

# LAKE MACQUARIE CITY COUNCIL PARKS AND PLAY STRATEGY 2021

## PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT TOOLS



AUGUST 2021

# Otium Planning Group Pty Ltd

## Head Office:

304/91 Murphy Street  
Richmond VIC 3121  
ABN: 30 605 962 169  
Phone: (03) 9698 7300  
Email: [info@otiumplanning.com.au](mailto:info@otiumplanning.com.au)  
Web: [www.otiumplanning.com.au](http://www.otiumplanning.com.au)

## Local Office:

The Plaza, 13.03/87-95 Pitt Street  
Sydney, NSW 2000  
Contact: Martin Lambert | Director  
Mobile: 0418 151 450  
Email: [martin@otiumplanning.com.au](mailto:martin@otiumplanning.com.au)

Otium Planning Group has offices in Auckland, Brisbane, Cairns, Christchurch, Melbourne, Perth and Sydney.

OPG, IVG and PTA Partnership has offices in Hong Kong, Shenzhen, Shanghai and Beijing.

Document History				
Document Version	Date	Checked	Distribution	Recipient
1.0	12/03/2021	ML VZ	Email	DM
2.0	25/03/21	ML VZ	Email	DM
3.0	28/04/21	ML VZ	Email	DM
4.0	01/07/2021	ML VZ	Email	DM
© 2021 Otium Planning Group Pty. Ltd. This document may only be used for the purposes for which it was commissioned and in accordance with the terms of engagement for the commission.				

*Otium Planning Group acknowledges the Australian Aboriginal, Torres Strait and South Sea Islander peoples of this nation. We acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands on which our company is located and where we conduct our business. We pay our respects to ancestors and to Elders, past, present and emerging. Otium is committed to national reconciliation and respect for indigenous peoples' unique cultural and spiritual relationships to the land, waters and seas, and their rich contribution to society.*

# Contents

1.	Introduction.....	2
1.1	Purpose of this Document.....	2
1.2	What is a Park?.....	2
2.	Land Acquisition and Assessment Guidelines .....	2
2.1	Site Suitability Assessment.....	3
3.	Prioritisation Framework.....	6
3.1	Use and Purpose of a Prioritisation Framework .....	6
3.2	Defining Priorities.....	6
3.3	Assessing Priority for Parks and Play.....	7
3.3.1	Strategic Priorities .....	7
3.3.2	Priorities for Emerging Actions.....	8
4.	Parks Reinvestment Framework.....	10
4.1	A Parks Reinvestment Strategy for Lake Macquarie .....	10
4.1.1	Outline for the Parks Reinvestment Strategy.....	10
4.1.2	Objectives.....	10
4.1.3	Mechanisms to be Considered .....	10
4.1.4	Principles .....	11
4.1.5	Consolidation.....	11
4.1.6	Selection and Identification of Land for Disposal.....	12
4.1.7	Transparency and Community Engagement .....	12
5.	Maintenance Service Level Framework.....	14
5.1	Park Types and Service Levels .....	14

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of this Document

This report contains a number of tools designed to support the implementation of the Parks and Play Strategy. It provides additional Guidance for Council in the following areas:

- Guidelines for ensuring land acquired for parks is fit for purpose.
- A recommended approach to prioritising planned and emerging actions.
- A framework for reviewing existing park networks within a local catchment as part of a reinvestment strategy.
- A framework for developing maintenance service levels.

## 1.2 What is a Park?

*A Park is a parcel of community land that Council manages and maintains as parkland for the benefit of our residents and visitors. These spaces are accessible to the public to enjoy active and passive recreation, outdoor activities, nature appreciation, social gathering and physical activity. Parks are usually grassed areas embellished with trees and/or landscaping and often include facilities, such as barbeques, picnic facilities, play equipment, exercise equipment and/or special features.*

*Lake Macquarie currently has 158 parks ranging in type and size from large, major destination parks such as Speers Point Park, to smaller parks servicing local communities.*

# 2. Land Acquisition and Assessment Guidelines

As Lake Macquarie grows and population density increases in some areas, providing additional parks to meet community needs may be required. Ensuring that the land provided by developers or acquired by Council is fit for purpose is critical. Land suitable for use as a park supports a range of recreation activities, is safe to use and cost-effective to maintain and develop.

The land acquisition and assessment guidelines offer:

- Guidance on determining the suitability of land proposed for use as public park.
- Assistance with minimising the inclusion of land that is not functional (fit for recreation use) within the parks estate.

## 2.1 Site Suitability Assessment

The following table summarises the suggested performance criteria to assess a potential site for suitability as a public recreation park.

**Table 1 Site Suitability Matrix – Land for Parks**

Assessment Criterion	Assessment Factors
<b>Land must be free of Hazards and Constraints to Community Use.</b>	<p><b>Unacceptable land proposed for transfer to Council (for park) includes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land listed on a Contaminated Land Register.</li> <li>• Land identified as having significant conservation value at a regional or higher level which would constrain recreation use.</li> <li>• Land likely to be contaminated from prior uses or uncontrolled fill.</li> <li>• Land under High Voltage Power lines or within 50m of the Line easement.</li> <li>• Land constrained by other easements that would prohibit or impede public access and use.</li> <li>• Land constrained by proximity to noxious uses</li> </ul> <p><b>Where existing Council land is investigated for conversion to park:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If previously part of a contaminated site such as landfill, industrial and operational uses, then appropriate remediation of any contamination and mitigation of any risk to users is required prior to consideration.</li> </ul>
<b>Road Frontage- park perimeter</b>	<p><b>Suitable land includes parcels with:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minimum of 50% of the perimeter with frontage to a public road or a combination of road and other public space (e.g. plazas, beach and foreshore). Where a combination is proposed, the absolute minimum is 25% public road frontage.</li> <li>• For linear open space along a waterway or similar a minimum of 25% may be acceptable, providing no section of road frontage is less than 50 m.</li> </ul>
<b>Minimum Size</b>	<p><b>Local Parks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be greater than 5000m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• In high-density areas 3000m<sup>2</sup> may be accepted if 100% of the site is useable.</li> <li>• Where suitable land for a stand alone park ( e.g., for infill development) is not available, multiple-use solutions may be acceptable where a portion of other public lands (e.g., a sports area) provides a recreation node. In these cases the space for a recreation or play “node” must be larger than 2000m<sup>2</sup> and 100% of the area must be functional.</li> </ul> <p><b>District Parks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be greater than 2 Ha</li> <li>• Where district park provision is proposed in conjunction with larger reserves or open space areas (e.g., foreshores, coastal reserves, bushlands) the useable area may be a composite of a number of sites providing different opportunities. In this case, each site must be larger than 3000m<sup>2</sup> and be 100% functional and the combined area must be more than 1.6 Ha.</li> </ul> <p><b>Major Destination Parks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater than 10 Ha</li> </ul>
<b>Shape and Minimum widths</b>	<p>More regular shapes are preferred and no boundary less than:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local parks 20 m</li> <li>• District parks 30 m</li> <li>• Major Destination parks 50m</li> </ul>

Assessment Criterion	Assessment Factors
	In some cases, there may be additional linear connections and entries to proposed parks (such as laneways). For these, the land should be greater than 15 m wide unless the length of such a corridor is less than 10 m, then a 5 m minimum width may be acceptable.
<b>Slope</b>	<p><b>Local Parks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main use areas must be less than 1:20 slope (a minimum useable space of 2000m<sup>2</sup>)</li> <li>• Remainder to be no steeper than 1:6 with no more than 10% of the site exceeding 1:10</li> </ul> <p><b>District Parks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1:20 for main use area and a minimum of 50% of overall site</li> <li>• 1:50 for kick about areas and group activity areas</li> <li>• No more than 10 % of the site to be steeper than 1:6</li> </ul> <p><b>Major Destination Parks:</b> N/A</p>
<b>Useable land in linear systems</b>	<p>Where land for public parks is proposed to be provided in conjunction with a waterway corridor then:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The open space corridor from top of bank to the boundary must be greater than 20 m and be functional for recreation.</li> <li>• The corridor (to be used as park) can not solely consist of riparian forest and vegetation and must provide useable activity nodes of 2000m<sup>2</sup> or more.</li> <li>• Flood immunity provisions for parkland still apply and land must be above the 1:10 year ARI or 10% AEP.</li> <li>• Land in linear systems proposed for public park must be generally level have slopes less than 1: 15.</li> </ul>
<b>Park Efficiency and Functional Area</b>	<p><b>Local Parks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The useable/ functional area must exceed 70% of the total site area or a minimum of 5000m<sup>2</sup> whichever is greater.</li> <li>• Any parks proposed at less than 5000m<sup>2</sup> must be 100% functional.</li> </ul> <p><b>District Parks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The useable/ functional area must exceed 70% of the total site area or a minimum of 1.6 Ha whichever is greater.</li> <li>• Sites larger than 4 Ha can have an efficiency ratio at 50% provided a minimum functional /useable space greater than 1.6 Ha is provided.</li> </ul> <p><b>Major Destination Parks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These sites are all master planned with multiple spaces and areas for use</li> </ul>
<b>Safety and Design</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All location and development of public parks and community facilities should consider CPTED<sup>1</sup> principles and any design guidelines for public spaces and facilities adopted by Council.</li> </ul>
<b>Buffers and adjacent land use</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parks should consider adjacent land uses and be adequately buffered from incompatible uses. Solutions may include vegetation corridors, planted mounds and fencing.</li> <li>• Any sites adjacent to residential areas should be large enough to enable buffering of noise generating nodes (e.g. a half-courts or playground).</li> </ul>
<b>Constructed Drains and Flooding</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constructed drains, grassed trapezoids and other “built” channels for overland flow paths are not generally suitable for parkland but may be considered as part of a multiple use outcome where the overall area exceeds minimum sizes and no more than 10% of the site is impacted.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design

Assessment Criterion	Assessment Factors
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stormwater treatment devices such as WSUD structures and GPTs are not suitable for inclusion in public parks.</li> <li>• Detention and Retention Basins are not suitable for parks.</li> <li>• All Parkland should be above the ARI 5/ 18 % AEP inundation line.</li> <li>• Local and District Parks must have at least 10% of area above 2% AEP / 1:50 ARI.</li> <li>• District Parks to have a minimum of 10% above 1% AEP or 1:100 ARI.</li> </ul>

Figure 1 - Example of land that may not comply with performance criteria for slope, road frontage, flood hazards and useable space.



## 3. Prioritisation Framework

The following prioritisation framework has been developed for this Parks and Play Strategy only. It does not include public amenities which have a separate demand and priority assessment tool.

### 3.1 Use and Purpose of a Prioritisation Framework

There are three areas where a priority assessment is useful:

1. Prioritising **Planning** actions arising from this strategy (Strategic Priority)
2. Prioritising **Infrastructure** actions arising from this strategy (Infrastructure Priority)
3. Assessing **Unplanned** requests or emergent issues (Reactive Priority)

The purpose of a prioritisation framework is to:

- Assess relative importance to other actions and planned works.
- Assess the level of urgency.
- Provide an objective basis for determining priority which gives the community confidence in the allocation of expenditure in response to identified needs.
- Assist with programming and identifying pre-requisite actions.

### 3.2 Defining Priorities

Determining a priority can apply a number of approaches:

#### Relative Priority

Relative priority is usually expressed as a measure of urgency such as *High, Medium or Low (and ongoing)*. It works best with higher-level strategic action planning and allows flexibility in implementation. Often circumstances can change, and opportunities for action (such as grant funding) may arise that will see some actions implemented before others. Relative priority is helpful to sort a group of recommendations within a single strategy.

In the Parks and Play Strategy context, a relative priority has been applied to the strategic recommendations and actions as the detailed (time bound) implementation planning should be undertaken after the strategy's adoption and is subject to budget assessments.

#### Time Based Priority

Time based priority focuses on the anticipated "to do" date of the action and is commonly used in asset and infrastructure planning to indicate an approximate date for completion of the task or action (e.g., "complete by 2026"). This approach can also be used for strategic recommendations by use of more general time cohorts such as *Immediate, Short (1-2 years), Medium (3-5 years) and Long (5-10 years) term* actions. An advantage of time-bound priorities is that they enable comparison against other business areas and strategies and can be aggregated across multiple areas to create yearly plans and forward works schedules. A disadvantage is that they are often based on predictions of the future which can be volatile and therefore need review and adjustment on a regular basis.

The current Developer Contribution Plans use estimated years as a future point at which a demand threshold (as measured by population) is reached and the planned infrastructure will be required.

For the Parks and Play Strategy, the time-bound priorities already set for contribution plan actions have been included in action plans.



## Planning Triggers versus Priorities

An alternative approach that can be useful when planning social infrastructure such as recreation parks and playgrounds is identifying the trigger or threshold that requires action to be taken. In this case, actions may be linked to measures such as population growth or asset failure. Estimates of an approximate the trigger will be reached can help in forward budget planning, but the use of a trigger enables reassessment on an objective basis and allows actions to be deferred until a threshold is reached.

## 3.3 Assessing Priority for Parks and Play

The prioritisation of actions relating to this strategy requires a combination of approaches that considers:

- Legislative requirements such as timeframes adopted for provision in Contributions or Section 7.11 plans
- Safety and public risk
- Assessed community need
- Level of service compliance
- Financial resources

### 3.3.1 Strategic Priorities

For the “The Parks and Play Strategy” a relative priority approach has been recommended and a general timeframe is indicated to link this to the overall time frame of the strategy (15 years). The priorities are:

- High: critical to strategy implementation. Should be commenced within the first three years.
- Medium: important in responding to a future need. Requires pre-requisite work to be undertaken. Should be commenced within three to eight years.
- Low: an identified future need that will improve parks and playspace provision. Should be commenced within eight to 12 years.
- Ongoing: recurring actions that support implementation and continue throughout the life of the strategy

*Note that for some actions the strategy may identify thresholds or action triggers such as:*

- *Asset lifecycle completion or asset failure*
- *Population growth thresholds*
- *Development triggers such as removal of a facility or opportunity, or commencement of a new development project.*
- *External funding and partnership triggers where the action can only be completed if external funding is secured or a key partner is established or becomes ready for the action.*

## Setting Strategic Priorities

The decision guidance for applying Strategic Priorities is detailed below:

**Table 2 – Basis for Strategic Priority**

Priority	Determinants	Considerations
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Required to allow the strategy to be implemented</li><li>• Responding to areas of urgent need (e.g., a planning trigger that has already been reached)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Adoption of planning and provision frameworks</li><li>• Adoption of service standards</li><li>• Pre-requisite to allow other actions</li></ul>

Priority	Determinants	Considerations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urgently needed to avoid a lost opportunity to address future provision in a cost-effective way</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant under provision that has been identified using adopted measures</li> </ul>
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires planning and pre-requisite work to be undertaken</li> <li>Is responding to a future threshold/trigger that has not yet occurred but will occur soon</li> <li>Responds to a known issue/ need that will become urgent in less than 5 years</li> <li>Relies on a partner agency or other event to occur.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Actions that require more detailed investigation</li> <li>Actions that are designed to address a future need</li> <li>Impacts of not acting within two years are acceptable/ sustainable</li> <li>May have multiple solutions and needs lead in time to identify the best option</li> </ul>
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is an identified future need that will not emerge for more than 5 years.</li> <li>Will improve provision outcomes but is not urgently needed.</li> <li>Relies on a number of other actions to be completed that are H or M.</li> <li>Requires substantial further investigation or planning or is linked</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May be brought forward if an opportunity arises for external resourcing</li> <li>Subject to a number of uncertain projections which will become more certain over time</li> <li>May have multiple solutions and needs lead in time to identify the best option</li> </ul>
Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy and process adoption that supports the implementation of the strategy</li> <li>Recurring actions that monitor or enable strategy adjustment</li> <li>Activity that is already underway and should be continued</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May be linked to a future event which triggers an ongoing action or causes it to cease</li> <li>Usually associated with monitoring and communications actions</li> <li>May be associated with compliance functions (such as development assessment)</li> </ul>

### 3.3.2 Priorities for Emerging Actions

A prioritisation framework is recommended to be developed to assist Council in assessing proposed actions arising out of the catchment-based action plans and to assess reactive/ unplanned requests that come from within Council or the community.

A priority assessment framework should combine a relative and time-based approach and have range of measurable assessment criteria.

A priority scale of 1 (low) to 5 (urgent) has been applied. It is not designed for assessing strategic and ongoing actions - rather it is for assessing specific requests or actions related to individual sites or facilities. The use of a five point scale allows more distinction between priorities and should help to plan action across a longer timeframe.

#### Priority Scale

1. Within 10+ years
2. Within 8 years
3. Within 5 years
4. Within 2 years
5. Immediate Investigation and action as required (within 1 year)

The Priority Assessment Framework will need a number of criteria to evaluate the prioritisation of projects.

The recommended criteria are:

1. **Asset Condition** – Considers asset condition and prioritises assets near the end of useful life or pose a public risk
2. **Need** - Considers specific needs identified within the Strategy, other strategies and plans and disadvantaged groups
3. **Level of Service** – Considers the usage levels of facilities, provision gaps and classification improvements
4. **Proximity and Distribution** – Considers the distance to the nearest park or playground
5. **Financial** - Considers the financial implications of projects and whether or not projects are part of a larger capital project and have broader community and financial benefits
6. **Safety/ Risk/ Compliance** – Considers safety, risk and compliance obligations and guidelines

## 4. Parks Reinvestment Framework

### 4.1 A Parks Reinvestment Strategy for Lake Macquarie

Over time, some past decisions and agreements may accrue a legacy of land which, while nominally part of a parks network, is not really fit for purpose or is a stranded asset located away from areas of need. In some cases, transferring investment in maintenance of an existing non-functional open space area to a location of need is a better strategy.

The analysis of the current public parks network, and the development of a strategy to ensure that investment and expenditure is targeted to areas of need, is known as a Reinvestment Strategy.

*A reinvestment strategy's core principle is that savings within a particular catchment are reinvested to service park needs within that same catchment.*

#### 4.1.1 Outline for the Parks Reinvestment Strategy

##### The Need for Rationalisation

Rationalisation of the existing open space network acknowledges that in some cases, the legacy of numerous smaller planning decisions has resulted in a parks network with uneven outcomes across the city. In some areas, supply may be poor. In others, there may be an excess of sites required to provide an effective parks network. There may also be sites that are not suitable for community use and may be better suited to some other purpose.

Parks can not simply be picked up and moved to an area of need. Therefore, a rationalisation program reviews the opportunities to reallocate resources more equitably. For parks, this means that land may be reallocated to another use or even sold. The revenue and savings on maintaining land that is not required as park can be transferred to the acquisition of land and embellishment of parks in areas of need.

#### 4.1.2 Objectives

The objective for rationalising parks supply is to ensure that the resulting parks network meets current and future demand more effectively. This means:

- Parks are located appropriately to serve the needs of surrounding residents.
- Resources are not “wasted” maintaining open space that does not effectively provide park-based recreation.
- Alternative uses of some under-used or surplus parcels may return a financial saving or another benefit that can help improve supply in areas of need.
- Disposal or conversion of existing parks does not diminish the network’s ability to meet current and future needs.
- Opportunities to consolidate disparate parcels or expand existing small parcels will create more functional parks in areas of need that are more efficient to maintain.

#### 4.1.3 Mechanisms to be Considered

Overall a Reinvestment Strategy aims to achieve a more effective parks network.

This can be achieved in a number of ways:

1. Sale of surplus land and the resulting revenue is used to acquire land that is more suitable or is more appropriately located.
2. Conversion of existing land from a maintained park to naturally vegetated bushland reducing maintenance costs.
3. Conversion of existing land to an alternative municipal use which reduces maintenance costs.

4. Leasing an existing parcel to an adjacent landowner or other party for a set time which removes the maintenance burden for that period but retains the land against a future need. (this is often termed a “transitional use strategy”).
5. Transfer of maintenance resources to sites more in need of operational funding.
6. Land swaps and transfers which effectively relocate supply to more essential locations.
7. Acquisition of “critical parcels” which can expand existing undersized parks or connect small parks creating larger more effective parks.

#### 4.1.4 Principles

Deciding to dispose of public open space that does is not required or suitable for parkland, is a significant decision and can create concerns in the community. The process must be undertaken cautiously and with respect to the local community’s sense of ownership and perception of local character.

The overwhelming principle that must apply is that:

***Sale or disposal of public open space should only occur where the benefit from that disposal is tangible and contributes to an improved level of service (of parks) within the same planning area or catchment.***

#### Principles for a Reinvestment Strategy

Any reinvestment program should consider the following principles:

- Funds from sale/transfer of land must be used to improve other park provision within the same neighbourhood or planning catchment.
- Considering future demand and long term strategic outcomes is essential. Developing a strategy via the development of detailed local open space plans is strongly recommended.
- Disposal or permanent reassignment of land should not be undertaken lightly. It is important that the likely path of future development in the area is considered at both medium and long term planning horizons. If a parcel meets performance criteria associated with a park or can provide space for sporting use, then there would need to be substantial certainty that it will not be required to service future residential growth.
- Consider transitional use strategies as an alternative to disposal. If there is no current demand for a parcel of land, but there is some likelihood of it being required in the future, then an interim (transitional) use may be appropriate. The alternative use should return a benefit in financial terms or at the least remove a maintenance burden. However, interim use strategies should only be considered where the land meets the performance criteria for parks- in other words, where it has obvious potential as a park serving a future need.
- Funds from the sale of a parcel of land may be used to embellish/ develop sub-optimal parcels allowing them to provide outdoor recreation opportunity. The income from the sale should deliver a greater benefit than that lost by disposing of the land.
- Disposal of several small non-functional or surplus parcels can be considered as a means of funding the acquisition of a single larger parcel of higher quality/ more suitable land for park.

#### 4.1.5 Consolidation

Detailed planning at local or catchment levels may identify parcels of land which on their own have limited capacity but are well located to serve local or district park needs. When located in areas of undersupply or likely future undersupply then these parcels may be suitable for enhancement through strategic acquisition of adjacent land to expand their capacity or improve their functionality.

Consolidation occurs when other open space in the same planning area is disposed of to facilitate this.

A consolidation strategy aims to:

***Reconfigure the parks network so that numerous individual parcels of limited value are replaced with fewer (but larger) parcels of greater potential and offering increased outdoor recreation opportunity, improved efficiencies in maintenance and improved quality of public open space.***

## 4.1.6 Selection and Identification of Land for Disposal

Parcels suitable for possible divestment should:

- Fail the Site Suitability test as detailed in 2.1.
- Include sites that are dislocated from the surrounding community and have no history of use.
- Be Council owned as opposed to Crown Reserves .
- Be of minimal importance to overall supply of park or sporting land in terms of quantity, quality and distribution e.g., located in an area of high supply, an area with numerous small used parcels, or an area with more appropriate alternative parcels to meet local needs.
- Have minimal potential for improvement by the acquisition of adjoining parcels or consolidation e.g. small in size/at a distance from other parcels, isolated from easy access.
- Have limited potential for improvement through development.
- Be able to generate some market interest and achieve a sale that returns a profit over the costs of sale and disposal.
- Have potential for alternative uses (or zoning changes) which does not conflict with the planning scheme nor generate undue impact on adjacent land uses.
- Be subject to legislative processes and community consultation in regard to the Local Government Act.

## 4.1.7 Transparency and Community Engagement

Reinvestment strategies can be sensitive projects and it is important that transparency of the process is maintained.

*A comprehensive community engagement strategy is required from the start. The disposal of land perceived as a community asset is a sensitive issue and can easily be inflamed by lack of information. The principal message that the objective is improvement of public open space in the local area must be communicated before any proposals are canvassed.*

It is clear that once the initial planning has been undertaken, then a detailed community engagement program must be developed as part of the implementation program. This program should be built around the preparation of a detailed local open space strategy to improve park provision, as opposed to just a general cost-saving measure to dispose of assets.

Key elements of the Community Engagement Program should be to:

- Anchor the program around the overall objective of improving the level of service in regard to parks and the protection and enhancement of natural systems such as waterways and local habitats.
- Provide transparency in how the plans will be implemented, particularly how Council will guarantee that all funds from rationalisation in a particular area will be used to benefit that area.
- Provide a genuine set of opportunities for the local community to consider proposals and be involved in the refinement of those proposals as well as opportunities to suggest alternatives.
- Ensure continual reference to clear criteria used in assessing sites and visible linkage to the overriding principle of a net benefit to the local community.

Sensitivity is required around locations where possible negotiations may have commercial implications. Early disclosure of an intent by Council to acquire a parcel of land may cause inflation of the purchase price or alternatively may generate a pre-emptive acquisition by another party.

***Therefore it is recommended that engagement processes focus more on the development of draft plans and strategic intent, with the objective to develop a “trusted” process that is implemented.***

## 5. Maintenance Service Level Framework

The following framework is designed to allow the development of service standards for maintenance based on the proposed hierarchy of parks for recreation. It is focused only on those formally developed recreation parks or areas of other open space that have been developed for community recreation use.

The framework does not cover:

- Natural Areas and Bushlands
- Formal Sporting Fields and Precincts
- Buffers, verges, waterways and other linear open space areas

### 5.1 Park Types and Service Levels

While the service level is generally associated with the park's hierarchy, there are circumstances where higher use profiles or increased visibility of a park may mitigate for a higher level of service.

For larger multi-site and multiple-use parks (e.g. Rathmines) service levels may be applied to individual locations or recreation nodes with the park rather than the overall park. Depending on the circumstances this allows for different levels of service within the same park.

The general levels of service for maintenance are:

- A. Major Destination Parks
- B. District parks
- C. Local parks

Within these three main service levels, some variation may occur to accommodate those parks that are highly popular or very visible and require an enhanced maintenance regime. In some cases a park may have the level of use and profile that would require it's maintenance to be at a higher level (e.g. a District Park requiring an A level of service). Similarly, a park may be have lower use periods or only be popular in the summer, in this case the lower end of the set service level may apply for certain periods in the year.

This Draft Service Level Framework is a recommendation of the Parks and Play Strategy and it will still need to be finalised with staff and adopted into forward budget and operational planning. This means that it may take some years for all parks to be transferred to the new service level framework.



**Table 3 - Draft Maintenance Service Level Framework**

Service Level	Inspection Frequency by Council Staff	Security	Mowing	Other vegetation	Waste Collection	Playground inspection	BBQ Cleaning	Public Amenities	Lights and irrigation	Building Maintenance
<b>A</b>	Daily to Weekly	External Security - daily Speers Point Park only Council Rangers twice a week Inclusion on regular police patrols	Weekly to Fortnightly (summer) Fortnightly to every three weeks (winter)	Major work undertaken in Winter As needed during summer months	Daily in peak use periods during summer As required in conjunction with organised special events Daily to every few days in winter	Visual Check as part of site inspections Quarterly formal play equipment inspection	Two to three times a week	Daily or twice daily as needed in peak periods.  As required in conjunction with organised special events	On demand maintenance Annual Inspections	Formal Annual inspections Incidental inspections Identified Maintenance programs
<b>B</b>	Weekly to Fortnightly	Council Rangers weekly to fortnightly or higher in peak use periods Inclusion on regular police patrols	Fortnightly to Monthly (Summer) Every three to six weeks (winter)	Major work undertaken in Winter As needed during summer months	2-3 times a week during peak use times summer (eg weekends, school holidays) As required in conjunction with organised special events Every few days to weekly in winter	Visual Check as part of site inspections Quarterly formal play equipment inspection	Twice a week to weekly	4-7 times per week as needed for level of site use.  As required in conjunction with organised special events	On demand maintenance Annual inspections	Formal Annual Inspections Incidental inspections Identified Maintenance programs
<b>C</b>	Monthly	On Demand	Monthly to every eight weeks or as needed	As needed	Weekly to fortnightly dependant on park use	Visual Check as part of site inspections Quarterly formal play equipment inspection	Weekly	2-5 times per week or daily as needed for peak periods.	On Demand Annual inspections	Formal Annual Inspections Incidental inspections Identified Maintenance programs