

**STAKEHOLDER GROUP MEETING
FOR BORONIA PARK COMMUNITY & SPORTS FACILITY**

Date: 18/01/2021

The meeting opened at 4:30pm.

Attendees:

Name	Organisation	Position
Neil Strickland	HHC	Director of Services Delivery & Special Projects
Antony Picone	HHC	Project Manager
Jacqui Jones	HHC	Communications Officer
Lucy Cole- Edelstein	RPS	Meeting facilitator
Andrew Hipwell	DJRD Architects	Architect (Director)
Peter McFarlane	HHRUFC	Vice President
Glen Sanford	HHRUFC	President
Blake Walker	HHRUFC	member
Ben Chaplin	HHRUFC	member
Melissa Cullen	Gladesville Ravens Netball Club	Director
Cathy Inglis	Gladesville Ravens Netball Club	President
Josh Smyth	Boronia Park PS	

Absent:

Name	Organisation	Position
Ben Woods	Ryde Hunter's Hill Cricket Club	President
Kerrie O'Brien	Boronia Park PS	
Katherine Micallef	VILLA Maria Primary School	

Preamble:

This meeting was facilitated by Lucy Cole-Edelstein. Lucy is an industry leader in community engagement and facilitation with over 30 years of experience. She has worked extensively with local councils and community organisations in Sydney to help negotiate planning issues.

The next meeting will be a combined meeting of the Sports Users with Residents and members of the Hunters Hill Trust, the Flora and Fauna Society and Bush Care and will be facilitated by Lucy. Accordingly, Lucy is attending tonight's meeting with the Sports Groups Stakeholders, to meet the participants.

1.0 Introductions

- 1.1. Lucy Cole- Edelstein introduced herself and facilitated the meeting.
- 1.2. Lucy summarized some of the concerns from the meeting with the residents, Flora & Fauna Group, Bushcare and Hunter's Hill Trust

2.0 Concept designs by DJRD Architects

Following the last meeting of the Sports Group Stakeholders, DJRD Architects have prepared some initial concepts, with feedback from the quantity surveyor. These concepts, 1, 2 & 3 were presented at this meeting.

It is important to recognise that these concepts are in no way locked-in and are subject to review, including as a result of comments from the other stakeholders and Groups.

The purpose is to arrive at a preferred initial concept or concepts which can be submitted to the elected Councillors at a briefing in early February. The final decision about any preferred concepts will be made by the Council.

Option 1.

This was the preferred option; the cost has been estimated at about \$2,949,750. It is a 2-story building with a ground floor comprising of an undercroft, a canteen, store rooms, referees' room, first aid room, toilets, change rooms and a lift. The Telco building was shown as being built around, however it has been pointed out that access to the enclosed equipment will need to be maintained. It comprises of an upper floor accessed by stairs and a lift with a Community room of about 150m sq, a Terrace of 103m sq., a Kitchen, an office, Accessible toilet and a small store room. The building has a foot print of 342m sq. which is well under the 450m sq. allowed under the P.O.M. The height of the building will not exceed 8m. The building has been positioned within the location (bubble) as per the P.O.M

There are concerns about potential noise generated from the terrace which will need to be addressed.

Option 2.

This option has a cost estimate of about \$2,955,500. It is also a 2-story building but has no lift, and relies on stairs and flat ramps, no greater than 1:20 to access both floors. It has a ground floor comprising of Store rooms, canteen, change rooms, an under-croft, referees' room, first aid room and toilets. The Upper floor has A small store, kitchen, toilets, office, community room of 168m sq. and a terrace which is 138m sq. The terrace is located on the east side and therefore noise is unlikely to be of concern to the residents. The building footprint is 293m sq well under the 450m sq allowed under the P.O.M. The height will not exceed 8m. The building is excavated about 600mm into the ground on the southern end. The building appears to have good clearance for access to the TELCO building.

Option 3.

The cost was estimated at about \$2,645,000, and is the less expensive of the 3 options. This is a single level building with a foot print of 664m sq. which is outside the P.O.M of a maximum of 450m sq. however Andrew Hipwell pointed out that it is a single-story option which may offset the extra area required in the footprint. It would be under 4m in height. All the requirements of the Stakeholders are met, with a community room of 150m sq. and a terrace of 120msq located on the east side, therefore noise is unlikely to be of a concern to residents.

All 3 options had security gates and air-conditioning allowed for.

3.0 Approximate Cost of the Concepts.

3.1. The estimates prepared by the quantity surveyor are:

- \$2,949,750.00 for option 1(preferred option)
- \$2,955,500.00 for option 2
- \$2,645,000.00 for option 3

3.2. Funding provided by the State and Federal Government totals \$1.5 million. The balance to be raised by HHRUFC. Neil Strickland indicated that there could be a possibility that the Federal Government may grant an extra \$455,000 through a separate program.

3.3. The HHRUFC would require near completed designs to show their members. This would then generate donations.

3.4. LCE suggested that perhaps other sporting groups and users could also raise some funds. CI suggested that The Netball club would have great difficulty raising funds as the facility, although is of benefit, its use and benefit is very limited as they only utilise the under- croft in bad weather, the toilets and a small store room.

4.0 Functional Requirements.

4.1 All 3 options were discussed, and although all 3 had their merits, it was decided that option 1 was preferred. However, it was acknowledged that noise from the terrace needed addressing and that access to the Telco Building needed to be maintained.

4.2. Council would encourage other Groups in the community to use the facility. Groups and uses would include, but not limited to, Yoga classes, playing of bridge, conferences and other suitable activities approved by Council.

5.0 Site Constraints

5.1 The Telco building to be considered. Access is required with a small crane to remove any heavy plant inside the facility.

5.2. Park infrastructure to be considered, utility services and underground sewer tunnel also to be considered.

5.3. CI suggested that any positional changes to field number 2 needed to account for the future netball courts being turned at 90 degrees and another court added.

5.4. GS also stated that any movement of any of the football fields, laterally, would include new concrete footings for the goal posts.

6.0 Stakeholder Issues.

6.1 GS stated that if the facility could not be built to suit their needs then they would not be prepared to fund the project.

7.0 Time Frames.

7.1. A meeting with Stakeholders and other interested groups is to be held at the Town Hall on Wednesday the 27th of January at 6.00pm.

7.2 LCE has suggested that only 1 representative from each Stakeholder attend this meeting.

8.0 Other matters

8.1. LCE listed some of the concerns from other groups as follows:

- Excess Noise generated from the HHRUFC when using the Community Room.
- Public Access to be maintained
- Drunken behaviour.
- Anti-social behaviour.
- Visual impact
- Funding requirements
- Removal of trees.

8.2. Andrew Hipwell indicated that he would avoid as much as practical any removal of trees, and that it would be likely that only 2 trees would be removed.

8.3. PM indicated that the HHRUFC would usually be gone by 5.30pm, but on occasions The Community Room may be used until later, but would not exceed 9.30pm.

9.0 Close of meeting

The meeting closed at 6.55 pm.