

DEANS MARSH COMMUNITY HUB – DRAFT FACILITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ANALYSIS (December 2023)

ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

PHASE 5: Final Facility Development Plan Community Feedback. The Plan was available to the community for review and comment from 5 June to the 3 July. An extension to 10 July to enable the project to be highlighted at the Community Action Network meeting on the 6 July.

How the opportunity to be involved was promoted:

- Community engagement launch – 5th June 2023
- Advertising / promotion – social media and website (SCS and Deans Marsh Community Cottage), SCS media release and local newspaper coverage.

How the community engaged on this project:

- Online (Survey Monkey) – 13 responses
- Emailed submissions to Council Officers – 7 responses

ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

1. Officers reviewed all feedback comments on the Deans Marsh Community Hub draft plan.
2. Topics and themes were identified in all responses.
3. Officers tallied responses for common themes for the community submissions and Group submission.
4. Design considerations were consolidated to be provided to Brand Architects along with this analysis summary to help inform their finalisation of the design and Plan.

ENGAGEMENT QUESTIONS:

Q: Have you previously provided input or comment on this project?

Q: Please provide feedback comments here on the draft plan

Q: Please upload any further detailed submission feedback

Individual community responses (n = 19)

Group response - Friends of the Deans Marsh Hub (n = 54)

GENDER AND EQUITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Further to community engagement, a Gender and Equity Impact Assessment was undertaken by Officers to consider who and how the space will be used from the different perspectives of women, men and gender diverse people. This included input from various sources and is included below for context alongside the community feedback.

THEMES

HERITAGE

TOPIC	COMMENTS SUMMARY	RESPONSE
Heritage	Four respondents expressed a strong desire to retain the existing facility, citing the heritage of the building.	The value of the existing facility to the community is appreciated and the design aims to celebrate this in the new facility by reusing materials if possible, replicating the hall ceiling and creating spaces to tell the local history.
	One respondent believes there is no heritage value in the existing building.	Noted
Architectural Significance	One respondent outlined that heritage significance has been established by several assessments.	Noted
	One respondent stated it was a positive outcome to demolish the existing 'eyesore'.	Noted

GENERAL FACILITY AND LAYOUT

TOPIC	COMMENTS SUMMARY	RESPONSE
Facility Orientation	Two respondents highlighted that the design doesn't connect with the oval, and that windows from the hall could assist with this.	The design has aimed to make the most of the northern light into the hall, and viewing out to the south through windows and glass doors. The preference was therefore to include change spaces and storage to the east end of the hall.
	One respondent noted the shed location is 'clumsy'.	This feedback will be taken into consideration by the architects.
Facility layout	One group response (n=54) and one individual respondent expressed their support for the previous Option 2.	Based on all feedback, the previous 'Option 2' will be used as the basis of the final design while also incorporating other changes from the feedback, and elements from the draft Final Design.
	One group response (n=54) stated that the importance of the main pedestrian axis to the precinct which occurs through the plaza has been weakened (specifically that it is not appropriate for bin storage, a storeroom and public toilets to be the first part of the Hub the public encounters when entering, nor should vehicles access the plaza).	Based on adopting the previous 'Option 2', the bin store can move to the north along with the kitchen. Toilets will be included in the redesign of the plaza).

TOPIC	COMMENTS SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		the small kitchen to the south, noting the building form and interaction with the plaza. Deliveries will be to the north along the service road, not through the plaza. Any use of the plaza for events will require vehicles to drop off equipment at the main car park, from the oval/playground direction, or alternatively removable bollards to be located at the car park/access intersection can be removed to provide access if required. The Plan shows what could be interpreted as a road heading into the plaza, however this is a footpath and this will be noted as such in the final design (with collapsible bollards for any access/setup requirements).
	Three respondents expressed that the facility is 'too big/cavernous' and that there is 'wasted space' and large transit areas.	There may be scope to rationalise spaces for greater efficiency. This feedback will be taken into consideration by the architects.
	One respondent noted that other spaces are 'cramped and inadequate'.	This feedback will be taken into consideration by the architects.
	One respondent noted that no information on community spaces fitout was provided, limiting community feedback.	The design is conceptual only. Greater detail will be provided in the next design stage when that progresses (funding is required).
Kitchen	One group response (n=54) and one individual respondent expressed a preference for the kitchen to be located on the north side of the Hub.	Based on feedback, the location of the kitchen will be changed. Noting this requires a kitchen to service the Cottage and plaza as in the previous Option 2. Based on other feedback of the size of the facility, the kitchen lobby, lounge and foyer spaces will be rationalised for greater efficiency of space.
	One respondent noted that the kitchen is smaller compared to previous plans with no dedicated area for serving/queuing during functions.	Flexible use of spaces will be addressed through the change to the north side.
Facility Toilets	One group response (n=54) noted that their preference is to not locate externally-accessed public toilets in the new building adjacent to the plaza, and instead upgrade the existing public toilets in the reserve.	The externally-accessed toilets on the south side will remain, however will be incorporated into a revised design noting the building form and interaction with the plaza. It is important to

TOPIC	COMMENTS SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		provide accessible amenities for users of the playground closer than the existing reserve toilets that are quite a distance away and not accessible. The existing public toilet block will remain and renewed when required/budget allows.
	One respondent stated that toilets should be externally and internally accessible.	This is as per the proposed option.
	One respondent said it is inappropriate that toilets are located on the far side of the foyer away from the hall (for regular users).	The toilets are relatively centrally located between the Hall/Big Room and the Cottage/meeting rooms.
Lobby / Foyer	One respondent stated the size of the lobby and foyer is too large. It was also suggested that the lounge area could be incorporated into this space.	As noted above, based on other feedback of the size of the facility, the kitchen lobby, lounge and foyer spaces should be rationalised for greater efficiency of space.
Big Room	One respondent noted that the Big Room isn't necessary and the Hall could perform a more multifunctional space (i.e. with a sewing alcove added). If the Big Room is to stay, it was suggested that it should connect to the Hall to make a large multiuse space.	In the previous Option 2, the Big Room connects to the hall. With the required change to the kitchen location, this configuration will be reinstated.
Early Learning Centre	Three respondents proposed that Council considers a centre being constructed on school land or adjacent to the school as a better integration option.	Please note 'Expanded Response' previously provided on the matter of early years provision at the end of this document.
	Two respondents said the early learning centre is 'unnecessarily large/disproportionate', and a third questioned the large size of the toilets in this space.	Under the Children's Service Regulations 2020 a minimum of 3.25 sqm clear floor space excluding fixed joinery and door swings must be provided per child. To allow for joinery and door swings the architect design to 3.5sqm per child as per best practice. The architect has been instructed to design the Children's room for 22 children x 3.5 = 77sqm. Further, in a centre offering long day care additional space, over and above the 3.5sqm must be provided for sleeping and storage of cots.
	One respondent proposed to build either a neighbourhood house or childcare at this stage – not both.	There is scope for the Early Learning Centre to be completed as a second stage, if only partial funding is secured.

TOPIC	COMMENTS SUMMARY	RESPONSE
	One respondent said the 'early learning centre isn't integrated in the Hub' and that it's 'a walled-off activity'.	This is correct in a physical sense and is required for compliance and licencing purposes, however it is expected that users of the Early Learning Centre will interact with other spaces and services within the Hub, which is more easily promoted by having the Centre within the Hub.
Community Cottage	Two respondents stated that the 'design misunderstands the role of the Community Cottage – it does not manage the facility. The prominent location suggests this, when it is the DMCAC that manages the facility'.	This is noted. The Community Cottage provide great services to the community and have been located at the front of the building to enable easy interaction with community members. The location does not imply that they will manage the facility.
	One respondent questioned whether Council will 'bear the ongoing cost of opening the proposed expensive facility to the public each day'.	The Deans Marsh Community Asset Committee is responsible for the day-to-day management of the existing facility. The draft Plan notes that Council will undertake future work to consider a management model commensurate with the provision of a range of services, programs, and activities to meet community expectations. The draft Plan signals a review of facility management into the future.
Social Space	One respondent questioned the size of the lounge area as it 'ignores the fact that the Hall itself is the primary 'social space''.	As noted above, based on other feedback of the size of the facility, the kitchen lobby, lounge and foyer spaces should be rationalised for greater efficiency of space.
Kitchen Kiosk	One respondent strongly objected to the kitchenette as it is line of sight to users, and proposed a separate smaller room be included.	Noted. As above, based on feedback, the location of the kitchen will be changed. This requires a kitchen to service the Cottage and plaza as in the previous Option 2.
	One respondent noted that user groups will have to access the main kitchen which is 'unsatisfactory as it will have more valuable, and dangerous, equipment'.	As above, based on feedback, the location of the kitchen will be changed. This requires a kitchen to service the Cottage and plaza as in the previous Option 2 which will alleviate this concern.
Internal Storage Spaces	One respondent stated that the storage space for the Cottage/office is inadequate.	The storage is deemed suitable for the expected use.

HALL

TOPIC	COMMENTS SUMMARY	RESPONSE
Hall	One respondent stated that in terms of the hall space, the community's current needs are not addressed competently and its 'unique character and local significance' have been lost.	The value of the existing facility to the community is appreciated and the design aims to celebrate this in the new facility by reusing materials if possible, replicating the hall ceiling and creating spaces to tell the local history.
Change Rooms	One respondent notes that 'as an experienced professional in this area, the proposed overall design of the stage, backstage, change areas and storage areas is clumsy and unsuitable. It needs a complete rethink. For example, it is inappropriate for performers to walk through the audience, access the same toilets as the general public and return to back of stage. It is noted that at least one toilet, wash basin and shower should be included backstage'.	As noted in other feedback, the change spaces don't include fitout/layout detail. However it can be confirmed that the change spaces will include a toilet, basin and a shower (if space permits).
Stage Design	One group response (n=54) and three individual respondents request that a permanent stage is included instead of the proposed demountable option.	The stage will be changed to a permanent structure. This may require alterations to the change rooms and storage spaces (primarily for access).
Lighting	Two respondents highlighted that basic stage lighting is an essential Hall requirement and needs to be within the design and cost plan.	Agreed – this will be included as a notation in the design and added to the cost plan.
Hall Curtain	One respondent stated that the re-purposing of the treasured stage curtain as a backdrop is inappropriate.	With the change to the permanent stage, the curtain will be able to be relocated to the stage as in the existing Hall.

EQUIPMENT

TOPIC	COMMENTS SUMMARY	RESPONSE
Heating and Cooling	One respondent questioned the glazing of the windows in the hall, and that it is not costed.	As the glazing to the foyer is provided as operable/bi-fold doors they have been described and priced as that in the Cost Plan. The Hall windows and doors have been accounted for in the general Windows and External Doors sections of the Cost Plan.
	One respondent questioned the location of the rammed earth walls as they cannot act as heat banks.	The rammed earth walls have principally been placed to define key areas in the building, provide a tactile, humane and warm finish and to provide thermal mass to stabilise the ambient temperature of the building. Having direct sun on the rammed earth is not the goal, but rather to have a building that is well oriented to achieve passive solar gain which raises the ambient temperature from which the rammed earth absorbs warmth to then later emit when the ambient temperature drops.
Pinboards / Whiteboards	One respondent questioned the large budget of \$50,000 for pinboards/whiteboards.	At this stage in the design process the detailed extent of the pinboards and white boards has not been established. The \$50,000 is a provisional allowance typical for a building of this size and nature and through the Detailed Design phase this will be refined. Pinboard fabrics will be used in various spaces on the walls to help manage acoustics, such as in the Early Years, Big Room, Foyer and parts of the Hall.
Sound field system	Two respondents questioned the reasoning behind the sound field system and seek clarity on who it is for and why is it prioritised.	Under the National Construction Code for the Class of building a Community Centre/Hall is, the architect is required to provide Hearing Augmentation to any space that has built in amplification. (See below: this is a Class 9b building) Rooms will include the Hall, possibly the Foyer, Lounge and the Big Room.

EXTERNAL

TOPIC	COMMENTS SUMMARY	RESPONSE
Public Toilets	One group response (n=54) and two individual responses requested that the existing public toilets remain and are upgraded.	The existing toilets will remain and renewed when required/budget allows.
	One group response (n=54) stated that the external public toilets in the Hub design should not be included and people can either use the internal public toilets or the existing reserve public toilets (noting they should be upgraded).	The externally-accessed toilets on the south side will remain, however will be incorporated into a revised design noting the building form and interaction with the plaza. It is important to provide accessible amenities for users of the playground closer than the existing reserve toilets that are quite a distance away and not accessible. The existing public toilet block will remain and renewed when required/budget allows.
Skate Park / BMX track	Three respondents are not satisfied that the removal of the skate park /bike park is required for the Hub, and that it displaces regularly-used play areas.	The design and development of a Hub facility to service generations of locals is the priority. While it is disappointing that this impacts the existing skate park, this facility will be rebuilt within the reserve. The Final Plan will note this in more detail to be clear for the community.
	Three respondents highlighted the environmental damage that would be done by removal and replacement of the skate park and another respondent wants to see it relocated/reused.	If the skate park can't be retained in its current location, a new facility would be constructed to an equal or better standard, and a new build would consider any environmental impacts (i.e. the concrete would be recycled and used in other products).
	Two respondents highlight that there is no allocation in the cost plan for reconstruction of a skate park and asked how it will be funded.	The revision to the design based on community and internal feedback will consider if the skate park can be retained. If not, there is potential that it may be funded through the Asset Renewal Program or the project.
	One respondent has no belief that the skate park / bike park will be replaced in a suitable way.	If the skate park can't be retained in its current location, a new facility would be constructed to an equal or better standard, and a new build will provide the opportunity to engage with local young people on their needs.

	One respondent highlighted that there is a real question on where the skate and bike parks will be rebuilt within the reserve (this hasn't been indicated).	If the skate park can't be retained in its current location, in order to provide a fit-for-purpose community facility with appropriate spaces, sizes and configuration, the skate park and bike park would be relocated. A location for the skate park and bike park would be determined in consultation with the Community Asset Committee and key stakeholders when further design work for the Hub is undertaken. There are a couple of location options identified within the site that will be considered if relocation is required. If the skate park has to be demolished, the concrete would be recycled and used in other products.
--	--	---

ENVIRONMENT

TOPIC	COMMENTS SUMMARY	RESPONSE
Environmental Impact	Two respondents highlighted key concerns including the embodied energy that will be lost with our current community spaces, that demolition of an existing facility is unnecessary and at complete odds with what this community stands for, and the environmental damage of a build of this scale with these materials.	If the existing building was to be retained, the structural and other issues previously highlighted would require it to be rebuilt. Therefore the demolition would be required regardless.
	One respondent is 'bewildered that Council is proposing a facility with an insane carbon footprint that has use of under 100 people per week'.	The facility is the only community space for a wider population of around 600 people. The architect will be asked to rationalise spaces for greater efficiency of space, however the intent is to construct a facility for future generations that can attract and service more locals than the existing facility.
	One respondent stated the proposed facility 'clearly detracts from Council's intent to actively address the global climate emergency threat, and that it has not been considered financially or more importantly based on carbon footprint and heritage value'.	The Plan has incorporated Environmentally Sustainable Design principles. Heritage has been thoroughly considered. The cost is in line with other facilities of this type.
EV Charging Bank	One respondent requested a bank of EV chargers is included in the design/cost plan.	This is a good suggestion the potential inclusion of an EV charger can be noted on the design (potential funding through grants).
Trees	One respondent highlighted that consideration of the cypress trees on the north boundary is required as they will impact light into the building.	This has been considered in the design. Trees will have to be removed to maximise the benefit of the northern aspect.

GENERAL PROJECT

TOPIC	COMMENTS SUMMARY	RESPONSE
Alternate Design Option	Two respondents provided an alternate design option which retains the existing hall and allocates funds to its repair and other key infrastructure, for a lower cost than the new building.	The initiative is appreciated, however given the significant structural issues, to retain is to rebuild, and replicating the current facility would limit the ability to design and provide a fit-for-purpose outcome. The current design, with changes through this feedback process, will be pursued.
Project Cost	Three respondents highlighted that the cost is significant for a small population/user base, and it will continue to increase over time (therefore becoming harder to fund).	The facility is the only community space for a wider population of around 600 people. The architect will be asked to rationalise spaces for greater efficiency of space, however the intent is to construct a facility for future generations that can attract and service more locals than the existing facility. It is noted that costs will likely continue to increase, as has been experienced post COVID-19.
	One respondent stated that the Plan appears to have 'not met Council's requirement to be realistic and within resource constraints'.	The proposed funding model is possible for this type of facility. There are also options to stage the development if only partial funding can be secured. The architect will be asked to rationalise spaces for greater efficiency in the design revision.
	One respondent suggested that the funds allocated within the cost plan to architects should be used for maintenance of the existing building.	The funds referred to are not currently available/secured externally.
Uncounted Costs	Four respondents asked how and when will the skate park / bike park replacement be funded.	The revision to the design based on community and internal feedback will consider if the skate park can be retained. If not, there is potential that it may be funded through the Asset Renewal Program or the project.
	Two respondents noted that decanting costs / relocation/housing of services for 18-24 months during construction are not included in the cost plan.	Noted. An allocation will be added to the cost plan.
	One respondent noted that joinery costs are not in the cost plan.	Joinery is included in the Cost Plan under item 13 – Joinery & Toilet Partitions.

TOPIC	COMMENTS SUMMARY	RESPONSE
Funding Strategy	One respondent suggested that the 'external funding required by 2026/7 will be 77% of a total projected cost, that this ratio has never before been achieved and if not achieved, it is Council that will need to find the substantial shortfall, or abandon this 'mega-design' project strategy'.	The proposed funding model is possible for this type of facility. There are also options to stage the development if only partial funding can be secured. The architect will be asked to rationalise spaces for greater efficiency in the design revision.
Community Engagement	Five respondents expressed their dissatisfaction with the community engagement process.	The engagement process has been extensive. It is acknowledged that at times it has been challenging for some community members. Officers. Additional measures have been adopted throughout the process to ensure all community members have had an opportunity to engage with the process, including additional community meetings, extended timeframes, community representative Project Steering Group, meetings with individual community members in their homes and more. Officers are mindful that parts of the process could have been improved, but are equally aware that there has also been positive feedback from community members on the process.
	One respondent noted that the process was 'flawed fatally from the beginning', with another respondent adding that it has been a poorly designed and discouraging community engagement process.	As above.
	One respondent noted that while some in the community accept Council's Hub Community Engagement process as appropriate, they found it 'highly stressful, inadequate, and damaging of long-established community harmony'. Another respondent added that they have no doubt it has contributed to their 'poor health over the past year'.	It is acknowledged that at times it has been challenging for some community members as above.
	One respondent noted that 'effective Community Engagement involves conversation first, then negotiation of persisting differences, then if necessary enforcement to resolve outstanding differences. Unfortunately, officers chose enforcement of their core concept as step one'.	The process included publicly highlighting the challenges of the existing facility and ascertaining future community needs, which have fed into the design.
	One respondent noted that Council was 'deceptive and dishonourable in running 'a community engagement' process which had secret and pre-set goals'.	Noted.
	One respondent stated that 'the only way forward for the Deans Marsh Hall and Cottage is to 'go back to the beginning and start again'', including asking the 'Deans Marsh community – all of us – by letter as well as email	This suggestion will not be undertaken with respect to the extensive community engagement

TOPIC	COMMENTS SUMMARY	RESPONSE
	and public notices – what is OUR vision for the building at the oval. Give us a deadline of say 6 or 12 months to allow us to discuss, debate and formulate ideas.’	process that has been undertaken and the significant involvement of the community throughout. As noted, the engagement process for this project has been extensive. In April/May 2022 there was 270 contact points through surveys and in-person. Further engagement undertaken in Nov/Dec 2022 resulted in another 190 contact points via surveys, in-person and group submissions. A Project Steering Group (PSG) was established with members from various community groups. PSG members and guest speakers (i.e. local historian Dr Deb Campbell) were involved in leading and/or presenting at community forums. Further, several individuals not comfortable with participating in public forums have been met with in their homes, acknowledging that the engagement process is different for people for different reasons. The overall engagement process has highlighted that there a people who would not be comfortable participating in the proposed ‘discuss, debate and formulate ideas’ format, given the extensive engagement that has already occurred.
	One respondent outlined that the final two phases are the drafting and finalisation of the Facility Development Plan must have representation from the community similar to the Steering Group, and that this does not preclude valuable ongoing input from the community during the build.	The involvement of the Steering Group in the project has concluded. There will be future opportunities for community to input to the process when the next stage of design and/or moving into construction occurs (noting this is funding dependent).
General Support	One group response (n=54) and eight respondents noted general support for the Hub development, including “I look forward with great excitement to seeing the funding secured and being present when the project gets underway”, “I think it's wonderful and will be a great asset to our community.”, “We look forward to what's to come.” and “Thank you & well done.”	Noted.

TOPIC	COMMENTS SUMMARY	RESPONSE
	One group response (n=54) and one individual respondent requested that the design concept known as 'Option 2' (dated October 2022) be the basis for any future development of the Hub.	Based on all feedback, the previous 'Option 2' will be used as the basis of the final design while also incorporating other changes from the feedback, and elements from the draft Final Design.
Objection	Four respondents stated that they do not support the Final Plan and oppose Council endorsing it, citing Cost, Funding Strategy, Environmental and Heritage grounds.	Noted.
	Four respondents asked Council to retain the existing facility.	Noted.
	One respondent noted that 'Surf Coast Shire is absolving itself from its responsibility to uphold its own Planning Scheme heritage overlay'.	Heritage has been thoroughly considered throughout the process with a range of advice sought and reviewed.
	One respondent asked Council to not go ahead with this plan and notes that community concerns were addressed in Option 2 plan that was presented.	Based on all feedback, the previous 'Option 2' will be used as the basis of the final design while also incorporating other changes from the feedback, and elements from the draft Final Design.
	One respondent asked Council to start the engagement process again.	This suggestion will not be undertaken.
Other	One respondent noted that having an 'architectural response that copies the form of the original ceiling and roof is an example of the worst type of facadism'.	Noted.
	One respondent advocates that before any work takes place at Deans Marsh, the Shire undertake a Conservation Management Plan for the building conducted by an appropriately experienced and independent heritage expert.	This was recommended by Council's Heritage Advisor and will be undertaken at the appropriate time.
	One respondent was concerned that the consultative process has been 'unreasonably influenced by a small number of persons who are not representative of the relatively silent community at large'.	Noted.
	One respondent trusts that 'Councillors will not permit this neglect to continue and will show Environmental Leadership by looking to change Council's current mindset on this Project - to favour asset replacement over asset care'.	The Final Plan will be considered by Council at a future meeting.
	One respondent stated that 'many locals, myself among them, hope and believe the Brand Plan will never be built'.	Noted.

TOPIC	COMMENTS SUMMARY	RESPONSE
	One respondent said ‘thank you for taking our comments on board, and not being put-off by the few loud voices raising opposition’.	Noted.
	One respondent said the ‘final draft plan has captured the wants and needs of a large portion of the community and that feedback and discussions they have had directly with members of the community have been nothing but positive and grateful for this opportunity’.	Noted.

GENDER AND EQUITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

TOPIC	COMMENTS SUMMARY	RESPONSE
Breastfeeding space	Women are statistically more likely to be the primary caregiver of children and require breastfeeding friendly spaces that provide some level of privacy without being segregated or set far away from communal areas. Breastfeeding spaces should be inviting, accessible and include comfortable furniture and access to basins.	The semi-circle seating in the Lobby is intended for this purpose.
Access to child-friendly/breakaway spaces	Ensure there is access to child-friendly/breakaway spaces adjacent to and visible from multipurpose meeting rooms/activity spaces to enhance the inclusiveness for people caring for children. Ensure clear line of sight can be maintained between transition spaces	The foyer, lounge and lobby are intended for this purpose.
Swing doors with automated sliding/opening doors	Where possible replace standard swing doors with automated sliding/opening doors to minimise reliance on operating swing doors for pram users and people using mobility aids	Airlock is automated, swing doors to other areas could be left open during use times.
Unisex options for toilets	Provide unisex options for toilets that are safe and accessible for gender diverse, non-binary, gender neutral and trans people. Ensure there is safe access to unisex ambulant toilets both indoors and outdoors, and adequate lighting in these areas.	Gender neutral ambulant toilets are included both internally and externally.
Footpath width	Ensure there is a footpath from the carpark to the front entrance of the building that is wide enough and stable enough to enable access for double prams, mobility aids, wheelchairs and scooters to assist with ease of access to the building. Ensure clear line of sight from the building to the carpark	Accommodated in the design
Unisex change rooms	Provide unisex change rooms that are non-gendered and accessible from the stage/hall area for use during performances, productions and other activities that require change room access in this area	Provided in hall area – layout to be refined in the Detailed Design phase.
Lighting	Ensure lighting design enables safe and visible navigation at night with clear signage and connection between places clearly defined e.g. carpark	To be addressed in the Detailed Design phase.
Baby Change Facilities	Ensure baby change facilities are accessible by all genders	Internal gender neutral toilet will have a baby change facility.

EXPANDED RESPONSE

TOPIC	COMMENTS SUMMARY	RESPONSE
Early Learning Centre	Three respondents proposed that Council considers a centre being constructed on school land or adjacent to the school as a better integration option.	Surf Coast Shire Council is about to commence a Workforce Development Plan and Kindergarten Infrastructure Services Plan (KISP) as part of funding received by the Department of Education. Our more remote shire locations will be prioritised as part of these two pieces of work. These plans will greatly inform the required infrastructure and workforce requirements across the shire in relation to current and future kindergarten demands (population growth expectations and birth rates). Surf Coast Shire is actually looking to combine our funding with Colac Otway Shire to complete the workforce development plan as both Councils are facing challenges in attracting and retaining staff in the same remote locations within our LGAs. It is important to note that both these pieces of work have a primary focus on kindergarten infrastructure and workforce – not occasional care, long day care or family day care specifically. Council hopes to weave in some outcomes related to these other childcare options not delivered by Council through these projects but due to the nature of the funding requirements (kindergarten specific), they won't be the primary focus. Both pieces of work will be complete by July 2024. The recent Victorian Government announcement regarding kindergartens on site at school locations is something that is very much in its infancy and won't be appropriate in all instances. I would imagine that based on exceptionally limited demand for kindergarten in Deans Marsh this would not be something that will be entertained as the intent of this funding is to expand oversubscribed sites as a priority.