



REDEVELOPMENT OF THE BUKIT FREEHOLD LAND

Our plan to redevelop the Bukit Freehold Land (BFL) has now reached an important milestone. Three options were put up for members' feedback at the dialogue in September 2018. Taking their inputs into account, together with feedback from numerous other sessions, the Planning & Redevelopment Committee 2 (PRC2) has worked with the respective architects to refine the three designs whilst maintaining as best as possible their original design concepts.

First, to recap the reasons for the redevelopment and what has been done so far. We embarked on this important project mainly because we will lose the existing Bukit Main Clubhouse by end 2021 when it is handed over to the Labour Movement. We need a new clubhouse to cater to the needs of SICC golfers playing at the Bukit location as we expect the lease on the Bukit Course to be extended to 2030.

But there is more to building this new clubhouse than just providing for our golfing needs. The SICC is unique among Singapore clubs in having two outstanding locations and we intend to continue capitalising on this. With a new clubhouse at Bukit, we will enhance the value of our membership, providing members with greater F&B and recreational options beyond that at Island. It will also ensure our facilities at Island do not become overcrowded.

A new clubhouse will also enable us to introduce more efficient and environmentally-friendly operations to replace the existing ageing facilities.

Where are we now with these plans?

The three design options were presented to members at a dialogue on 17 September 2018. Taking into account their feedback, and at the Annual General Meeting on 28 September 2018, the PRC2 and the architects involved discussed and reviewed the designs. Important changes were made, as outlined below.

Option 1 – “5 Acre Woods” design by Park + Associates **Estimated cost: \$59.97m**

This option involves the complete demolition of the existing facilities on the BFL, and building a new clubhouse in its place.

But there is one important development with significant impact on this option.

After reviewing the original design with the architect and the Club-appointed QS, it was found that the \$59.3m budget presented at the April 2017 EGM was no longer realistic. The QS assessed the cost to be in the region of \$72m instead. The main reasons for the difference was that the original cost of \$59.3m did not include required works such as

sewerage diversion, new consumer switch room (to serve the new facilities), and the power and telecommunications pipeline extension from Adam Road. Escalation costs and contingencies sum were also not factored in the original costing.

In view of the \$60m cap stipulated by the Club, the PRC2 team worked with the architect and QS to value engineer the design, and spent a considerable amount of time from April to August 2018 to finally bring the cost down to \$59.97m. This table shows the changes made to bring down the cost from \$72m to \$59.97m.

S/No.	Item
1	The original subterranean tennis courts were raised closer to road level to reduce cost of excavation works
2	Reallocation of buggy staging area from Level 1 to Level 2 to save on excavation, structure and softscape area
3	Reduction of carpark lots from 300 to 200
4	Reduction of facilities floor space
5	Original six tennis courts (three indoor and three open) were reduced to four tennis courts (two covered and two open)
6	Reduction of circulation areas such as walkway and corridors

Option 2 – “Our Family Forest” design by DP Architects **Estimated cost: \$54.35m**

This option involves the demolition of the Bukit Swimming Pool and part of the Tennis & Squash Complex, retaining the three existing covered and two open tennis courts. It is a less extensive construction project compared with Option 1, and enables us to keep some tennis facilities open for use during the construction period, with the option to expand capacity if needed.

Members who gave feedback on this option asked for more facilities e.g. function rooms, mahjong rooms, multi-purpose halls, a conference room, a roof garden, new common spaces e.g. rooftop lounge area, outdoor dining in the landscape pool and a kids' pool in the forest.

It was also suggested that the new building façade be built with in-grained concrete panels, providing an earthy tone and evoking a natural expression for the club entrance. With these modifications, the cost is revised from the original \$50.73m to \$54.35m.

Option 3 – “Town Club in the Forest” design by Eco-ID Architects
Estimated cost: \$43.38m

This design incorporates the heritage wing (Bukit Swimming Pool Complex) and the Tennis & Squash Complex, and introduces a distinctive new clubhouse with all prime facilities facing the nature reserve. The design is a seamless blending of the new and existing facilities and gains the most usable area for facilities at the lowest cost. It includes major remodelling to the arrival lobby, façade, relocation/expansion of the changing rooms and F&B facilities.

The design provides for expansion in the future if the needs arises.

Instead of a two-phase construction that was originally presented, members’ feedback was for a single phase project to minimise disruption to club operations. The cost is revised to \$43.38m.

A summary of the key features of these three options as compared to existing facilities is in **Annex A**.

THE PRC2’S RECOMMENDATIONS

Having made the changes to the three designs, the PRC2 discussed whether it was best to put them up for members to choose or to make their preference known to members before they vote for their choice.

The PRC2, now having an intimate knowledge of the three options, feels that it will be in the membership’s best interests if it articulates its preferred choice and the rationale for it.

It should be stressed that, though the PRC2 is sharing its own preference to members, ultimately, it is still up to the membership to decide and to vote on it.

What is the PRC2’s Recommendation?

The PRC2 does not recommend Option 3 because it was originally a two-phased project where the first phase involved the retrofitting of the existing Swimming Pool Complex and creation of a new entrance lobby. This “do minimum” phase would cost about \$29m. The optional second phase, estimated at \$14m, involves adding on a new resort-like family water centre overlaying the car park near the nature reserve. The total sum for the two phases of construction and contingencies for unforeseen works (inherent in an A&A project) is close to Option 2’s budget, thereby making Option 3 unattractive. Many members also expressed objections to having to bear with two rounds of disruptions to the usage of facilities if the project is done in two phases.

More details of the disadvantages of this option are in **Annex B**.

From a design perspective, the PRC2 considers both Options 1 and 2 to be aesthetically pleasing, befitting a Club of our stature. The PRC2’s preference is dictated principally by practical considerations.

Option 1 (“5 Acre Woods”) “pod design” is unique but it will also be more complex to build and maintain. The different ‘pods’ for different activities is an attractive design but it also means less flexibility should we need to reconfigure them in future. Moving from one pod to another through the exposed walkways during inclement weather, especially at Level 2, might also not be as convenient for members.

Most significantly, the PRC2 is concerned with the cost of this option. The present estimate of \$59.97m is very close to the budget cap of \$60m, leaving little room for changes.

Option 2 (“Our Family Forest”) is a more regular geometric design, making it easier to construct and maintain. The design is simple, with inter-connected courtyards offering a family centric environment. The estimated cost of \$54.35m gives us some latitude to take on board improvements and further members’ feedback in the course of the construction.

The PRC2 is of the opinion that there are more merits in Option 2 than in Option 1, taking all the various factors into consideration.

Annex C provides more details of the PRC2’s assessment of Options 1 and 2.

THE GENERAL COMMITTEE’S (GC) RECOMMENDATION

The GC has deliberated over the PRC2’s recommendation.

The GC is unanimous in its view that it should also state its view openly for members’ consideration. It concurs with the PRC2, that Option 2 has greater merits than Option 1.

The GC acknowledges the PRC2’s efforts in scrutinising details of the project and hearing from the feedback offered by members. The GC wholeheartedly supports the recommendation by the PRC2.

It is imperative to note however, that the choice ultimately rests with the membership through a voting process at an EGM.

Members will have more opportunities to make suggestions and to comment on the issue. Please email your feedback to **bfl@sicc.org.sg**. Alternatively, you may also check the SICC website regularly for updates to the FAQs.

We will update members on how and when we will be conducting voting for members to choose between the three options.

Annex A - Comparison of Existing and Proposed Key Facilities

FACILITIES		EXISTING	OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3
		BUKIT LEASEHOLD & FREEHOLD BUILDINGS	"5 ACRE WOODS" BY PARK + ASSOCIATES	"OUR FAMILY FOREST" BY DP ARCHITECTS	"TOWN CLUB IN THE FOREST" BY ECO-ID ARCHITECTS
SPORTS	Pro Shop (m ²)	190	195	NA	NA
	Golf Office (m ²)	129	143	50	NA
	Buggy Lots (nos.)	188	120	86	72
	Tennis Courts (nos.)	3 Covered 4 Open 1 Practice	2 Covered 2 Open	3 Covered 2 Open	3 Covered 4 Open 1 Practice
	Squash Courts (nos.)	3 Singles 1 Doubles	3 Singles 1 Doubles	3 Singles 1 Doubles	3 Singles 1 Doubles
	Swimming Pools (m ²)	1,080	840	1,000	1,315
LIFESTYLE	Gym (m ²)	423	368	370	600
	Aerobics Room (m ²)	118	81	80	118
	Reception / Lobby (m ²)	136	316	400	380
	I-Lounge / Reading Room (m ²)	155	200	NA	Integrated in the Co-working space
	AV Entertainment / Theatrette (m ²)	241	236	240	241
	Gaming Centre / Jackpot Room (m ²)	124	200	120	205 (incl. mahjong)
	Children's Playroom / Area (m ²)	NA	NA	150	Co-Program at Function Room
	Co-working Space (m ²)	NA	NA	200 (3 meeting rooms)	184
F&B	All Day Dining (m ²)	948	873 (200 seater)	850 (300 seater)	742 (240 seater)
	Poolside Café (m ²)	338	Included in All Day Dining	Included in All Day Dining	NA
	Chinese Restaurant (m ²)	372	560 (230 seater) 5 Private Rooms	550 (220 seater) 10 Private Rooms	672 (250 seater) 8 Private Rooms
	Club Bar (m ²)	70	197 (64 seater)	120 (50 seater)	250 (100 seater)
	Japanese Restaurant (m ²)	331 (60 seater)	132 (40 seater)	NA	NA
	Multi-Function Room (m ²)	213	Included in Chinese Restaurant	600 (300 seater) *Divisible by 3	605
AMENITIES	Board Room/Meeting Room (m ²)	118	117	60	60
	Central Changing Rooms/ Lockers (m ²)	1,333	762	548	880
	Carpark Lots (nos.)	425	200	175	155



Annex B – Disadvantages of Option 3

Option 3 – “Town Club in The Forest” is not recommended because of the following:

1	Contains many unforeseeable elements and future costs risks. Additional works to existing structures may need costly structural strengthening hence escalating project cost.	6	Design is constrained by existing structures and programme space.
2	When the unforeseeable are “discovered” and changes (additional variations) are made, the project will inevitably be delayed and there will be claims from the contractor for prolongation costs.	7	Since existing structures will be kept, the spatial experience in terms of head room largely remains unchanged.
3	At the end of the day, the costs may be the same as total demolition and re-build or even higher, because of uneconomic working conditions (not so efficient) in the A&A construction process.	8	Tennis & Squash facilities kept open during construction period will not offer comfortable or conducive environment for members to enjoy their games due to dust and noise, apart from not having proper support facilities such as F&B and car parks.
4	The existing old building is designed based on the old structural design codes and will likely need to be strengthened.	This option is not cost effective as the current estimate of \$43.38m, if done in a single phase, offers facilities markedly inferior to Options 1 and 2 with minimal savings in costs. If done in two phases as earlier suggested, a significant expense of about 30% of Phase 1 (estimated at \$25.15m) amounting to approximately \$7.5m will be wasted as it will have to be redone during the Phase 2 construction.	
5	Maintenance cost will be higher if retained structures start to give problem earlier than the new structures.		

Annex C - Comparison of Options 1 and 2

CRITERIA	OPTION 1 – “5 ACRE WOODS” BY PARK + ASSOCIATES	OPTION 2 – “OUR FAMILY FOREST” BY DP ARCHITECTS
Buildability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While aesthetically pleasing, more complex to build. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A more regular geometric form which is relatively easy to build.
Accessibility (efficiency of site planning)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well-defined entry and drop-off, clear way finding to carpark. Good accessibility to golf course. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well defined entry and drop-off, clear way finding to carpark. Good accessibility to golf course.
Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance cost will be higher due to irregular structure. Off-form concrete finished exterior save recurring re-painting cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easier to maintain due to its rectangular form and smaller footprint.
Connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pod design provides clear demarcation for various Club activities. Exposed walkways linking pods may be susceptible to inclement weather particularly at the second level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offers a cohesive family centric environment. Exposed walkways linking facilities may be susceptible to inclement weather.
Spatial Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interesting inter-play of spatial volumes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conventional design with inter-connected courtyards.
Design Appeal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Iconic and dynamic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beauty in simplicity.
Flexibility for Future Expansion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pod design is more dynamic and exciting but its rigid and definitive form offers less flexibility for expansion and reconfiguration for future needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The regular layout and spaces allows flexibility for change.
Facilities (significant differences)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two covered and two open new tennis courts. Chinese restaurant doubles up as function room. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing three covered and two open tennis courts. Dedicated function room. Slightly less car parking lots.
Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The \$60m budget is maximised and leaves little room for additional variation orders or changes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimated cost is \$54.35m. Allows for greater flexibility for changes or improvements during design development.