



## Meeting Notes - Mona Vale Surf Life Saving Club Working Group – 10 October 2017

### Mona Vale Surf Life Saving Club 6-8pm

---

**Present:** Bernard Koon – Senior Project Officer – Northern Beaches Council  
Lisa Trewin – Community Engagement Officer – Northern Beaches Council  
Vish Kunjur – Architect Warren & Mahoney  
Thomas – Hansen Architect Warren & Mahoney  
Andrew Walsh – Graduate Warren & Mahoney

Working Group Members representing the following groups:

- Mona Vale Surf Life Saving Club – Executive
- Board Rider Group
- Local Residents
- Local Business
- Architects – Warren and Mahoney
- Observer – Board Rider Grp

Apologies:

Campbell Pfeiffer - Executive Manager, Property – Northern Beaches Council  
Representative - Bronze Café  
Representatives – Key User Hirer

Meeting commenced: 6.10pm

Meeting was opened by Lisa Trewin who provided an overview of the meeting format, introduced architects from Warren & Mahoney, Vish, Thomas and Andrew.

A brief update from the last meeting was provided by Ms Trewin, who also opened to the floor for feedback or questions from community networks via the Working Group members.

A discussion was opened regarding a point raised at the last meeting about the sand dunes at Mona Vale Beach.

Mona Vale SLSC Exec Representative asked:

*Question: Was there any discussion internally [at Council] about moving the sand dunes?*

*Response: Bernard Koon advised that discussions with the internal stakeholders confirmed that the relocation of the dunes is not supported by Council. In addition, Vish Kunjur from Warren & Mahoney responded that the brief from Council was that it was not possible to move the sand dune as the location was positioned to take advantage of the access.*

*Question taken on notice for detailed response: What is the reason behind Council's decision to not relocate the dunes, considering that Council carried out similar works at this site two years ago?*

*Response: The Mona Vale Beach dune restoration works have been completed by Council's Parks & Recreation Unit in accordance with restoration principles agreed with the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) as conditions of the financial assistance grant (2014-15-CM-0015) offered by OEH in 2015.*



*In response to complaints received about the extent of excavation and dune reshaping works undertaken for Stage 1 of the Mona Vale Beach Dune Restoration Project (north-east of Mona Vale surf club building), the State Assessment Panel imposed project specific conditions on the funding agreement for Stage 2 of the project (south-east of the surf club building) namely:*

**19 Project-specific conditions**

- 19.1 *No earthworks or dune reshaping to occur. Grant money to only be spent on revegetation works.*
- 19.2 *Council to provide amended budget prior to grant commencing.*
- 19.3 *Restoration should aim to introduce a plant assemblage as close as possible to that which existed on site prior to degradation. This refers to both species diversity and structure (strata). Views should not be a consideration in restoration projects unless there is a significant necessity, such as the need for sight lines from surf lifesaving buildings.*
- 19.4 *Restoration projects should follow the “3 Rs” of Retain, Regenerate, Revegetate. Planting should only be done as a last resort if enhanced natural regeneration methods do not work. Brush matting should be used as a preference to planting in revegetation. If Council can justify that regeneration is not likely to occur, revegetation can occur immediately.*

*With respect to Condition 19.1, OEH granted Council a partial release from this condition which enabled limited dune reshaping and revegetation to be undertaken along the front of the dune paddock immediately south of the surf club building. The dune restoration work as undertaken has been completed in accordance with the agreed conditions and no further relocation or reshaping of the foredune is proposed.*

Other items of discussion regarding feedback from the community reflected a mix of positive feedback and questions.

*Question:* What does the general community get from the building?

*Response:* There will be a function space available for hire that can accommodate events such as weddings and birthdays, community groups, a restaurant and amenities. Facilitator Lisa Trewin also discussed options to ensure the community benefit is highlighted on the project page on Council's Your Say page. The Surf Club Representative also advised that the facility would be available for broader community use.

6.15pm Ms Trewin introduced Project Manager, Bernard Koon who gave an update on what had happened to date including meeting with the architects in the past weeks to further discuss the functional analysis, building form, siting and mass on the site. It was also clarified that the building was agreed to be on the existing location and it is not necessarily restricted to the existing footprint.

Mr Koon then handed over to Architects from Warren & Mahoney to start the functional analysis presentation.

A recap on the 'Brief Analysis' was presented – based on the information provided by Council after the first stage of Community Engagement and the initial working group meeting.

A visual presentation of functional spaces covering an area of 1777m<sup>2</sup> was presented. Warren & Mahoney also clarified that circulation was not previously included in the briefed areas and was now added to enable the spaces to operate more efficiently. The allocation for circulation space amounts to approximately 10% of the building area.

For reference and comparison purposes, Warren & Mahoney investigated the circulation space for surf clubs at Kempsey, Avalon and North Bondi, and they range from 6.5% - 10.3%.



*Question: Are the public toilets separate from the total area of 1,777m<sup>2</sup>?*

*Response: No, the toilets are not separate from the building. Council's position is that the public amenities form part of the project and is included within the proposed building envelope.*

Warren & Mahoney also discussed the spatial hierarchy in relation to the Park, Beach, Public and Surf club, and their spatial adjacencies. They also explained how the functional areas are defined and placed together.

The amount of storage space proposed was also raised and the member representing the Surf Life Saving Northern Beaches suggested that the storage may not be sufficient. The architect clarified that the storage area proposed on plan is actually much larger than the existing. It was also emphasized that the community expects that the surf boats and trailers will not be kept on the road.

*Question: Can the floor slab be lowered to provide underground storage?*

*Response: In addition to significant costs, this option is not viable due to the coastal engineering analysis requiring a minimum constructed floor level of 0.5m above surrounding natural ground levels to minimise the risk of wave run-up and coastal inundation.*

Access paths are important to this area, especially east / west and the north / south traffic also presented a number of constraints. Access from both the east and west to the public amenities is also preferred and gym access to be from the south.

The merits and issues of creating a wider north / south corridor was discussed due to beach access requirements for Surf Life Saving Equipment. The space on the beach side of the building restricts the mobility of equipment/ wash down, clean up and preparation.

Beach access was also discussed regarding storage of life boats (IRB) needing direct access to the beach and the means to alleviate some of the pedestrian congestion.

*Question: Can the design include storage at the southern end near the proposed Nippers area?*

*Response from Warren & Mahoney: The brief stated that the nippers and parents congregate on the grass area at the southern end. Storage in that area would be in conflict with that requirement.*

The presentation and discussion then moved to focus on the first floor elevation covering the building mass, visual breaks, elongation of the building, balconies and addressing beach views.

Warren & Mahoney explained the integration of the ground and first floor plans and how the areas are mapped so they are co-ordinated and connected. Further investigation will be required if the location of functional areas is amended on either the ground or first floor.

An image depicting the building's visual impact, was displayed showing an overhang from the second floor which would address views, provide security and shade.

The upper floors take into account the precinct by having elements facing the park as well as the beach. The view from the beach is considered just as important as the view from the park and a perspective of the building was presented to illustrate this point.

At the completion of the presentation, Warren & Mahoney that they will further develop the concept options with details on materials, internal and external design of the building to be presented to the group. A preferred option is then to be agreed with amendments made for presentation and approval by all stakeholders.

*Question: When will the QS be involved?*

*Response: Following approval of the concept design, the QS will then be instructed to prepare the cost estimate.*



*Question: Will the concept design undergo a peer review process?*

*Response: It is not in the architect's scope and Council does not consider that a design peer review is necessary.*

*Question: What is the size of the boardrider's storage area?*

*Response: 3 x 3m.*

It was identified that the boardriders and nipper could potentially share storage as there will be no conflict with their usage throughout the year, ie boardriders from Apr-Feb and nippers from Oct-Mar.

Discussion returned to the area required for the hosing and maintenance of equipment – requesting possibility of a loosely fenced area that would provide a 'designated and recognised space' where equipment could be maintained. It was suggested that it would be safer to carry out this activity on the south side. Detailed discussions followed looking at functional spaces and locations in order to accommodate functional spaces to minimise pedestrian congestion. WH&S was also raised as an issue with the handling of equipment conflicting with a high pedestrian zone.

*Question: Is a raised boardwalk across the sand dunes in front of the Surf Club feasible?*

*Response: This is not in scope and works on the sand dunes are not supported by Council.*

*Question (from Warren & Mahoney): Is there a need for the public amenities to have an open roof?*

*Response: The group agreed that the roof should be closed and allowance made for skylights.*

*Question (from Warren & Mahoney): How manoeuvrable are the surf boats?*

*Response: The surf boats are very difficult to turn especially when the angle is acute.*

*Question (from Warren & Mahoney): Do the storage area require doors on all four sides to enable ease of equipment movement?*

*Response: Two doors are adequate as four doors would remove valuable wall space that can be used to hang or shelve equipment.*

The group advised that the gym is for club members and not accessible to the public. It was also highlighted that the usage of the gym will not conflict with the nippers space as these two groups have a different demographic and are used at different times.

A member pointed out that there seemed to be a lot of space allocated to the gym. It was discussed that in the overall scheme of the project, the gym is probably not the most important area. The location adjacent the grassed area is preferred to enable the connection to the external space. There was also a comment made that the size of the gym could potentially be reduced.

7.50pm – the facilitator flagged that the meeting would run over time and sought confirmation from the group to proceed past 8pm.

Project Manager Bernard Koon asked the group about their thoughts about the presentation of the functional analysis and whether it met the functional brief. The reaction from the group was mostly positive and well received. One SLSC executive mentioned that the project is moving in the right direction with some items that he believed may be need to be confirmed.

The management of dunes was raised and comment about "if Council is inflexible about the sand dune management, you are going to stifle what could be a very good outcome".

Another concern raised was that the east – west access may become a wind tunnel.



Vish (Warren & Mahoney) stated that the brief was to take into account the precinct connecting the park and the beach.

The predominantly north – south traffic was raised as a concern and the proposed thoroughfare may not be used because the access is mainly from Bassett or Darley Streets and there is not a large number of people coming across from the park. Most park users are specifically there for the park not the park and the beach / and vice versa.

As there was further discussion and confirmation on the placement of some functional areas, the working group decided to meet independently on Sunday 15 October at 1pm at the Surf Club to provide detailed feedback for the architects Warren & Mahoney. The facilitator Lisa Trewin reiterated to the group that the information discussed within the meeting must remain confidential.

Facilitator Lisa Trewin requested that Warren & Mahoney provide a template with specific questions to aid the working group in providing consolidated and structured feedback. This feedback will then assist Warren & Mahoney in further developing the concept options.

Agreement to send the template to the group by Thursday afternoon was reached and the working group committed to providing feedback by Monday 16 October.

Next Meeting: **Monday 6 November**  
Venue: **Civic Centre, Dee Why**

Meeting closed at 8.15pm