



- 8.1 SOUTH MELBOURNE LIFE SAVING CLUB AND PUBLIC AMENITIES REDEVELOPMENT**
- LOCATION/ADDRESS: SOUTH MELBOURNE**
- ACTING GENERAL MANAGER: LISA DAVIS, INFRASTRUCTURE & AMENITY**
- PREPARED BY: JACOB BREITBARDT, PROJECT MANAGER  
KIRSTY REIDY, COORDINATOR  
RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLANNING  
KATIE EMMERT, COMMUNICATIONS AND  
ENGAGEMENT ADVISOR  
ANTHONY TRAILL, MANAGER OPEN SPACE  
AND RECREATION**
- TRIM FILE NO: 12/05/46**
- ATTACHMENTS:**
- 1. SMLSC Concept Design Pack**
  - 2. Clubhouse of the Future June 2014**
  - 3. Consultation summary report SMLSC phase one engagement**
  - 4. Consultation Summary Report - SMLSC Phase 2 Engagement**
  - 5. SMLSC Phase 2 Engagement Verbatim Responses**

## **PURPOSE**

To present to Councillors the outcomes of the community engagement process for the redevelopment of the South Melbourne Life Saving Club (SMLSC) and Public Amenities facility; seek endorsement of the draft concept (Attachment 1); and seek approval to move to the next stages of the project.

## **I. RECOMMENDATION**

That Council:

- 1.1 Acknowledges the feedback received through the community engagement process and thanks the community for participating in the process.**
- 1.2 Endorses the attached concept design for a new South Melbourne Life Saving Club (SMLSC) and Public Amenities redevelopment, whilst noting the following amendments to be made in response to community feedback:**
  - Ensuring the public outlook from Withers Street road reserve and footpath to the bay is protected through the building via a covered opening and a glazed community room.
  - Setting back the bike lane from Beaconsfield Parade to address the risk of pedestrians exiting cars adjacent to the building.



- Incorporating plantings and landscaping which are complementary to the marine and local environment to soften the external façade along Beaconsfield Parade.
  - Provision of beach showers for community use.
  - Provision of a safe vehicle crossover for emergency vehicle and club vehicles' access to facility.
  - Provision of a drinking fountain.
  - Provision of bicycle racks.
- 1.3 Approves officers to progress to detailed design and continue to consult SMLSC and Life Saving Victoria to ensure final design is operationally fit for purpose.
- 1.4 Approves officers to apply for Consent under the Coastal Management Act (1995) for the endorsed concept design.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1. On 23 May 2011 Council formally committed to provide funding to redevelop the SMLSC facility and recognised the many community development opportunities associated with a new facility.
- 2.2. On 5 August 2013 Council undertook a consultation with representatives from the five lifesaving clubs on its foreshore and Life Saving Victoria (LSV) to discuss the issues faced by all clubs in regards to their facilities.
- 2.3. The State Government, through LSV, committed \$2 million towards the redevelopment project in the May 2015 State Budget, following an election commitment.
- 2.4. The State Government committed of \$2 million to the project is being matched by the City of Port Phillip Council whom is also contributing \$2 million plus additional funding for the public amenities block.
- 2.5. Council appointed Jackson Clement Burrows Architects to undertake the design work.
- 2.6. The facility will meet the minimum requirements of LSV's *Clubhouse of the Future Guidelines 2014* (Attachment 2) and the *Coastal Management Act (1995)*.

## **3. KEY INFORMATION**

### **LSV and Club engagement**

- 3.1 The scope of the project was set through consultation with LSV, as a key funding provider, and the SMLSC as the primary user.
- 3.2 It was established that the key project parameter to be met was the requirements of LSV's *Clubhouse of the Future Guidelines 2014*.
- 3.3 The SMLSC requested rooms/facilities above and beyond the *Clubhouse of the Future Guidelines 2014* including: separate gymnasium space, separate club member facilities, exclusive outdoor space on the decking and additional equipment storage.



- 3.4 In order to meet the key parameters agreed to by the community in Stage 1 of the community engagement the additional spaces were not included in the project scope.

### **Community engagement**

Two stages of community engagement were undertaken to ensure the community had ample opportunity to comment on both the project parameters and the concept design.

- Stage 1 – Scope, objective and parameters – November 2015
- Stage 2 – Draft Concept design – March/April 2016

- 3.5 Stage 1: Consultation on project parameters ran from 6 November 2015 to 29 November 2015 (Attachment 3 – Stage 1 Consultation Report), including:

- Letter box drop of postcard to a consultation area of over 1300 residential properties
- Letter to all property owners within the consultation area
- Advertisement in the Port Phillip Leader
- 'Have Your Say' page
- Notification to the South Melbourne Life Saving Club of the 'Have Your Say' page and a request to notify their members
- Notification to the VicBeach and Melbourne Beach Volleyball Association of the 'Have Your Say' page and a request to notify their members
- Onsite consultation on Saturday 21 November 2015
- Project page on the City of Port Phillip website linked to the 'Have Your Say'

- 3.6 A high level summary of the 'Stage 1' feedback is:

- 106 responses received
- 51 people fully agreed with the draft project parameters
- 43 disagreed with some aspects of the project parameters
- General feedback themes included:
  - The project should include provision for beach volleyball (show courts and lighting upgrade).
  - The public toilets and showers should be upgraded.
  - Additional seating and shade along the foreshore should be provided.
  - Sustainable materials and measures should be included in the new building.
  - The building should be available for community access, as well as use by South Melbourne Life Saving Club.



- A commercial space such as a restaurant or bar could be incorporated in the design.
- The new building should be located near the Plum Garland playground.
- The height of the new building should be minimised.
- The Beaconsfield Parade pedestrian and cycle path should be upgraded to improve safety.

**3.7 The Stage 2: Consultation on the concept design ran from 22 March 2016 to 15 April 2016 (Attachment 4 – Stage 2 Consultation Report)**

- Newsletter and reply paid survey distribution to 2,400 Albert Park residents - 23 to 29 March 2016
- Have Your Say page and online survey
- Project update email to stakeholder database of approximately 100 interested persons.
- Advertisements in the Port Phillip Leader - 22 and 29 March 2016
- Local resident presentation at the Clubhouse - 23 March 2016
- Public consultation session #1 - Sat 2 April 2016 (10am-12noon)
- Public consultation session #2 - Wed 13 April 2016 (6pm-8pm)

**3.8 A high level summary of the 'Stage 2' feedback is:**

- 167 survey responses received
- 8 additional written submissions were received by email/letters
- The majority of people (98 responses) agreed that the design meets the key parameters for the project.
- The majority of people (102 responses) said the building size and facilities were not appropriate for the following reasons:
  - The building footprint is too large, blocking views of the foreshore.
  - The building footprint is too small and will not provide enough space for the club to carry out their duties.
  - A new club building is not needed as there are two other lifesaving clubs nearby.
  - The design should include provision for other sport and recreation activities such as beach volleyball or triathlons.
  - The proposed public deck is too large.
  - Not enough parking is being provided as part of the project.
  - The cost of the project is excessive.



- The majority of people (108 respondents) agreed the exterior of the building is appropriate for the Albert Park foreshore.

**Response to community feedback**

3.9 A summary of the key consultation themes and responses are:

Theme:	We heard:	Response:
<p><b>Response to design meeting key parameters question</b></p>	<p>We received some supportive statements about the concept design meeting the key parameters from community engagement phase 1.</p> <p>We also heard some respondents don't believe we have designed to key parameters; the reasons are captured below in themes.</p>	<p>The following example quotes are noted:</p> <p><i>"Aesthetic attractive building using modern materials that fits in well within the landscape. Provides sufficient amenities for now and future anticipated increase needs"</i> <b>(from a local resident)</b></p> <p><i>"It would make a much more appropriate addition to the beachscape than the existing building, and clearly meets all the criteria listed"</i> <b>(from a local resident)</b></p> <p><i>"All my concerns have been addressed. It is an outstanding facility. Congratulations"</i> <b>(from a local resident)</b></p> <p><i>"The initial schematic designs are consistent with the key parameters for the project"</i> <b>(from a beach volleyball participant)</b></p> <p><i>"Generally speaking I think CoPP and JCB have done a great job with the design despite a few issues that are yet to be addressed with SMLSC. As a community member I think the project will deliver a great outcome for the community. As a club member I look forward to the next stages of design to ensure club needs are appropriately addressed"</i> <b>(from a member of SMLSC)</b></p>
<p><b>'Fit within existing footprint' (Length of building)</b></p>	<p>We heard the length of building was a concern, some residents have requested the new building remains within the existing footprint.</p>	<p>The existing facility is 47m long. The concept design presented to the community is a building roof length of 75m. The 75m length includes a 6m building gap.</p> <p>The following example quotes are noted:</p> <p><i>"By replacing the already-long brick walls...with even longer blank stone walls, the building creates a barrier for residents and visitors alike - both in terms of views of the beach and accessibility."</i> <b>(from a local resident)</b></p> <p><i>"The footprint has been increased by 60%, hence blocking more of our view to the bay. If it remained on the existing footprint then there would not be any issues."</i> <b>(from a local resident)</b></p>



<p><b>Response to building size and facilities question</b></p>	<p>We received some supportive statements about the building size and facilities proposed in the concept.</p> <p>We also heard some respondents don't think it is appropriate and these reasons are captured below in other themes.</p>	<p>The following example quotes are noted:</p> <p><i>"I like the reduction on height – there is plenty of space to increase the footprint and reduce height which is welcomed"</i> <b>(from a local resident)</b></p> <p><i>"The larger footprint is more than compensated by the reduction in height and mass"</i> <b>(from a local resident)</b></p> <p><i>"Simple, modern and soooo much better than the current eyesore"</i> <b>(from a local resident)</b></p> <p><i>"Great lowrise and contemporary building"</i> <b>(from a local resident)</b></p>
<p><b>'Build the new facility within existing volume and mass'</b></p>	<p>We heard from some residents the preference to build the new facility within the constraints of the existing building.</p>	<p>The new building is required to be compliant to Building Code of Australia standards including accommodating for sea level rises and king tide storm fluctuation.</p> <p>This has resulted in the storage currently set up as a basement not being able to be utilised as part of the new design. The design has been limited to fulfil the minimum requirements of the Life Saving Victoria Clubhouse of the Future Guidelines.</p> <p>The following example quotes are noted:</p> <p><i>"The new building should only be built on the same footprint as the existing lifesaving club."</i> <b>(from a local resident)</b></p> <p><i>"It extends well beyond existing footprint and envelope. One of the key parameters should have been that it is within the existing building envelope."</i> <b>(from a local resident)</b></p>
<p><b>'This is bigger than the Life Saving Victoria Clubhouse of the Future Guidelines.'</b></p>	<p>We heard the design is bigger than the Life Saving Victoria Clubhouse of the Future Guidelines. We have also heard that the design is not big enough.</p>	<p>The concept design has been built to minimum guidelines with the only increase being a 20m addition to the community space.</p> <p>To deliver on the minimum requirements the concept has required circulation space and accessibility requirements to be incorporated within the design to ensure the building can function safely and as intended.</p> <p>The building also includes public amenities, community shade area and kiosk as part of the proposed footprint.</p> <p>The Club did request larger storage and community space allocation at the projects inception; however Council has been clear this design will be to the Life Saving Victoria Clubhouse of the Future Guidelines</p>



**‘We want to change the location’**

We heard a preference from some residents to relocate the building eastwards adjacent to the Plum Garland Playground.

During early planning Council did investigate opportunities to relocate the building closer to the playground, however constructing the building closer to the playground would require new services connections (such as electricity, gas, sewer and water) to be provided to a new site.

In addition investigations show that there are a number of sites which hold heritage significance between Withers Street and Kerferd Road. Although these are not visible above the ground they would be impacted if the building was proposed to be built over them, it is also likely that it would increase the cost of the project.

The primary reason Council is proposing to construct the new SMLSC building in the same location (opposite Withers Street) is to minimise new impacts on the coastline and sight-lines across the beach and minimise construction risk.



**Foreshore Management**

We heard that this design is not in keeping with the adopted guidelines of the City of Port Phillip Foreshore Management Plan.

The City of Port Phillip Foreshore Management Plan has a principle to not increase building footprints on the foreshore, it also has principles to:

- Provide a positive community benefit based on public access and coastal dependence or supporting use.
- Be promoted as an important social and recreational destination with a variety of active and passive recreational uses that are coastal dependent and attract both residents and visitors.
- Plan for the environmental, social and economic impacts associated with climate change to implement adaptation strategies to deal with beach erosion, flooding, storm surges and sea level rise.
- Provide a safe foreshore environment with a predominance of free and accessible use for all foreshore users.
- Provide opportunities for ongoing community participation and support community initiatives to progress a range of foreshore management issues.
- Promote safe and attractive pedestrian linkages
- Aspire towards foreshore buildings that are multi-purpose in design to encourage shared-use and fulfil a range of community uses and needs.
- Recognise the economic value and contribution of the foreshore and only encourage investment in foreshore activities that will provide long-term economic sustainability, balanced use of foreshore public land and net community benefit.

The concept design has prioritised the community benefits of this facility and controlled the footprint expansion through smart design, applying the minimum Life Saving Victoria requirements, statutory requirements (e.g. accessibility) to maintain the existing service provision for the community.

The following example quote is noted:

*“It also ignores Council's foreshore management plan guideline :“increases in building footprints or increases to the foreshore car park net footprint will not be allowed”.”* **(from a local resident)**





**Parking**

We heard concerns the new facility will have a negative impact on parking in the neighbourhood.

The existing SMLSC building has been in its current location on Beaconsfield Parade (opposite Withers Street) since 1957, with parking available outside clearway hours.

As Council's proposal is for the building to be constructed in the same location, there is no proposal to change the current car parking conditions on Beaconsfield Parade and adjoining streets.

The following example quotes are noted:

*"It does not cater for parking demands."* **(from a local resident)**

*"Where are you providing parking for these people?"* **(from a local resident)**

**Summary of Community Engagement Response:**

- 3.10 Council officers have considered all of the feedback across two stages of consultation on the concept design and thank the community and stakeholders for their contributions. The full verbatim responses received are available in Attachment 5.
- 3.11 Council officers note the majority of respondents agreed the concept design meets the key parameters for the project and the exterior of the building is appropriate for the Albert Park foreshore.
- 3.12 Council officers note the majority of respondents indicated the building size and facilities were not appropriate, and that there is a variety of opinions from our community regarding this facility and design – some who thought the building is too large and others indicating it is too small. A further breakdown to understand responses showed that:
  - 64 respondents indicated the size and facilities as adequate
  - 61 respondents indicated the size and facilities as too big
  - 19 respondents indicated the size and facilities as too small
  - 7 respondents requested additional facilities
  - 6 respondents indicated the facility was not required
  - 10 respondents indicated other reasons (e.g. cost, parking and provide for beach volleyball)
- 3.13 On balance, and considering the facility location and important services that will operate from it, officers recommend that the draft concept, with the enhancements proposed from community feedback, is the best solution.



**Design Response arising from consultation:**

- 3.14 The concept design for a single-storey, linear building will provide a modern lifesaving facility and allow views across Port Phillip Bay from the various vantage points along Beaconsfield Parade.
- 3.15 The proposed location of the new redevelopment of the SMLSC is to keep the building within the existing location (opposite Withers Street) to minimise additional impacts on the coastline and optimise public and lifesaving sight lines across the beach.
- 3.16 The public views from Withers Street will be protected within the design from the road and footpaths onto the beach and the water.
- 3.17 Officers did explore reducing the length of the building to keep it within the existing SMLSC footprint, but this was unable to be accommodated. The current SMLSC storage area is below the 'king tide' water line that is subject to flooding, meaning storage space in the new building needed to be above ground.
- 3.18 Council officers have considered two options to respond to the feedback on building length provided during community engagement:
  - i. Redesign to a second storey. Whilst this is possible it would increase costs and remove the community benefits of shade and community-room access from ground level. Further, a second storey is not achievable with the available budget and would require additional consultation with the community.
  - ii. Reducing the length and building further onto the beach. This option would encroach on valuable beach space and result in construction and operational complexities by extending the building closer to the water line. It would also place the building at greater risk of storm damage and impact the public view from Withers Street.

**Design Enhancements:**

- 3.19 The following design enhancements are proposed in response to feedback received throughout the consultation engagement.
  - Ensuring the public outlook from Withers Street road reserve and footpath to the bay is protected via a covered opening and a glazed community room.
  - Setting back the bike lane from Beaconsfield Parade to address the risk of pedestrians exiting cars adjacent to the building.
  - Incorporating plantings and landscaping which are complementary to the marine and local environment to soften the external façade along Beaconsfield Parade.
  - Provision of beach showers for community use.
  - Provision of a safe vehicle crossover for emergency vehicle and club vehicles' access to facility.
  - Provision of a drinking fountain.
  - Provision of bicycle racks.



## FURTHER SUPPORTING INFORMATION

### 4. ALIGNMENT TO COUNCIL PLAN AND COUNCIL POLICY

- 4.1 The redevelopment of the SMLSC and Amenities Redevelopment meets the following components of the Council Plan:
- Engaged
    - 1.1 Provide clear and open communication and engagement that is valued by the community
      - Continue to improve community consultation practices to support open and inclusive decision making
  - Healthy
    - 2.2 Support our community to achieve improved health and wellbeing
      - Promote a healthy and active lifestyle for our community
      - Provide flexible community spaces that meet the broad needs of the community
    - 2.3 Foster a community that values lifelong learning, strong connections and participating in the life of the city
      - Promote and increase participation of volunteers
    - 2.4 Promote an improved range of cultural and leisure opportunities that foster a connected and engaged community
      - Provide public spaces for all to enjoy, be active and feel safe
  - Vibrant
    - 3.3 Ensure growth is well planned and managed for the future
      - Ensure integrated planning and management of our foreshore
    - 3.4 Improve and manage local amenity and assets for now and the future
      - Ensure that our capital projects are well planned to deliver the best outcome for the community
      - Advocate to State and Federal governments to support improved infrastructure for the future

### 5. CONSULTATION AND STAKEHOLDERS

- 5.1 Consultation will continue with SMLSC and LSV throughout the life of the project.
- 5.2 Project status updates will be provided throughout design and construction to community members that have contributed to community engagement or declared an interest in this project and provided us contact details.



**6. LEGAL AND RISK IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 The facility must comply with *Coastal Management Act 1995* requirements.

**7. SUSTAINABILITY – Triple Bottom Line**

**7.1 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1.1 The building will be 5 Star rated (benchmarked). A 5 star benchmark rating will provide assurance that the thermal performance of the building has been considered throughout the design and construction.

**7.2 SOCIAL & CULTURAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.2.1 The facility will ensure the continued patrolling of the Albert Park Foreshore by volunteer life savers, providing a safe and welcoming experience for residents and visitors.

- 7.2.2 The inclusion of public toilets delivers on the Public Toilet Plan 2013 - 2023.

**7.3 ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.3.1 The existing kiosk service will be maintained in the redevelopment.

- 7.3.2 The provision of a lifesaving service attracts visitors to the Albert Park Foreshore and there is potential for those visitors to generate economic benefit for local businesses beyond the foreshore.

**7.4 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.4.1 The redevelopment of the SMLSC facility has received the following external funding commitments:

- Life Saving Victoria - \$2 million

**8. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

**8.1 TIMELINE**

- 8.1.1 Council will apply for Consent under the *Coastal Management Act (1995)*, subject to Council resolving to proceed.

- 8.1.2 The consultant architects will commence detailed design immediately, subject to Council approval to proceed.

- 8.1.3 Construction procurement will be undertaken early-mid 2017.

- 8.1.4 It is anticipated that construction works will commence in late winter 2017.

**8.2 COMMUNICATION**

- 8.2.1 The project page on the City of Port Phillip website will be updated throughout design and construction.

- 8.2.2 A media release will be issued by the City of Port Phillip.

- 8.2.3 Stakeholders on the interested parties database will be contacted directly.



**9. OFFICER DIRECT OR INDIRECT INTEREST**

- 9.1 No officers involved in the preparation of this report have any direct or indirect interest in the matter.