

HORNSBY SHIRE COUNCIL
OLD MANS VALLEY DELIBERATIVE FORUM
VALIDATED CRITERIA

SOCIAL

1. **Lowest impact on amenity of neighbours:**
- **Noise**
 - **Traffic**
 - **Security**

Weighting: L

Comments:

- Unavoidable re noise and traffic
- Mitigate as best as possible
- Acceptable
- SOCIAL: Make more specific and measurable e.g. NOISE db measurement of trucks and sport fields. SAFETY – road siting, any pathways that cross it. SECURITY/access after hours.
- Provide soon-as-possible access where possible.
- ENVIRONMENTAL: add traffic impact assessment.
- Determine acceptable noise standards for the long-term continuing use.

Scoring:

Option 1	7	7	5	4	5	5
Option 2	10	10	10	10	10	10

Reasons:

- Option 1 - Will generate more noise.
- Number of people attending sports.
- Option 2 less traffic.
- Both options have noise generally oval closest to neighbours.
- Both generate noise.
- Option 1 will have higher peaks.
- More sport more noise.
- Option 1 has lighting – big impact on neighbours.
- More noise at sporting events.

2. **Greatest contribution to health, education and cultural cohesion of local community.**

Weighting: H

Comments:

- Opportunity to create a sense of community.
- Active and passive uses.
- Picnic areas for families.

- Community vegetable garden.
- Creating a sense of community
- Community gardens/bush gardens
 - Involve people
 - Reduce costs to ratepayers
 - Creates opportunities for wildlife
- Add education, aboriginal and European heritage, growing and preparing food and social interaction.
- Equitable – free access for all.
- Provision for NESB, unit dwellers, kids.

Scoring:

Option 1	7	10	3	7	7	5
Option 2	10	9	10	10	10	10

Reasons:

- Option 2 – provides a focal point for cultural activities (Lake and BBQ units).
- Option 2 – has better range of use.
- Option 1 – good for health due to sport but limits opportunities for other activity.
- Both do not appear to include provision for bikes and walking tracks.
- Option 2 – more diverse focus, wider appeal.
- Option 1 – more “single minded”.
- Option 1 addresses one sector of community more – active sports.
- Option 2 addresses more sectors.
- More diversity of activity.
- Very close. Hard to agree.

3. Maximises range and mix of activities to meet likely community needs:

Weighting: H

Comments:

- Inclusive of all age groups – not just focussed on children who play organised sport.
- NEW – Balance between passive and unstructured recreation.
- A wide range of uses is very important.
- Parkland/areas for quiet contemplation that expands natural bushland/wildlife and gives people exposure to natural beauty.
- A good mix of activities.
- Requires a more specific definition of needs through needs analysis including audit of existing facilities and broad (including gardens, dog walking, bike riding paths, special needs).
- TECHNICAL: Multi-use could minimise environmental damage, minimise earth works and drainage. Sports fields can be expensive to maintain in good condition.
- Must continue into future (social).
- A range of sports and other activities inch for ethnic groups.
- Ensure multi-use – flexibility.
- Flexible/multi-use is the key to higher usage including by ethnic groups.

- The high-rise community (at present) more likely to benefit from passive use.
- Activities that encourage wide range of community to access and gain benefit.
- Multi-use site:
 - Encourages multicultural use
 - Inclusive of all ages
 - Passive and active use
 - Becomes a meeting place rather than an exclusion zone
 - All week use, not weekend focus.

Scoring:

Option 1	7	8	2	6	5	2
Option 2	10	10	10	10	10	10

Reasons:

- Option 1 – focussed on organised sport. Little provision for wider range of needs.
- Smaller sports and max range of outdoor options but indoor sport could be included at the expenses of passive space.
- Encourages wider age mix in activities.
- Option 2 has more diversity.
- Not focussed on apparent sporting activities.

4. Provides the most attractive destination for users:

Weighting: L

Comments:

- Aesthetics
- Accessibility
- Sufficient appropriate facilities
- Mix of natural beauty/sporting activity
- Incorporating natural beauty
- Encourages fauna

Scoring:

Option 1	10	5	3	2	5	7
Option 2	9	10	10	10	10	10

Reasons:

- Option 1 – range of activities in bushland setting.
- Really depends on final design – potential for wider range of passive recreation opportunities.
- If attractive means absolute number of people Option 1 otherwise Option 2.
- Diverse, aesthetically pleasing re Option 2 – a community destination for enjoyment.
- Sports fields are functional and boring.

5. Sensitive to heritage issues/values of the area and culture:

Weighting: L

Comments:

- Provides open area for cultural events and activities.
- Culture
- Sculpture garden
- Concert venue.

Scoring:

Option 1	5	10	8	9	9	10
Option 2	10	10	10	10	10	10

Reasons:

- Equal.
- Little information to suggest if either addresses these criteria – COULD BE BAD OR GOOD.
- Neither option does much for this.
- Marginal difference. Heritage sites retained under both.
- No difference?

ENVIRONMENTAL

6. Best addresses Environmental Issues

- Minimise weeds
- Restores bushland
- Addresses water quality
- Minimises impact on wildlife:

Weighting: M

Comments:

- High importance
- Minimise infrastructure
- Complements all activities
- Minimise noise and off leash affects on adjoining bush
- Considers impact on wildlife already in Old Mans Quarry, particularly lighting in evenings
- Reduces down stream water induced degradation on bush land areas.

Scoring:

Option 1	2	10	5	7	2	7
Option 2	10	10	10	10	10	10

Reasons:

- Option 2 – more opportunity for wildlife corridors/habitat maintenance.
- Both have significant disturbance to site.
- Option 2 allows use of planting to re-establish the ecology of the site.
- Option 2 – can integrate water feature/treatment.
- Option 1 – no nearby remediation of pollution etc.
- Nutrient run-off from playing fields in Option 1.
- Option 2 is more compatible with the local environment.
- Option 1 will require more earthmoving and retaining walls – less room for native flora regeneration.
- Mo apparent difference.
- Synthetic grass or recycled/treated water.

7. Most complementary to site topographic, bushland and visual character and minimises carbon footprint:

Weighting: H

Comments:

- Utilise existing difference in land levels as much as feasible
- Minimise adding to/taking away from filled areas
- Sensitive future plantings:
 - Provide a range of fauna options
 - Locally native close to current bushland
 - Avoid noxious weeds
- Minimise acoustic impact
- Ensure space is sufficient
- Safeguards is set aside for?
- Incorporates the unique features of the site
- Botanical gardens
- Park lands
- Community gardens
- Native bush tucker plants:
 - Less maintenance
 - Encourages native animals
 - Educates the community on and about the traditional owners
- Take advantage of natural contours
- Wildlife corridors
- Plant bush tucker trees and plants
- Maintain native trees and plants – less cost to maintain
- Fire retardant trees on boundaries
- Acknowledge traditional owners/native plants

Scoring:

Option 1	5	7.5	4	5	3	2
Option 2	10	10	10	10	10	10

Reasons:

- Earthworks.
- More congestion for Option 1.
- Less bush redevelopment for Option 1.
- Option 2 provides an opportunity to link back to past heritage values of the site.
- Less earthworks/maintenance and closer to existing contours.
- Option 1 is not very flexible and is flatter.

TECHNICAL

8. Best facilitates staged development:

Weighting: L

Comments:

- Develop passive areas first
- Start on passive recreational use
- Fill the quarry
- Construct sports fields (plural)
- Ease/speed which option can be delivered

Scoring:

Option 1	5	8	8	4	7	5
Option 2	10	10	10	10	10	10

Reasons:

- Option 1 – works need to be done at the same time to create 2 level playing fields.
- Less work to start up of picnic area.
- Significant work on either option.
- Option 2 does not need re-levelling.
- Option 1 will require more substantial earthworks.

9. Best caters for the access, parking, pedestrian and cycle and other needs of visitors:

Weighting: M

Comments:

- Green space important
- Track access (to existing)
- Pathways that allow a wide range of ages and abilities to access the area
- Well designed disabled access
- Need to feel safe when using walking and cycling access and trails
- The access itself should be a recreation experience

- Very important
- Consider types of track – flat vs BMX
- Need comprehensive traffic plan
- Multiple pedestrian access
- Provide disincentive for parking by non-recreational users
- Link to Westleigh bush
- Convenience is a key part of attractiveness
- Bicycle and walking access – provision for and maintenance of – ENSURE there is a link e.g. Clarinda (NW of quarry) to near the pool
- Elderly access
- Disabled access
- Multiple access for fire equipment and evacuation

Scoring:

Option 1	6	10	2	9	3	7
Option 2	10	10	10	10	10	10

Reasons:

- Option 2 – more uniform usage and can cover usage.
- Option 1 – Bad fit between used and parking/access requirements.
- Parking needs in Option 1 are a lot higher and high peaks at changeover times.
- Option 2 is
 - More flexible
 - More generic.
- equal.

10: Lowest fire risk on facility and surrounding area:

Weighting: L

Comments:

- Make sure there is a second access point.
- Little thought given to parking and spectators.

Scoring:

Option 1	10	7	10	8	10	7
Option 2	7	10	8	10	5	10

Reasons:

- Option 2 – lake.
- More grass/less bush so less chance for fire to spread.
- Less to burn in Option 1.
- Option 1 is a huge firebreak and much more flat.
- Both options need to facilitate safe exit. Option 2 likely to result in patronage over extended periods. Option 1 – larger crowds – restricted period.

FINANCIAL

11. Minimise financial impact on ratepayers - equity:

Weighting: L

Comments:

- Commercial opn of facility (income)/exclude public?
- Ensure equity of access by lower income families.
- Maximises opportunity to apply development S94 Fund \$
- Need to analyse cost vs expected usage
- Develop appropriate models for user-pays
- Build passive (low cost) facilities first
- Build \$-generating facilities first , wrt promoting self-sufficiency of site (e.g. café and produce garden)

Scoring:

Option 1	6	10	5	5	5	7
Option 2	10	7	10	10	10	10

Reasons:

- Less work less cost.
- Option 2 doesn't include indoor facility; and less earthworks; less retaining barriers; more maintenance.
- Option 2 has less maintenance costs.
- Option 1 requires maintenance of 2 ovals.
- No 2 involves more earthworks.
- No 2 has cheap walking trails.

12. Optimises construction & maintenance costs:

Weighting: L

Comments:

- Consider garden and oval water needs and costs
- Capture potential voluntary participation by the community.

Scoring:

Option 1	6	8	5	5	7	10
Option 2	10	10	10	10	10	10

Reasons:

- As above.
- Option 1 – higher maintenance costs.

- Option 2 costs less to build and maintain.
- More costs in maintaining 2 ovals.

13. Investment optimises level of use:

Weighting: M

Comments:

- Minimal cost vs maximum benefit
- Balance high cost oval maintenance vs walking tracks

Scoring:

Option 1	7	10	5	9	10	9
Option 2	10	8	10	10	9	10

Reasons:

- Would provide a great space for the hundreds that use Willow Park (nowhere else to go!!).
- Option 2 requires less earthworks etc to achieve its aims.
- Level of use could be # of people x intensity or diversity.
- More diversity of Option 2 – more use.

14. Best fit with local projects and Hornsby’s Strategic Planning:

Weighting: L

Scoring:

Option 1	9	10	5	8	7	3
Option 2	10	10	10	10	10	10

Reasons:

- This criteria does not seem to fit with the discussion which was about overall development/strategic planning.
- Option 2 caters to more diversity of community needs.
- Need to promote active and healthy lifestyles – No 2 is better.