

Whiritoa Community Feedback Responses

Building Sub-Committee April 2024

- Design2
- Lifeguarding spaces.....2
- Accommodation.....4
- Public / Social spaces.....4
- Other use6
- Design - other.....7
- Demolition & Construction9
- Funding, budget and costings11
- Planning & Consents15
- Future-proofing (inc erosion)16
- Other17

Lifeguarding spaces

We have concerns with the proposed upper-level deck facing Kon Tiki Road. This is because it will look directly over and into our private deck area. Therefore, to avoid this effect and before the plans are finalised we would like you to strongly consider either removing the upper deck or orientating it to the North and not over Kon Tiki Road.

The Design team, with the stakeholders input have explored other options around this deck area and are looking at mitigating design around this concern. This may include removing the deck, enclosing the deck as an internal 'loggia space', addition of visual screen device such as louvres, or reorientating the opening of the lifeguard lounge to the North and South in order to provide some visual screening yet maintain the experience of an open breakout space of a similar experience they currently have whilst ensuring the building does not end up with an aesthetic 'back of house' appearance from Kon Tiki Road.

I was just wondering how you are going to make the 2nd floor accessible as often we have injured lifeguards doing patrol support who need to be able to access the tower (maybe a ramp instead of stairs)?

Adding a ramp or lift to the upper level is not envisaged due to the amount of area that a ramp will take up as well as the cost either option will impose on the project. We have discussed this with the lifeguard representatives and do not believe it to be problematic.

The first aid room door needs to be able to open quite wide so we can get patients with things like dislocated knees in easily.

We have sized the double door first aid room on best design practice and that used in other reference sports clubs.

<p>Lifesaving storage, has a worthy increase from the existing, however it is the area of the Club that is most under strain, with inadequate access to items and a near claustrophobic appearance. I would believe that the thinking in establishing the 100% area increase in the brief was well intentioned and the resultant 60% gain would be disappointing to the Lifeguards</p>	<p>The existing space allocation is 88m² – increasing to 139m² – an additional 51m². The brief was aspirational but overall, we must take into consideration the available site and other club requirements. The stakeholders are pleased with the improved size and planning of the space allocated.</p>
<p>In the survey of members, when drawing up the 2011 alterations, one of the must-haves by the Lifeguards was for them to have an outside area not only to socialise in but to hang their clothing out for drying which was not visible to the general public. Particularly relevant to the Regional guards. Such an area is not obvious in the present plans.</p> <p>Where are the Lifeguards going to have their BBQ? Hopefully not on the second storey deck</p>	<p>We have worked closely with the lifeguards’ representatives and the design reflects their valued inputs.</p> <p>A revised minor internal layout option following input from SLNZ around removal of accommodation has provided improved provision for short- and long-term drying requirements of the lifeguards.</p> <p>The lifeguards believe that the club would benefit from a communal BBQ located on the east elevation.</p>
<p>The idea of a Dry room for Lifeguards to de-robe in during inclement weather is a good idea. I would think they would want to have direct access to the Gearshed to avoid returning to inclement conditions. This could be achieved if the First Aid room and the Dry room were switched positions.</p>	<p>Noted, and a variant of the comment has been considered in a later minor revision internal layout design.</p>
<p>At the time of an emergency there is a considerable distance to travel from the Watch-tower to the Gearshed and outside. A fire-persons pole would reduce this time critical travel.</p>	<p>There has been considerable consultation with the lifeguard representatives on the proposed design. Provision of a ‘fireman’s pole’ was not endorsed.</p>

Accommodation

The accommodation space provision for Lifeguards feels excessive. In recent years there has been discouragement of lifeguards from staying overnight in the Club. My observations from the current season is that one bunkroom was used for storage and I'm not aware of the other being used for overnight sleeping either. The current bunk capacity is 10 (6 + 4). How did the design arrive at the requirement of 20 (18 + 2)?

A revised minor internal layout option has been presented to the build committee following input from SLNZ strongly recommends removal of accommodation due to H&S requirements and care for our lifeguards and members

This submission is made specifically in response to planning of accommodation facilities in the new Club building.

It is my position that WLGS, and surf clubs in general, should no longer be providing onsite accommodation facilities, and that the Club rebuild provides the ideal opportunity to phase out onsite accommodation – Full reasons for this are detailed in communications to the subcommittee – available to members upon request.

Many thanks, this has been discussed with stakeholders and SLNZ. It has been agreed to remove the accommodation from the scheme. A revised design has been prepared to utilise this space, providing some added benefit to other areas as well as a potential minor reduction to the floor plan.

Public / Social spaces

Would be good to have a couple more external showers for the public to use to rinse off.

Noted and agreed. We have a design location allocated for these for Lifeguard personnel and gear use and additional public – similar to the ones in the Pohutakawa reserve.

A wide railing around the deck that could serve as seating would be fabulous. It would serve as seating

The proposed design has a slightly elevated deck level designed to encourage sitting on the edge of the deck in a similar manner to sitting on a bench. However, this suggestion has been

<p>when the club is open but also in the many months that the club is closed it would give people a place to sit and enjoy the view much as they do with the outdoor seating now</p>	<p>noted and we will look to place a measured amount of perimeter benching in appropriate locations around the deck, in a balanced amount to ensure a clear access space onto the deck into the lounge from the grassed area.</p>
<p>Be good if the outside area of the bar was a bit more able to be used in drizzly weather than it is now as at the moment, rain makes it quite difficult for the bar to run in summer as there is not enough space inside</p>	<p>The proposed design has a generous covered area to provide some sheltered area from inclement weather or shade from sun wrapping around much of the North and East of the building. Additionally, we are considering reinstatement of the external shade device, but with consideration to easier removal and reinstatement through the seasons, or storm event management.</p>
<p>It is unclear from the plans what, or if any, partitioning there is between the Breakout area and the Members Lounge. Observing how the current facilities operate most frequently, when the bar is open, adults occupy the outdoor shaded area, and maybe the Lounge, and the while the younger folk utilise the Hall for games or watching TV or a bit of both. It is difficult to see this family friendly environment operating in the proposed floor plan.</p>	<p>The breakout room has a large sliding door separating the lounge or extending the space as required. We note that this will not be a high performing acoustic door due to the significant cost of these.</p> <p>An updated design includes for a separate transition space between the breakout space, kitchen and toilets separate from the lounge / hall to minimise potential disruption to the use of either space.</p>
<p>From the proposed floor plan is the members lounge and breakout room as one? Is there an area that could be used for children watching movies or playing pool as is now with the current club rooms?</p>	<p>The proposed plan has a breakout space for separate activities.</p> <p>Removing accommodation from the scheme offers a slightly increased breakout space with a separated corridor space to a kitchen servery and toilets, without entering or reducing the proposed main hall / lounge space.</p>
<p>I appreciate that there is a lot of detail design still to be done around the Kitchen/Bar layout. Returning to how the current facilities operate, consumption of product purchased from the Bar is predominately consumed on</p>	<p>The kitchen / bar design will be undertaken during detailed design with the assistance of specialists to ensure best use and potential funding support from breweries.</p>

the eastern grass unless the climatic conditions are such, that it is indoors consumption. With the proposed layout there is a considerable distance to be travelled from the Bar to the most popular consumption area, outdoors.

The proposed distance from the bar to exterior face of the building is ~12mtrs to allow for additional lounge seating, multi-use space.

Other use

This appears to be a single use building which will be closed for most of the year.

We have considered how the building can function better as a community space, with the potential for occasional letting to external parties to provide additional income to the club. It is important to acknowledge the primary purpose for the club is surf lifesaving and associated activities. The spaces are considerably more generous than current and that will ensure the space can be used for other community uses accordingly.

A medical bay that an ambulance can fit in, a gym, other sports and hobby groups using the facilities have been mentioned but won't generate the income a cafe/eatery/ events place will.

Whiritoa already has a community hall and fire station. Consideration of additional inclusions has been discussed with many stakeholders through the project. These would require a complex resource consent that will cost the project a significant amount of money and time to have the use changed to accommodate an ambulance, fire tenders or civil defence use etc. Additionally, the inclusion of these additional occupancies will take away from the spaces required for the surf club use.

Currently, when training is underway in the clubhouse, nearly the full Hall area can be utilised by one group and another group studying an alternative topic within the Lounge. It is not clear that this sort of mixed training is feasible with the proposed layout.

The breakout room has a large sliding door separating the lounge or extending the space as required. We note that this will not be a high performing acoustic door due to the significant cost of these.

An updated design includes for a separate transition space between the breakout space, kitchen and toilets separate from the lounge / hall to minimise potential disruption to the use of either space.

Mechanical ventilation was mentioned at the meeting for cooling. What about heating to assist hireage during the off-season?

Under NZ Building regulations including the new H1 code amendments, the project will require a very high standard of insulation, significantly higher than what the current club consists of. The build committee is cognisant of not embedding too much cost into the build project. A calculation will be done in due course to what, if any, additional heating will be required. Otherwise low cost yet effective commercial ceiling fans are proposed over Airconditioning heat pumps etc that require ongoing maintenance and replacement schedules that will impose additional cost on the club operations.

One of the better fundraisers over time was the hiring of the facilities to schools for Yr 13 coastal geography studies. There used to be 3 and sometimes four different schools a year for 2 night stays. There could be 20 – 30 students and 6 -10 adults. The adults used the bunk rooms and the students were segregated by gender between the Hall and Lounge for sleeping. Thus, the reason for the two Fire-cells. From my experience they were better hirers than a number of the weddings hirers who removed wall hangings and not return them and not leave the premises as tidy and clean as expected. I am not sure if the disappearance of these trips is a Covid causality, or something else?

A revised minor internal layout option has been presented to the build committee following input from SLNZ strongly recommends removal of accommodation due to H&S requirements and care for our lifeguards and members.

Design - other

The internal gutter on the second storey roof is a problem waiting to happen, in my experience. From a comment from somebody involved with the insurance industry this would cause a premium loading for a building within a Coastal zone. A single slope could be achieved by increasing the tower height from the as-of-right 9 m up to 11m by applying for a Restricted

The proposed design considers the 'internal gutter' and have mitigated the risks through enlarged width and no restriction of overflow to the lower roofs.

A design review was undertaken on a mono-pitch roof design – this added potentially significant wall to the project that added significant engineering and cost.

<p>Discretionary consent. Such an increase could be argued to be minor, I feel. The FL of the Tower could rise to improve visibility. Or alternatively reduce the length of the Lifeguard Lounge.</p>	<p>We do not believe it is wise to create cause for challengeable additional resource consent issues and have developed the design to minimise potential additional processing cost where possible.</p>
<p>There is no shade over the E grass areas – we should be aware of our Sun Smart obligations.</p>	<p>The proposed design includes large overhangs to the North and East from the hall / lounge that will provide shelter during rain or provide shade from sun. Additionally, the site still has provision for external shade devices as the club presently enjoys.</p>
<p>For the bin room to work efficiently the bins base need to be 600 – 750 mm below the internal floor level and close to the patrons empty return area. The glass bottle disposal system adopted for the Bar has been a godsend to health, cleaning and ease of disposal. Commercial waste collectors have replicated this design in other facilities.</p>	<p>The proposed design has provision for rubbish, recycling based on the current design, as well as easy access for collection.</p>
<p>The area of decking on the N and E faces, in my view, is excessive and is inadequate in shape/size to be used for tables and chairs.</p>	<p>The grassed area to the east considers the placement of similar benches and tables. The enclosed deck provides for improved shelter during summer and winter conditions with additional built-in benches to the perimeter of the decking proposed.</p>
<p>The HDC water storage tank has disappeared. It currently straddles the S Bndy and is the source of potable water for the Club.</p>	<p>The site use needs to be maximised to allow for the past and future growth of the club. It is not possible for the existing tank to remain in the current location. The project proposes ‘under deck / floor’ potable water tanks for best use of space.</p>
<p>From my ‘back-of-a-bus-ticket’ calculation, there could be need for around 40,000 L of retention tank storage above or below ground level. Has any consideration been given to utilising the estimated 720 m² of roof area for Rainwater collection for the supply</p>	<p>As part of the original design proposal, the build committee engaged a services consultant to assist. Roof top catchment has been considered mostly for non-potable purposes along with ensuring continued access and rights to the sites existing bore.</p>

to the clubhouse. A top-up arrangement could be included to manage dry season/high demand from the existing HDC bore..

The accessible carpark space that needs to be provided will most likely be S of the public toilets/changing rooms at the commencement of the Ramp. There will be conflict/competition here with the general public parking to use the ablution facilities. Further, the distance to be travelled via the ramp from the accessible carpark to the members lounge, the most likely destination, is considerable.

Am I correct in assuming that the icons on the S wall are outdoor showers? If not, where is the outdoor shower to remove excess sand before entering the premises?

The proposed project notes carparking locations immediately around the project to the North, to the south and on Kon Tiki Road.

Outdoor showers have been allowed for. These will be a combination of 'on the building for lifeguard use' and 'off building / remote' for public use.

DEMOLITION & CONSTRUCTION

Edited Feedback

We are strong supporters of prefab and used Leisurecom to build our bach. A slight caution would be that in our experience it did take a little more time

Whiritoa Build Committee Response

Good to hear. We have contingency in our delivery programme, and this will be gone through in great detail once we have confirmed our delivery method and construction partners.

<p>to stitch it together on site than was indicated by the company....</p>	
<p>I think the modular design is a good idea - it may be a good idea to double check the dimensions to get into Whiritoa vs a normal modular delivery due to gorge and roads in etc. I know 2 years ago on enquiry into a modular prebuilt house what could come into Whiritoa on a truck was a lesser size than say to Miranda.</p>	<p>We have engaged in discussions with modular construction companies that have delivered modular projects in our region and know the route well. They have guided us on the maximum module size that can be accommodated through to the site location.</p>
<p>What is the expected handover date ?- the presentation says Dec 2025 but I am sure that on the day you presented Dec 2026 was the date - this would be more realistic in terms of getting all the funding ,duck in a row and build complete.</p>	<p>This date was a typo – you are correct – the construction programme indicatively reads readiness for December 2026 – however this is entirely dependent on 100% funding by January 2025 in order to commit to build partners – we note this is ambitious – so encourage the community to assist in connections for commercial, public donations wherever possible.</p>
<p>Everything is being built off site so no opportunity for local tradesmen.</p>	<p>Our commitment to the community is to provide a durable project that does not have legacy issues that the community must fund. We do not see there being a capable resource within Whiritoa to complete this project in full. To that end we believe the best approach is to have a ‘main contractor’ that will be responsible for the build and provide a building warranty for minimum 10 years. We expect there will be several local projects that local resource will be able to contribute to once the project is handed over.</p>
<p>At the presentation there was comment made that the roof would be Ali based. The presented plans note it is steel.</p>	<p>This was a typo – the roofing material is proposed to be Aluminium for durability.</p>
<p>Demolition: Two weeks appears to me to be extremely short considering the asbestos roof, as I understand, removal will require the existing building to be</p>	<p>The provided project delivery programme is indicative and for information and guidance of the project only at this time for preconstruction phases – but equally is driven by fundraising</p>

enclosed in a weather tight temporary structure and a separate internal lining to collect loose fragments and stray fibers. The work will be undertaken by bods in spacesuits, well not quite, and the waste material removed to a designated landfill in trucks that will prevent leakage of fibers while in transit. If Veros's suggestion that the cladding contains asbestos is true, this will further complicate the demolition.

100% before commitment to our build partners. This is also a condition of many of the charity funders that we are in discussion with.

We have sought external advice on the demolition of the existing building as well as the removal of the asbestos roofing.

The demolition is not on our critical delivery path and we can undertake sooner as necessary once we engage fully with our preferred build partner. Equally the final best value build process will dictate the eventual build programme.

Construction Start and Finish: I am puzzled why May and June are not being utilised as they are slow periods for the Club. This could then allow the finish to be advanced to late October early November (allow a little more time for winter interference) which would allow time for overrun if required and time for Club patrolling operations to commence at the start of December from the new facilities, rather than having the patrolling operations moving facilities/location after patrolling commences with a 20 December finish target.

As above. Based on a proposed offsite modular construction delivery – there is no reason to demolish the existing club sooner than the project programme requires so the community gets the longest benefit and the shortest time without a club – minimising P&G costs and remote storage and temporary buildings as and if required, whilst ensuring delivery at the beginning the next summer season. A more detailed programme will be built once we have a confirmed build partner.

FUNDING, BUDGET AND COSTINGS

Edited Feedback

Is there no ability for council funding contributions of any kind, with them recently completing the 10-year plan and us being the only beach in their council area?

Whiritoa Build Committee Response

We have met with the Mayor of HDC and other senior council staff and discussed some contribution options. These are on-going.

<p>Is the expectation of \$1million realistic from Lotteries with their current funding pools and the fact that they already may consider they are contributing through contribution to SLNZ?</p>	<p>The fundraising requirements for this project are significant and we have a considerable amount of work to do in discussing all the available avenues, opportunities and obstacles funding the project. This will be exacerbated by current economic conditions.</p>
<p>The breakdown of cost is great to see but I see the demolition at 1% is normal and probably spot on for a demo of that size but does it include any additional expense due to the asbestos roof?</p>	<p>We have a special allowance for the removal of the asbestos roofing material.</p>
<p>Waitarere Surf Club has just been built for 3.2m.</p>	<p>The amount that we need to raise covers all the design, Building Consent, Resource Consents, Specialist consultants and pre-construction investigations – the actual build cost is ~60% of the total amount being sought. It is common for build costs to be misunderstood from other builds and what they include.</p>
<p>What is the contingency plan if we are not able to achieve all the funding required to complete the rebuild?</p> <p>Is there ability or planning to rebuild in sections? Maybe starting with the operational area which needs to be improved in size and facilities.</p>	<p>Our programme does not allow for the start of the project until full funding has been achieved. The design of the project is such that to achieve the additional amenity and better usage of the site, it is not possible to partially deconstruct and partially build – this will cost the project more money in the long run. We need to be realistic and if the project takes longer to obtain the funding needed, we will delay the build accordingly.</p>
<p>From the information provided I don't think it was clear what allowance had been made for inflation from today until handover, end 2025. The timeline seems reasonably tight to me. I realize you are mitigating</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. We have allowed for a contingency for inflation, as well as design development through the proposed delivery programme – however as you correctly state depending on the timeframe it takes to obtain full funding, costs will inflate beyond the</p>

some of the risks with the offsite construction but I would be more comfortable if the costings and inflation component made provision for the project slipping into the following year i.e. running 6 to 12 months late. Your committee has a lot of experience in various projects so I am sure you will have experienced the unforeseen delays that often happen causing this type of delay.

projects control – the sooner we can complete our funding drive, the sooner we can lock in pricing.

Given the location of the building and potential issues which could be encountered the 10% contingency seems light compared to projects I have been involved with previously.

The committee was tasked with providing a preliminary design for community engagement and accordingly preliminary budgets only. As the project now moves into it developed design phase and resource consent, the ability to firm up on delivery costs will be possible. However we have built in contingencies into each subsection of deliverables where we see the risks are. At present we fully inspect that there will be value engineering that will need to take place – the most important deliverable will be the building shell and operational requirements – subject to funding, we have considered subdividing some internal projects to a later fundraising.

A question was asked at the meeting re sunk costs that would be incurred by the time the members voted. The answer was circa \$35k. However, the Next Steps slide seemed to say you will submit your resource consent application and gain approval from council prior to that meeting. I would have thought the costs associated with a resource consent would be significant and therefore wonder why this would be incurred prior to gaining a mandate from the members.

The project has spent ~\$35k to date. That includes Architecture design, planning advice, geotechnical investigations and reporting, coastal erosion and structural design reporting.

The next stage is developed design and resource consent. We have a fixed price for the RC submission; however it is not possible to obtain a fixed price for the processing from HDC – we are in discussion with them to the degree that that they can assist.

The Developed design / RC submission set of documents will allow us to obtain a further detailed cost analysis that will allow member committee voting. It is important to note that the build committee have undertaken best endeavours to mitigate a RC process that will be convoluted and expensive – however this process and cost is largely outside of our control

and the committee will be kept update at all times on the projected costs of this important process.

I have concerns regarding spending significant sums of money before the club is certain they can definitely fund the project. In the event the project doesn't proceed either due to the members mandate or funding issues these costs will largely be wasted.

The Committee have acknowledged the club requires replacement, in order to determine what can be built takes specialists and as noted in previous questions / answers a detailed design to price against – which we have endeavoured to do with experienced contributors.

I note from NZLC website that their large project funding Community Facilities committee, has 46% less funding available compared with previous year. In the last two rounds there have been 106 successful recipients receiving \$18.7 m in total, an average of \$176.5 k each. Almost 50 % of them received less than \$100k. 7.5% of them received \$500k or greater, with the largest, a Local Territorial Authority, obtaining \$800k. What discussions has the Club had with the Community Facilities committee or Lottery representatives to give us confidence that \$1 m will be made available to the rebuild project?

Fundraising is a priority focus for the project to succeed. We have a committee working on this.

It is acknowledged that under current economic circumstances, fundraising maybe more difficult than in previous years. It is important to note also that every year that passes the project cost will increase due to unavoidable inflation. The allocated contingency for the project is only allotted for the reasonably anticipated conditions over the programmed deliverable period.

The sooner we can lock in all our funding and building contracts the better for the project and the sooner the community can enjoy the new facility. We encourage any connections to commercial or charity funding opportunities that can be sourced.

The costs and funding appear to be all in 2024 dollars. The rate of increase in building materials may have slowed but increases will occur. Considering the location, environment and one-off design, the 10% contingency would, in my experience be the minimum. The recently completed Midway Clubhouse, which I understand had a reasonably fast development cycle

It is acknowledged that under current economic circumstances, fundraising maybe more difficult than in previous years. It is important to note also that every year that passes the project cost will increase due to unavoidable inflation. The allocated contingency for the project is only allotted for the reasonably anticipated conditions over the programmed deliverable period.

and considerable government Covid 19 funding, had a reported cost overrun of 50% - \$5 m to \$7.5 m.

The significant omission of the timeline as presented is that there is no linkage between the funding tasks and the construction tasks. My suggestion is that no further expenditure is incurred by the Building Sub-committee, until say 80% of the estimated funding has been secured. The 80% achievement would allow the detailed design, RC and BC to proceed. Demolition should not commence until 100% of the funding has been secured. It is imperative, in my view, that no further hard gained Club members funds are spent until the completion risk is reduced to zero.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to spend nothing and yet achieve certainty.

The project has spent ~\$35k to date. That includes Architecture design, planning advice, geotechnical investigations and reporting, coastal erosion and structural design reporting.

The next stage is developed design and resource consent. We have a fixed price for the RC submission; however it is not possible to obtain a fixed price for the processing from HDC – we are in discussion with them to the degree that that they can assist.

The Developed design / RC submission set of documents will allow us to obtain a further detailed cost analysis that will allow member committee voting. It is important to note that the build committee have undertaken best endeavours to mitigate a RC process that will be convoluted and expensive – however this process and cost is largely outside of our control and the committee will be kept update at all time on the projected costs of this important process.

PLANNING & CONSENTS

Edited Feedback

Having regard to the district plan provisions, that the proposal is relatively conservative, but logical. Only one suggestion – the resource consent will likely be heard by an independent commissioner (given some

Whiritoa Build Committee Response

Many thanks for your input and suggestion. We will take this into account and will be in touch directly if there is further assistance you provide the project.

Council input?) so to close off issues it might be appropriate to obtain, if you can albeit 'without prejudice', the Council agreement that the original buildings were legally established and, with the supporting design evidence, they think that the proposal sits appropriately under RMA s.10 in terms of relevant character, intensity and scale matters.

There are clauses in the Lease agreement that require permission from the lessor to be obtained before changes to the building can be undertaken. There may be other implications from the Lease to. This should be a task on the project plan. From my engagement with DoC, they do like being taken for granted. The DoC consultation is a HDC obligation.

HDC is fully aware and supportive of our rebuild plans. We will raise this obligation with them to ensure all requirements are satisfactorily met.

FUTURE-PROOFING (INC EROSION)

Edited Feedback

This suits the needs of the surf club today but is there space for growth.

My feedback both as a professional geologist and as a casual reader of the report is that it seems clear from the report that the design should accommodate

Whiritoa Build Committee Response

We have a thorough project brief that takes on board our current needs and projected club growth and use requirements. Each area and use have been considered.

The specialists' reports are available for viewing and have been issued to the member for review.

the 28.5m erosion (I understand this to be measured horizontal from toe of dune) that has been predicted to be likely. I question whether the current preliminary design addresses this expectation. My initial assessment is that the design does not appear to address the requirement for a sufficient width of dune that can respond effectively to future erosion events.

Please strongly consider not only sea level rising but the possibility of an increase in severe weather events. The existing club is extremely close to the ocean and it would be optimal in my opinion to bring the club as far back as possible. A smaller, or more rectangle shape club could be possibility to achieve this? We visited the club at the height of Cyclone Gabrielle and I thought the front fencing and platform were going to be washed away. Just a thought to consider.

We have engaged with a number of professional consultants as part of the design of the new clubhouse including coastal erosion engineers. We have taken into consideration based on their expertise and recommendations and designed the club house in accordance with their advice, that of the HDC and SLNZ who provide the insurance for the club.

OTHER

Edited Feedback

Whiritoa Build Committee Response

It would be a good idea to find a lawyer who can write the resolution well for member voting- if you need a hand I have some contacts/commercial law partners

Thank you for this offer, we will be in touch in due course as necessary.

<p>I can ask about pro bono work who are used to writing complex resolutions for member organisations</p>	
<p>With the member vote I would suggest looking at Electionnz. They probably have a cheaper rate for small member orgs or pro bono they may be able to offer. This enables electronic voting online with code, reaches the full voting membership, provides reminders and is arms length. It would capture a larger number of people to vote rather than in person and removes any paper/hand votes/proxies etc and or manipulation of any kind. They would be the returning officer and present the numbers- pass etc in advance of the formal meeting.</p>	<p>Thank you for the suggestion. We will review the suggested platform and make a final decision on how to manage the member vote as we get closer to this stage.</p>
<p>The intended SGM for members, I feel, needs a lot of thought. The magnitude of the decision in the scheme of things can not be underestimated. A simple majority by persons at that meeting and proxies, is inadequate in my view. The bar should be set much higher. An example from the commercial world for a major transaction could be at least 50 % of the membership participate and a 75 % majority required. The engagement of one of the vote administration organisations should be considered to assist with the voting logistics.</p>	<p>The Special General Meeting will be held in accordance with our constitution and all necessary requirements adhered to.</p> <p>The Executive Committee will make any decisions on member voting methods and logistics.</p>
<p>As a special resolution - it would normally be a 75% threshold of the members who vote- will this be the case.</p>	<p>As per the constitution, a member vote will be passed if a majority is achieved. There is no requirement for a minimum 75% member vote to be achieved.</p>

As I have previously commented, the process outcome being presented to members is not what was envisaged at the 2021 AGM. I, for one, was expecting some sketch options for consideration that had not encountered a range of experts costs. The first point in the Veros Report notes 'Preliminary feasibility and options study for the construction of a new facility'. One of the options that could have been the presented, is the current rebuild option another, a long term plan to redevelop of the facilities in stages over time or other options. It is the Gearshed and the Gearshed alone that needs urgent consideration. The issues within the 3A's could be addressed as R&M until funding was assured and the need was warranted. This could be decades away.

Following the 2021 AGM, a motion was unanimously passed to “set up a building committee to commence design and fundraising to achieve a new facility”. Part of this motion included clarification that stated, “stage one is the design and planning stage for funding requirements”.

To enable the building committee to meet this requirement and to develop designs for a future new facility it was necessary to engage with external experts to understand any potential current and future design restrictions. The building committee have minimised expenditure where possible while working collaboratively to meet this requirement.