

23 June 2016

Private & Confidential

Mr Richard Hill
Coordinator
Property Projects and Development
Property Management, Corporate Services
Sunshine Coast Regional Council

Via Email: richard.hill@sunshinecoast.qld.gov.au

Dear Richard

Re: Maleny Golf Course

Further to your email and our phone conversations, this letter outlines our thoughts regarding a design issue for the proposed additional nine holes at the Maleny Golf Club ("the Club"), located on the Sunshine Coast in Queensland.

The issue you have asked for advice on is whether a constrained area on one hole with the proposed additional nine holes would be acceptable and whether it is detrimental to the overall viability of the course

Council provided GBAS with three images (attached to this letter), being:

- The Golf Concept Plan ("the Plan") including the last nine holes as designed by Graham Papworth.
- A precinct map ("the Map") outlining the area of the first nine holes, the proposed additional
 nine holes, the area of wetlands within the site and the location of the adjoining land to be
 used for other sport and recreation purposes ("the Sport & Recreation land").
- A zoomed version of the Map identifying the particular area of concern, this being a constrained area of the fairway that is between the wetlands area and the Sport and Recreation land.

GBAS is advised that the area of fairway of concern, taking into account the constraints provided by the Sport and Recreation land to the west and the wetlands area to the east is 15 metres wide (including 5m of path). GBAS is advised that both boundaries are unmoveable, one being the property boundary of the leased golf club land and the other being a wetland area that is to be protected.

At this constrained width, this fairway would be more than 50% less than the guideline historically used for the design of safe fairways. The guideline used is a minimum of least 40 metres from fairway centreline to fairway centreline. In modern times this guideline is often being further extended to 60 metres, making the proposed width some 75% less than widths deemed appropriate.

Further exacerbating the issue is that the hole is designed as Par 5 with the constrained width being at the likely landing point for second shots, these shots typically being hit with longer clubs as golfers try to reach the green. Were the area to be an area that golfers were potentially hitting from (eg a

Golf Business Advisory Services PO Box 274 Sandringham Victoria 3191 Australia www.golfbas.com



teeing ground), as opposed to hitting through, the narrowness of the area could potentially be accommodated as the golfer is playing out into a wider space.

If the boundaries are presently drawn are unable to be moved, presenting a much wider playing area, this hole should be not constructed as designed and an alternative design solution should be sought.

Given this safety issue, whether it is detrimental or not to the overall viability of the course becomes a secondary consideration. That said, for a club with this positioning, that being a regional, community focused golf course offering very affordable green fees, a design compromise or compromises are almost inevitable. The playability and length of one specific hole will rarely be the sole driver of viability.

In this case, where an alternative design to be created that saw golfers pass through the constrained part of the land (perhaps walking past the wetlands instead of playing through it) then it is my opinion that the golf experience would be equally as good and would not impact overall viability.

We trust this letter is sufficient for your purposes. Please contact the writer should you require any further information.

Yours sincerely,

Jeff Blunden Managing Director

Attachments:

The Golf Concept Plan Precinct map Zoomed version of Precinct Map

APPENDIX 4 - Counter Clockwise Course Configuration





