



RECREATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Committee Brief

The duties of the committee shall be:

- *prepare a draft Shire of Plantagenet Recreation Strategic Plan for the consideration of the Council;*
- *utilise the July 2008 Plantagenet Sport and Recreation Needs Assessment and any other report considered pertinent by the Committee; and*
- *liaise as necessary with community groups Recreation Centre Advisory Group, the Department of Sport and Recreation and other bodies.*

A meeting of the Recreation Advisory Committee
held in the Council Committee Room, Lowood Road, Mount Barker
at 4.00pm on Tuesday 11 May 2010

Rob Stewart
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Committee Members:

Cr K Clements, Cr A Budrikis, Cr S Etherington JP, Cr J Moir, Cr S Grylls (Deputy) – 313/09, 232/08)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE NO
1	DECLARATION OF OPENING / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS	1
2	RECORD OF ATTENDANCE / APOLOGIES	1
3	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	1
4	DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST	1
5	RECREATION DEVELOPMENTS IN KENDENUP	1
6	SKATE PARK DEVELOPMENTS	6
6	NEXT MEETING	9
7	MEETING CLOSURE	9

1 DECLARATION OF OPENING / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

4.00pm The meeting was declared open.

2 RECORD OF ATTENDANCE / APOLOGIESPresent

Members:

Cr Ken Clements - Chair

Cr Jeff Moir

Cr Andrus Budrikis

Cr Simon Grylls

Officers:

Mr Rob Stewart

Mrs Nicole Selesnew

Apologies

Cr Sue Etherington

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved Cr Jeff Moir, seconded Cr Andrus Budrikis:

That the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Recreation Advisory Committee held on 23 March 2010, be accepted.

CARRIED

4 DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Part 5 Division 6 Local Government Act 1995

Cr Andrus Budrikis declared a Code of Conduct – Perceived Interest — Recreation Developments in Kendenup, Agenda Item 4.

Cr Andrus Budrikis declared a Financial Interest – Landowner of land east side of Railway Line, Agenda Item 5.

5 RECREATION DEVELOPMENTS IN KENDENUP

Code of Conduct Disclosures (S5.103 LGA/Reg 34C Local Government Administration Regulations) A perceived interest (Clause 2.3 Code of Conduct) was made by Cr Andrus Budrikis.

Nature and Extent of Interest: Kendenup resident and former member of the Kendenup Community Recreation Centre Board.

Cr Andrus Budrikis advised that his Interest was perceived only and would be remaining in the meeting to participate, debate and to vote.

Background

The Council adopted a Recreation Precinct Development Plan for the Kendenup townsite on 13 October 2010. The plan identifies existing infrastructure, future proposed infrastructure and includes recommendations for infrastructure rationalisation.

Since the adoption of the plan it has become clearly evident that the Kendenup community is divided in relation to future infrastructure developments and rationalisation.

Both the Kendenup Community Recreation Centre (KCRC) committee and Kendenup Country Club (KCC) committee have made presentations to this committee regarding their future plans:

- The KCRC is progressing a feasibility study and management plan for the proposed community centre through the appointment of a consultant and with funding assistance from the Great Southern Development Commission, Department of Sport and Recreation and Shire; and
- The KCC has finalised plans for a building renovation and extension for their existing site at the Golf Course. The plans include fitting out the kitchen to bring it up to standard, new ablution facilities (critical), recladding the exterior of the building and extending the building to the east.

Two petitions and one letter of concern have been received at the Shire regarding the proposed location of the KCRC building.

The Kendenup community is growing increasingly divided while there is a struggle between two community groups to establish or expand their infrastructure. There also appears to be a perception within the community that recreation developments will take precedence over expenditure on basic infrastructure, such as roads and drainage, which is creating more anxiety.

Cr Ken Clements, Rob Stewart and Nicole Selesnew met with Chris Thompson (Manager – Great Southern Branch) and Steve Humphreys (Asset and Infrastructure specialist) from the Department of Sport and Recreation on Monday 3 May 2010 to discuss the infrastructure development proposals and seek the Department's advice.

Financial Implications

The Council's capacity to fund any major recreation developments in Kendenup is limited. Priority has been placed on developing facilities at Sounness Park, Mount Barker, prior to major capital investments on Kendenup recreation facilities.

The Long Term Financial Plan does not support any borrowings until 2014. It could be 10 years before the Council is in a position to consider a large capital injection to developing Kendenup recreation / community facilities.

The KCRC has been quite firm that they are not seeking financial support from the Council as they are confident that the funding for their proposal will come from external funding agencies and their own fundraising efforts. They would require Council land for their proposed development.

The KCC building is owned by the Council. The KCC committee has maintained the facilities within their capacity as best possible and no significant contributions have been sought from the Council in the past.

Asset Management Implications

There is a myriad of facilities scattered throughout the Kendenup Agricultural Grounds precinct and the Golf Course area including:

- A playgroup / bridge club building which has kitchen facilities and a meeting room;
- A large shed with verandah adjacent to the oval area;
- The Agricultural Grounds caravan / camping site;
- Sheep dog trial facilities;
- The Kendenup Tennis Club courts, club house and toilet block;
- The Kendenup Golf Club / Country Club building;
- Oval refurbishments including improvements to the oval reticulation and construction of cricket training nets; and
- The proposal to construct a new recreation / community centre.

Only two of the above organisations have formal agreements with the Council regarding their tenancy, including maintenance obligations (the Tennis Club and Country Club).

The Council has already spent a considerable amount of money refurbishing some of these facilities, in particular the large shed, which is only used occasionally. Infrastructure rationalisation and asset management needs to be a major consideration across this site.

Recommendations From The Site Meeting With The Department Of Sport And Recreation

'Getting the best bang for the dollar' was the outcome of the site visits to the Kendenup Country Club site and Agricultural Grounds site with the representatives from the Department of Sport and Recreation.

Kendenup's existing recreation infrastructure from the golf course grounds through to the Agricultural Grounds is spread out and there is no one building that is easily accessible to all recreation users.

Existing infrastructure (with the exception of the new tennis club facilities) is ageing and several facilities require capital investment to bring them up to a functional standard.

Reference is often made to a community meeting held approximately 6 years ago with the Department of Sport and Recreation's Director, Ron Alexander, during which he supposedly advised the Kendenup community that the Department would not invest money into existing ageing infrastructure, such as the KCC building, and would prefer that new facilities be constructed that are more accessible to all sport and recreation groups across the Agricultural Grounds and Country Club / Golf site.

This community meeting was the catalyst for the KCRC to start investigating 'green-field' sites for a new community / recreation building.

The present situation in Kendenup is:

- The KCC building is used by a majority of sporting clubs as a socialising area. It is not used as a changeroom / clubroom facility and the plans for expansion of the building do not include a changeroom / clubroom facility;
- The KCC building is ideally located within the golf course to support golf. The location is not ideal to support recreation activities across the Agricultural Grounds (for example cricket or the sheep dog trials) other than by providing a venue for socialising, fund raising, meals etc.
- The KCC building is owned by the Council and leased by the KCC. They have not requested significant financial assistance from the Council towards the facilities in the past. The ablution area is now in a critical state and kitchen refurbishments are required in order to keep the building operational. Plans for building re-cladding and extensions are also proposed.
- The KCRC proposal extends beyond a recreation based facility of providing a changeroom / clubroom area and encompasses a range of community services as well.
- The new building proposal will be costly, in excess of \$2million if it is to incorporate all of the services outlined to the Council previously.
- The Council is not in a financial position to support the KCRC proposal for a considerable period of time.

The 'best bang for the dollar' proposal is to:

1. Support the construction of a new toilet block and kitchen refurbishment at the KCC financially. This way the building can remain operational for the next 10 plus years until such a time as the Council is in a situation to support other recreation developments. If, during this time, another community / recreation facility was constructed then the toilet block and kitchen would remain on site to service the golf club. This was acknowledged by members of the Golf Club during recreation planning meetings as very important.

It should be noted that the Department of Sport and Recreation indicated that they would consider an application to refurbish the toilet block and kitchen areas at the KCC based on the provision of basic amenities in Kendenup that would remain functional despite future developments.

2. If the KCC wanted to spend additional money to develop the remainder of their facility such as building improvements (recladding, painting etc) and extensions, that would be at their own cost.
3. Support the planning of a facility that would service the needs of all recreation users in the Agricultural Grounds / Golf Club precinct but revisit the ideal location for such a building to best service the whole area (given the community concern about the proposal to locate the building in the north eastern corner of the Agricultural Grounds. Support should not be construed as a financial investment and this needs to be clearly communicated to the KCRC.
4. The construction of a community / recreation facility be considered after comprehensive management planning has occurred and been adopted by the Council and the development of the new facility will result in the removal of some existing infrastructure on the Agricultural Grounds site, with support from the community.
5. If a financial investment from the Council is required for the construction of a community / recreation facility, then development will only be considered at a time that the Council can reasonably afford to invest and after existing recreation developments at Sounness Park and / or Frost Park are complete. This may be a ten plus year timeline and this also needs to be clearly communicated to the KCRC and Kendenup community.

Any recommendation to the Council would need to include the following issues:

1. That the Council consider contributing financially to the construction of a new toilet block and kitchen refurbishment at the KCC after negotiating an appropriate amount with the KCC committee.
2. The Kendenup Country Club be advised that if they want to spend money to develop the remainder of their facility such as building improvements (re-cladding, painting etc) and extensions, that would be at their own cost.
3. Support the KCRC's endeavours to plan a facility that would service the needs of all recreation users in the Agricultural Grounds / Golf Club precinct, but revisit the ideal location for such a building to best service the whole area.

This recommendation would need to be coupled with correspondence to the KCRC that reinforces that planning support does not correlate to a cash contribution.

4. That the Council may consider the construction of a community / recreation facility after comprehensive management planning has occurred and management plans have been adopted by the Council,

and the development of the new facility will result in the removal of some existing infrastructure on the Agricultural Grounds site (with support from the community); and

5. If a financial investment from the Council is required for the construction of a community / recreation facility, then development will only be considered at a time that the Council can reasonably afford to invest and after existing recreation developments at Sounness Park and / or Frost Park are complete.

This recommendation would need to be clearly communicated to the Kendenup community.

Moved Cr Jeff Moir, seconded Cr Simon Grylls:

That it be a recommendation to the Council:

That:

1. **A financial contribution to the Kendenup Country Club, through the Financial Assistance Grant process, not be supported.**
2. **The Kendenup Country Club be advised that development of the Kendenup Country Club building located at Reserve 41498 (Lot 7675) Kendenup, would be at the Club's own cost, subject to normal Council approvals and must be in line with the adopted Kendenup Precinct Development Plan.**
3. **Consideration will be given to the construction of an appropriately cited community recreation facility after comprehensive planning has occurred (including management plans, concept plans and asset management plans), these plans have been adopted by the Council and the development of the new facility will result in the removal of some existing infrastructure in the Kendenup area.**
4. **If a financial investment from the Council is required for the construction of a community / recreation facility, then development will only be considered at a time that the Council can reasonably afford to make such an investment.**

CARRIED

6 SKATE PARK DEVELOPMENTS

An Interest pursuant to (Section 5.60(A)) was disclosed by Cr A Budrikis.

Nature: Financial

Extent: Owner of land nearby but not adjacent to the subject site.

Cr Andrus Budrikis left the room at 6:11pm.

Moved Cr Jeff Moir, seconded Cr Simon Grylls:

That as the interest disclosed by Cr Andrus Budrikis is so trivial or insignificant as to be unlikely to influence his conduct in relation to the matter, he be permitted to participate in the discussion, but not vote, pursuant to Section 5.68 (1) (b) (ii) (l) of the Local Government Act (1995).

CARRIED

Cr Andrus Budrikis returned at 6:13pm.

The Council has identified Royalties for Regions allocations in the 2009/2010 budget for the construction of a skate park in Mount Barker and Kendenup. The budget stands at \$70,000 for Mount Barker (comprised of \$50,000 Royalties for Regions funds and a \$20,000 Office of Crime Prevention grant) and \$50,000 for Kendenup.

Design plans have been sourced from Convic Skateparks, a company which specialises in the construction of skate parks around Australia. Convic built the skate park in Albany adjacent to the YMCA building, regarded as one of the best in the state. Convic designs and constructs in-built, concrete, fixed structures.

The design plans and relative costings have been used to support funding applications to the Great Southern Development Commission's 'Regional Grants Scheme' program and Lotterywest for both the Mount Barker and Kendenup skate parks (although the Lotterywest application for the Mount Barker skate park is yet to be submitted).

Despite the outcome of the funding applications still outstanding, we are confident that money will be forthcoming.

The existing skate park design plans have been based on the Denmark Skate Park (the proposed design for Kendenup) and a combination of the Albany Skate Park and an eastern states skate park (the proposed design for Mount Barker). Costings are \$180,000 (Kendenup) and \$200,000 (Mount Barker).

There has been some debate about the construction of the skate parks – should they be concrete, fixed structures, modular structures or a combination of them both? The advantage of a concrete, fixed structure is that the park components are fixed and cannot be easily moved (often causing damage or safety concerns), the structure, if built correctly, should require minimum maintenance and the fixed, concrete design is the optimum facility for skate park users.

Modular skate parks can be moved and therefore, the risk of damage increases. If the components are moved and not replaced appropriately, considerable safety issues may arise. However, the advantage of a modular park is that components could be moved between the Kendenup and Mount Barker skate parks providing a new challenge to skate park users. This would also come at a cost to the Shire which could be in the vicinity of thousands of dollars each time the skate park components are moved. It should also be

noted that modular skate parks are not designed or built with regular rearranging in mind.

Modular skate parks are often considered the 'poor second cousin' to a concrete, fixed skate park. The transition from the modular component to a concrete hard pan often causes problems for skate boarders and components within a modular park are often not as challenging, high or well-angled as those of a fixed skate park.

A combination of both a modular skate park and fixed concrete skate park could be a consideration. A skating 'bowl' is often the core of skate park designs. It is extremely difficult to construct a functional bowl from modular components, therefore it would be preferred that a 'bowl' be a permanent, in built component. Modular components could be located adjacent to a fixed bowl structure, however the cost of combining both modular and fixed components to create a well designed skate park would exceed the cost of either focussing all money on a fixed or modular skate park.

Cost savings would also be achieved by constructing both skate parks of the same components.

Committee members should also consider whether a skate park, similar to the scale of the Shire of Denmark's skate park, is appropriate for the much smaller Kendenup community. The Kendenup community has been very proactive in sourcing in-kind contributions and lobbying for financial support and this will be recognised with the construction of a skate park in the Kendenup townsite, however the Committee and Council also needs to consider Asset Management principals when constructing new infrastructure.

A recommendation to the Council would need to incorporate the following points:

1. Both the Mount Barker and Kendenup skate parks be permanent, fixed concrete structures; and
2. The design plans for the skate parks should reflect the size of the user group that will use the facility and the Council's capacity to maintain and depreciate the skate park structures.

Moved Cr Jeff Moir, seconded Cr Simon Grylls:

That it be a recommendation to the Council:

That:

1. **Both the Mount Barker and Kendenup skate parks be permanent, fixed concrete structures; and**
2. **The design plans for the skate parks should reflect the size of the user group that will use the facility and the Council's capacity to maintain and depreciate the skate park structures.**

CARRIED

(Cr Andrus Budrikis did not vote)

6 NEXT MEETING

To be advised

7 MEETING CLOSURE

6.35pm

CONFIRMED: CHAIRPERSON _____ **DATE:** ____ / ____ / ____