

Boardwalk Update as at 5th March, 2015

Background

Members of the Working Group (J.Rolls, C.Ashford and D.Treloar) attended an on-site meeting yesterday with MI Engineers (Tim Wilson and Graham Stokes) and Ray Massie to review revised design/engineering plans and inspect the boardwalk for the purpose of preparing a dilapidation report on present condition and likely longevity of existing.

The revised design/engineering plans (Revision 2 – which Council has agreed to forward to the CCB) incorporates all suggested Working Group design recommendations with the exception of the following features...

...‘Switchback’ detail has been deleted for reasons of site instability and associated costs to construct in these ground conditions. As well as, emergency ATV (quadbike) improved manoeuvrability through this section.

... The inclusion of additional viewing platforms at Chainages 209 (heading toward beach this platform will be immediately before the existing ‘switchback’) and 340 (again, heading toward beach, this platform will be on the left hand side of the boardwalk). This last viewing platform replaces the small seating area at Chainage 320, on the right hand side heading toward the beach.

The dilapidation report will not only identify sections in need of repair but also provide an estimate on the useful life of the existing boardwalk. Interestingly, MI Engineers are of the opinion that the installed “Holey Belt” will accelerate the rate of deterioration of the decking given it will trap moisture for longer periods than those sections open to the sun and wind.

Next Steps /Actions

MI Engineers to prepare Dilapidation Report for Council for forwarding to the CCB along with requested Revision 2 design/engineering plans for review and comment.

Action – MI Engineering/Council

Council’s late December 2014 ‘Survey Monkey’ results with CCB for analysis and incorporation into Council’s Business Plan for increased funding for boardwalk. Current Community position remains 1.8m wide/Wagner Construction Option requiring additional \$640,000 of funding. Council’s draft Business Plan states *“The boardwalk represents a key asset for the village... that warrants a sustained reinvestment commitment...”* whilst integrating *“...asset enhancement utilising targeted HH profit reinvestment combining all available budgets and asset program / grant funding.”*

Action – CCB/Council

Analysis of Council's 29th – 30th December 2014 "Survey Monkey" Results

Background Overview

Council conducted a two day field survey of people using the boardwalk on 29th and 30th December 2014. Asking a battery of seven (7) closed ended questions, this field survey is based on a sample size of fifty eight (58) respondents. Analysis of their responses is as follows...

1. Where are you from?

... a combined 3 in 10 respondents were from the Lake Conjola area/Shoalhaven.

... 3 in 10 respondents reported they were from Sydney.

... 1 in 7 respondents reported they were from Canberra/Interstate. This same number reported they were from NSW.

... 1 in 10 respondents reported they were from Overseas.

2. Why are you using the boardwalk?

... 1 in 3 respondents reported to access the beach.

... a combined 2 in 5 respondents reported access to beach; to check or go for surf.

... a combined 1 in 5 respondents reported they were walking the dog; walking; tourist attraction/viewing surrounding area.

... 1 in 4 respondents reported staying at the HH Caravan Park

3. How often do you use this boardwalk?

... 1 in 6 respondents reported weekly usage

... 3 in 5 respondents reported usage during holiday periods

... 1 in 10 respondents reported infrequent usage. Similarly 1 in 10 respondents reported this was their first visit.

4. I would still visit this area if this boardwalk was removed.

... a combined 1 in 3 respondents disagreed (1 in 4); strongly disagreed (< 1 in 10) with this statement

... a combined 3 in 5 respondents agreed (1 in 2); strongly agreed (< 1 in 10) with this statement*

* Unsure if these combined 3 in 5 respondents are notionally referring to additional facilities in this area, such as parking, boat launching, picnic seating, amenities block, fishing and swimming access. As such, their response may likely reflect their purpose for being in this area. If so, it is important to note that 2 in 5 respondents specifically reported to access beach; check or go for surf.

5. The boardwalk needs to be improved.

... a combined 1 in 2 respondents agree (1 in 2); strongly agree (< 1 in 10) with this statement

... a combined 3 in 10 respondents disagree (< 1 in 3); strongly disagree (none) with this statement

6. What aspects of the boardwalk require improvement?

... a combined 1 in 2 respondents reported safety (> 1 in 3); disabled access (> 1 in 10)

... 1 in 3 respondents reported information about the local area

... 1 in 10 respondents reported a more direct route to the beach

... < 1 in 20 respondents reported beach safety information

7. It will cost \$1million (approx.) to replace and upgrade this boardwalk. How should this be funded?

... 1 in 10 respondents reported Shoalhaven City Council

... < 1 in 10 respondents reported community fundraising

... 1 in 8 respondents reported government grants

... < 1 in 6 respondents reported a bed tax (through local caravan parks)

... > 1 in 3 respondents reported a mix of community funding and public monies*

* Unsure if community funding notionally includes Council rates/property charges along with community fundraising. Or for that matter, if public monies includes Council rates/property charges along with State and Federal Government grants.