



## Meeting Notes

### Long Reef Working Group – 30 November 2017

Civic Centre, Dee Why 6-8.30pm

---

**Present:** Campbell Pfeiffer – Executive Manager, Property  
Eliza Halsey – Senior Project Officer, Property  
Lisa Trewin – Community Engagement Officer

Working Group Members were present representing the following groups:

- Long Reef Surf Life Saving Club – Executive
- Save Long Reef Community Group
- Surf Life Saving Sydney Northern Beaches
- Board Rider Groups
- Local Residents
- Key User Hirer

Architects from Adriano Pupilli

- Adriano Pupilli - Architect
- Matt Ryall – Architect
- Oliver Smith – Architect

Apologies

- Community Representative (incl Youth)
- Environmental Groups Representative
- Donald Gibson – Northern Beaches Council

The meeting commenced at 6.00pm

Meeting opened by Campbell Pfeiffer who addressed the housekeeping and gave an overview of the Agenda.

Mr Pfeiffer introduced Cayla Hill, replacement participant representing Manly Surf School on this occasion and appointed Architects from Adriano Pupilli, Adriano Pupilli, Matt Ryall and Oliver Smith.

6.10pm

Mr Pfeiffer introduced the next item on the Agenda – ‘Access and management of space, including revenue’ and recapped on working group activity that took place at the meeting of 27 July, 2017 where the group discussed Access and Ownership.

Four models of access were identified as being potentially viable for the surf club spaces (including, storage, function rooms, surf club space)

- Fully Club run
- Stipulated hours for Council to Manage / Club Manages other hours
- Council runs a booking process / Club has set times available (revenue share)
- Fully Council run

The working group discussed key considerations of all the options and the following discussion points were captured:

- The surf club is on crown land – once built there would be lease document in place
- Surf Life Saving guidelines for use, as per NSW Department of Primary Industries *Authorising surf life saving club's use of Crown land in NSW*. Discussion about clauses in this document – Council to send copy to all working group members.
- 750 members of the surf club, which provides a service to the community.
- Training and function room should be under control of the club during season time September – April.
- Access should not be a problem for other people to use it when the surf club are not using the space/ building.
- As the property is on crown land, it should be available for the wider to community to use
- Need to look to the future as to how the building and its areas will be managed (i.e. what works today under today's management, may not work that way in 20 years' time).
- Issues to consider when managing / operating the space are cleaning, power, room preparation (relating to the function space).
- Who (Council / Club) are responsible for security? Reputational risk will lie with the Club – even though it is a Council building.
- Expectation that community and café spaces would be run by Council.
- Management of the space could be done similarly to the way Clontarf or Manly Dam areas are booked out, that would work well.
- The only revenue raised for the club is from venue hire (generate income from the public)
- Difficult for the club to function without that revenue stream.
- Who is paying for the building? Rate payer money. Council should have the opportunity to get revenue to repay the investment.
- Needs to be a funded build.
- If funded by a grant – potential.
- Surf Club historically has been funded by the members
- View of community differs from that of the Surf Life Saving Club members (SLSC). The community want a return on investment being spent. There is a full range of views in the community about how this space will be used – varying from relaxed viewing area / bar to an environmental space with no function area
- Solutions could include a technical booking system
- When looking at which access / ownership model – insurance / maintenance are key considerations (who is responsible for this – Club or Council).
- Suggestion to split the ownership / access three ways: Storage lockers / Club operational / Function space. The working group were in agreement that licencing of the lockers should sit with Council – with non-commercial licencing.

6.50pm – break for dinner



Ms Trewin introduced Adriano Pupilli and Matt Ryall to present.

Adriano Pupilli addressed the group providing a summary on their response to the feedback received at the last meeting – and gave an outline on how that had been addressed in the refinement of the design concept.

Mr Pupilli thanked the surf club and boardriders for their input and explanation given at the onsite meeting – where Adriano and his team were able to gain an understanding of the usage of the space.

The following key feedback factors were addressed:

- broken down the mass
- softened the corners
- inclusion of wider BBQ area
- inclusion of chair store
- dedicated and wider store for wash down area and preparation
- removed a column
- building location shifted a little to the north to accommodate nippers and increase the space where they congregate
- identified that stormwater sump needs attention – which is yet to be addressed
- increased shade
- outdoor room will provide access points to all areas
- outdoor paving has been taken into the café – as it will be a wet / sandy space
- access path will have integrated seating
- keeping the green grassy area to allow people to use the recreation space - with power and water available
- provision of extra space has been facilitated by making space within the building not by creating a larger building
- gym and training space has an operable wall between, meaning it can be opened up for extra space.
- design improvements to the doors and the aspect of the café will reduce the wind and sand
- hydraulic or gas shutters will stop the possible shuddering of the shutters
- extended eaves and plantings.

The suggested changes, based on the feedback received from the previous meeting, were generally well received. There was further discussion about the design and some questions were raised:

- water retention and sump
- distance from the pathway is the café to the south track? *Response was six metres.*



- concern about the amenities – window / air space was there adequate privacy in the window space? *Response – yes the air vents have been angled for optimum privacy and the area will be countered with plantings.*
- query about the slight movement of the proposed new building to the north? *Response - to accommodate room for marshalling of nippers and the boat turning circle.*
- discussion about the requirement for hot water near the first aid room. *Response - that hot water could be accommodated with an external removable handheld shower.*
- concern about main storage and how it is going to work. Space / shape of storage.
- new south double door has been incorporated into design which will provide ease of access of equipment.
- height can be accommodated via a loft type design in the storage section allowing for the storage for rescue boards.
- architects suggested they could look at incorporating a double door or an additional door to help with access / egress of equipment.
- suggestion from working group member to perhaps include a cavity door?

Following the presentation from the architects, the working group were asked re-visit the access model and vote on their preference for how the building and/or the spaces should be managed. Each member was given one yellow and one green dot - yellow depicted function space – green depicted club space.

The voting results showed:

Fully Club Run	Stipulated Hrs for Council to Manage Club manage other hrs	Council Runs a booking <del>service</del> Process / Club has Set book at times Revenue share.	Fully Council Run

Further to gathering the view points of the working group on the access / management of the club, storage lockers and function space, Mr Pfeiffer suggested that this be considered as part of the broader community consultation process when the draft design concepts and endorsed for public exhibition.



After hearing the feedback from the architects the group were asked if they agreed that the plans were at a point where the designers could proceed to Draft concept for presentation to Council and the community for further engagement.

There was varying opinion on this question with concern primarily from the Surf Club Executive representatives.

When looking at the plans closely, specifically in relation to the club storage space (i.e. surf life saving equipment, rescue boards, IRB's, surf boats and nipper gear) the surf club representatives raised specific concern as to whether the space would be adequate for their needs.

Discussion points captured during this conversation included:

- how many surf boats does the club have? Four – this will probably be maintained
- suggest that community members feel that there is enough space to run a surf club
- surf club suggested they will consider the space identified in the plan and compare it with the actual space required now to fit in all the equipment
- concern regarding the community perception on what was agreed and what could be the result

As a consensus from the group could not be reached, the Long Reef Surf Life Saving Club Executive representatives asked to 'crunch the numbers' [on space requirements] and return with a response to the project manager by Saturday 9 December.

If the Surf Life Saving Club Executive advise the space can be accommodated within the existing footprint design (i.e. not move the exterior walls to accommodate extra space) then the working group gave their endorsement that the design plans could proceed.

If the Surf Life Saving Club Executive advises the space in the current design cannot accommodate the storage space requirements of the club without increasing the current footprint – the working group will need to reconvene early next year to reach a consensus on what is presented to Council.

The impact to the project timeline and the community engagement timeframes were explained to the group – identifying that the project timeline would probably be pushed out by approximately 3-4 months.

Meeting closed at 8.35pm