looked at originally proposed position for facility. This doesn't allow activity spaces connection with the centre of activity on the oval – it is off to the side and potentially worse off than the original hall. Very limited opportunity to build an outdoor spectators area due to level changes and the boundary of the oval. Disjointed / disconnected from Netball and playground. In summary there are some serious constraints with the position of the building that possibly doesn't exploit the full benefit of all users.

Option 2: this allows positioning of the passive area of the building in a more central location to connect centrally and more visually. Would require overlay to an existing netball court. One large building with fire walls to eliminate the triggering requirements for fire. Negative of this solution – In this arrangement connectivity to the first aid room for emergency services is problematic. The existing hall could not be retained which would not facilitate use of the old building during the build. This could be accommodated by temporary buildings. Feel that while this ticks some boxes it doesn't achieve everything that we have identified.

Option 3: split changerooms and main building. Centred on viewing of the pitch and oval. Centre access to changerooms, emergency vehicle access, and kitchen/canteen and connects well with circulation of netball and oval sports. Could have an internal space to the function area that connects both. Allow the existing building to be retained until the end of the build.

- Would result in a netball court being removed in the short term and a long term installation of a new netball court. To facilitate the 3 court options for netball in the interim would require resurfacing works to the old court on the north end of the facility adjacent to the cricket nets. Netball will ultimately need 4 useable netball courts in within the next few years to accommodate local competition through SMNA. Heritage listed trees would be impacted by this decision where there is

a strong view of longer term residents that the trees need to be retained. Would be nicer if it is 2 and 2 court placement, but at the moment have 3 and 1. Could make it work as long as the courts are installed appropriately

- Could facilitate more parking at entrance to the facility on the site of the existing hall. What amount of off street parking ought to be provided? Number of parking bays on site? Site will investigate this. Could effectively double the car parking area when the existing hall is removed and also at the northern end of the site.
- See incorporating the play area into the main part of the building. Clubs concerned over the playground close to the road. It is important to the reference group members that the playground is in a place that is in proximity and visual connection between activities and kids on the playgrounds.
- Could envisage a covered walk way between the buildings. Could provide shelter and an activity space with connection to inside activities (bar/kitchen/toilets).
- Septic's – could the existing units be utilised. Likely to result in an upgrade or replacement. New system has been budgeted for. Could be potential to keep old system to utilise as large function toilets/ open days.

Overall discussion: it is pointless to put a building in that is the same floor size as what we have now. The floor area originally proposed by the project was 590^{m²} including store and toilets. The proposed floor area is 500^{m²} plus the changerooms etc. that are another 200^{m²}. In the next phase will look at rooms and their relationship and priorities to determine the best placement of these i.e. activity and function rooms.

We also need to figure the best design to budget. There are certain areas and divisions where it is sensible and economical to have fire separation. This may enable us to maximise space and drive economies of space within the changerooms particularly for football with the larger teams. Issue is ensuring there is adequate area for the community to use. It will be important for us to consider what is needed and what may be extravagant areas that can be economised to enable the rooms to function appropriately against the priorities determined by the MRC reference group while working within budget. There will be opportunity to critique the priorities and amend the floor plan to meet these within the current footprint.

Any suggestion to increase the footprint of the building will need to be considered by Council. Looking ahead 50 yrs. it is difficult to justify planning for growth in Steve's experience. For example numbers anticipated may end up being split with another facility. It is possible to design a building to add on to accommodate future growth and this could be accommodated in the area currently occupied by the existing hall.

Focus of tonight is to find the optimum place to position the building. Preferred solution of Site Architecture is option 3. Allows hall to be retained, central to oval, allows viewing area and all related activities, potentially less costly solution to squeezing into another area and the necessity of building retaining walls due to the proximity to the oval.

In reviewing each option the reference group discussed the below:

Option1 doesn't provide connectivity to sports activities. If the back court goes it could allow increased connectivity and footprint to the netball court but doesn't allow maximum viewing to netball and oval activities. This would disconnect the changerooms and kitchen etc., restricting connectivity and central activity.

Option 2 - the playground is disconnected and not ideal. Would mean that the existing facility would be off line during construction, impacting existing users. Viewing of oval not too bad but disconnected from Netball. Really only a slight improvement to what is currently provided in relation to viewing. Walkway from courts to oval and access to building from the northern end would be problematic due to space.

Option 3 – would enable first aid access at the northern end. Lighting tower is problematic in existing position. Should have been positioned between courts and oval. Fairly broad brush plan. Will continue to look for positive to achieve brief and achieve better outcomes, recognising existing constraints and massage or minor changes to accommodate these. If we opted for this site could the changerooms be done quicker? We are looking at two buildings but one project. Need to consider the impact on cost of building. Two buildings completed simultaneously have economies of scale across trades working sequentially. Strongly suggest carefully considering the benefits and pitfall of staging the project. This option provides space north and south to expand lending to future expansion. Like the layout of changerooms separated from public toilets so spectators and players have privacy. This layout provides elevation and a walkway around back of the building so that people aren't entering the building through the spectator area.

Overall site considerations

- The position of playground needs to be in prominent place for parents to view what is going on. Want to optimise visibility for parents.
- Parking needs further thought particular the access and egress points
- If we used a shed for storage this may enable more floor area to increase function space. We would need to move the green shed and reposition to enable access to the site. Would need to consider the minimum standards for the run off to the netball court if positioning at the northern end of the old 4th court.

Project updates for community

Need to consider how we keep the community informed and communicate that the facility is a Community space not just a sporting facility. MHUG recommended the installation of a public noticeboard at the front of entrance to the facility to keep members and general community up to date on the project.

Resolution of the reference group: Option 3 as presented by Site Architect is the preferred option of MRC for the site position for the new building/s based on the above feedback.

6. NEXT MEETING

Site will be presenting more detailed spacial arrangements.

Monday preferred day for all reference group members.

Confirmed for Monday, 30 August 2021, Shire Chambers 5pm.

7. CLOSURE

Meeting closed 6:35pm