

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

1. SOCIAL WELLBEING

1.1 TO WHAT EXTENT WILL THIS FACILITY/PROGRAM PROPOSAL ENHANCE THE COMMUNITY?

Social wellbeing is a very broad term. Generally it is defined as the degree to which a population's health, education, income, leisure and economic needs and wants are being met. Data gathered during Stage One should guide the assessment.

Rating guidelines

- 1 – Has negative effect on social wellbeing.
- 2 – Has little to no positive influence on social wellbeing
- 3 – Somewhat enhances social wellbeing
- 4 – Has a significant contribution to social wellbeing.

1.2 TO WHAT EXTENT WILL THIS FACILITY PROGRAM ADD TO THE SENSE OF COMMUNITY?

Sense of community can be defined as the degree to which people feel part of a wider social network. Indicators may include participation and volunteer rates, facility usage, number of people within an individual's network, feelings of safety and security and levels of trust. Surveys and consultative activities can assist determine these factors.

Rating Guidelines

- 1 – Has a negative affect (i.e. divides the community) on sense of community.
- 2 - Has little to no positive influence on sense of community
- 3 – Somewhat enhances sense of community
- 4 – Has a significant contribution to sense of community

1.2 TO WHAT EXTENT WILL THIS FACILITY PROGRAM BRING DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE COMMUNITY TOGETHER

Facilities can act as important meeting points for different parts of the community. Indicators may include the likelihood that the facility will be used by a cross section of the catchment population.

Rating guideline.

- 1 – Is only likely to be used by a very small section of the community
- 2 – Use is limited to a select number of groups and individuals
- 3 – Will be utilized by a reasonably wide section of the community

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

4 - Will be a vibrant community meeting place catering to all sections of the community.

1.3 TO WHAT EXTENT WILL THIS FACILITY/PROGRAM CATER FOR ALL AGES?

Facilities that cater to a wide range of age groups are more sustainable as they: 1) enhance the catchment potential and 2) promote social interaction. In assessing this criterion, consideration should be given to the catchment age and profile and the nature of the facility (e.g. senior centre, skate parks are designed for specific age groups)

Rating guidelines

1 – Is only likely to be used by one age cohort (young children, teenagers, young adults, families, seniors)

2 – Use is limited to two age groups

3 – Will be utilized by at least 3 different age groups.

4 – Will be patronized by all age cohorts

1.5 TO WHAT EXTENT WILL THIS FACILITY/PROGRAM CATER FOR BOTH GENDERS?

Facilities that cater for both genders are more socially and financially sustainable. While acknowledged that some facilities/programs will have an inherent bias, efforts should be made to promote use by both men and woman.

Rating guidelines

1 – Will be used 100% by one gender

2 – Will be somewhat inclusive of both genders

3 - Will be predominately used by both genders

4- Will be patronized equally by both genders

1.4 TO WHAT EXTENT WILL THIS FACILITY/PROGRAM ADDRESS KNOWN SOCIAL ISSUES IN THE CATCHMENT POPULATION?

As part of Stage One – Intelligence Gathering exercise, certain social issues may be identified (e.g. unemployment, declining numbers of youth, perceptions of safety and security, health problems in local population). Facilities/programs that, in part, address these issues should be considered more socially desirable.

Rating Guidelines

1 – Could exacerbate known social issues in local community

2 - Will have a neutral effect on known social issues in local community

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

3 – Will partially contribute to alleviating known social issues in the local community

4 – Evidence of significant reduction in known social issues can be established.

1.5 TO WHAT EXTENT WILL THIS FACILITY/PROGRAM INCREASE PARTICIPATION RATES?

Measuring the extent to which a facility or programs will increase participation rates is a difficult task. The best method is to determine whether demand on existing facilities and programs are limiting the ability of groups and individuals to participate in activities of choice. At times (but certainly not always) the physical presence of a facility (e.g. footpaths) will improve participation rates.

Rating Guidelines

1 – Will have negative impact on overall participation rates.

2 – Will have neutral effect on overall participation rates

3 – Will partially contribute to an increase in participation rates

4 – Evidence of a significant increase in participation rates can be established

1.6 TO WHAT EXTENT WILL THIS FACILITY PROGRAM CATER FOR THE DISADVANTAGED IN THE CATCHMENT POPULATION

Definitions for the less advantaged in the community would include people with mental and physical disabilities; low income families; unemployed or people with significant health issues. Data attained during Stage One should assist in the process.

Rating Guidelines

1 – Will exclude the less advantaged

2 – Has no known benefits for the less advantaged

3 – Will partially cater for the needs of the less advantaged

4 – Has above compliance facilities and programs to cater to the less advantaged

2. CATCHMENT DYNAMICS

2.1 HOW WELL DO EXISTING AND PROJECTED PARTICIPATION RATES MATCH THE PROPOSED FACILITY'S/PROGRAM'S FUNCTION?

Comparing projected participation rates carried out as part of the Stage One – Intelligence Gathering with facilities/Programs projected target user groups should enable an assessment of this criteria.

Rating guidelines.

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

- 1 - Targeting Groups are mismatched to existing and projected participation rates
- 2 – End users are somewhat matched to existing and projected participation rates.
- 3 - End users reasonably well matched to existing and projected participation rates.
- 4 – End users are almost perfectly matched with existing and projected participation rates.

2.2 HOW DISTINCT IS THE CATCHMENT POPULATION FOR THIS FACILITY/PROGRAM FROM OTHER FACILITIES/PROGRAM FROM OTHER FACILITY/PROGRAMS?

Ensuring that the proposed facility's/program's catchment does not overlap with existing facility's/program's is critical to their long term sustainability. Refer to Stage One- Determining Catchment/Study Area Guidelines:

Rating guidelines

- 1 – Facility/Program is in the immediate catchment of other facilities/programs of similar nature
- 2 – Facility/Program catchment is somewhat discrete
- 3 – Facility/Program catchment is generally discrete
- 4 – Facility/Program catchment is entirely discrete

2.3 HOW WELL DOES THE TARGET POPULATION OF THE PROPOSED FACILITY/PROGRAM MATCH THE AGE PROFILE OF THE EXISTING CATCHMENT POPULATION?

Comparing catchment/ study area population profiles carried out as part of the Stage One- Intelligence Gathering with the facility's/programs projected target user groups should enable an assessment of the criteria.

Rating Guidelines

- 1 - Facility/program target group is mismatched to catchment population profiles
- 2 - Facility/program end users are somewhat present in the catchment
- 3 -A significant proportion of the facility/program end users are within the catchment
- 4 – Proposed facility/program end users are almost perfectly matched to local population profiles

2.4 HOW WELL DOES THE INCOME PROFILE OF THE CATCHMENT POPULATION REFLECT THE INCOME VERSUS PARTICIPATION PROFILE OF THE PROPOSED FACILITY/PROGRAM?

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

Comparing catchment/study area income profiles and participation profile carried out as part of Stag One- Intelligence gathering should enable an assessment of this criteria.

Rating guidelines.

- 1 - User cost exceed the disposable income capabilities of the local community
- 2 – User costs somewhat exceed the disposable income capabilities of the local community
- 3 – User cost are somewhat matched to the disposable income capabilities of the local community
- 5 – User costs ate entirely appropriate for the local community's disposable income capabilities

2.5 HOW WELL DOES THE CULTURAL FLAVOUR OF THE PROPOSED FACILITY/PROGRAM MIRROR THE CATCHMENT POPULATION?

Comparing catchment/study area ethnicity profiles (carried out as part of Stage On – Intelligence Gathering) with facility's/program's projected target user groups should enable an assessment of the criterion. They key is to ensure that the cultural leisure preferences are matched to the intended function of the facility/program

Rating guidelines

- 1 – Facility Program function is mismatched to dominate cultural mix of the catchment population
- 2 – Facility program function is somewhat matched to dominate cultural mix of catchment population
- 3 - Facility/program functions somewhat to dominate cultural mix of the catchment population.
- 4 – Facility /Program function is predominately matched to dominate cultural mix of the catchment population

3. STAKEHOLDER AND COMMUNITY ENGAEMENT

3.1 TO WHAT DEGREE DOES THE LOCAL COMMUNITY (NEARBY RESDIENTS) SUPPORT THE POPROSED FACILTY/PROGRAM?

Gauging local community support is a complex task. Support can be measured in degrees based on the results of a survey (e.g. strongly supported, supported, opposed, strongly opposed) or consultation activities.

Rating guidelines

- 1 – 75% or more of the local community strongly opposed or opposed.

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

2 – 50-75% of the local community strongly opposed or opposed.

3 – 50-75% of the local community strongly support or support

4 – 75% or more of the local community strongly support or support

3.2 TO WHAT DEGREE DOES THE CATCHMENT POPULATION SUPPORT THE PROPOSED FACILITY/PROGRAM

Gauging regional or catchment support can be measured through a survey sample, public comments or as part of a broader engagement process (e.g. workshop outcomes)

Rating guidelines

1 – 75% or more of the catchment strongly opposed or opposed.

2 – 50-75% of the catchment strongly opposed or opposed

3 – 50-75% of the catchment strongly support or support

4 – 75% or more of the catchment strongly support or support

3.3 HOW LIKELY IS THE LOCAL COUNCIL(S) TO SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPOSED FACILITY PROGRAM?

While difficult to ascertain, council resolutions and conversations with officers can provide an indication of likely local government support.

Rating guidelines

1 – Highly unlikely to support

2 – Unlikely to support

3 – Likely to support

4 – Highly likely to support

3.4 HOW LIKELY IS THE STATE GOVERNMENT (DSR) TO SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPOSED FACILITY/PROGRAM?

While difficult to ascertain, funding guidelines and conversations with officers can provide an indication of likely DSR support.

Rating guidelines

1 – Highly unlikely support

2 – unlikely to support

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

3 - Likely to support

4 – Highly likely to support

3.5 HOW LIKELY IS THE STATE SPORTING ASSOCIATION(S) TO SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPOSED FACILITY/PROGRAM?

While difficult to ascertain, state sporting association strategic plans and conversations with officers can provide an indication of likely SSA support.

Rating guidelines

1 – Highly unlikely to support

2 – Unlikely to support

3 – Likely to support

4 – Highly likely to support

3.6 HOW WELL HAVE THE NEEDS OF SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS BEEN INTERPRETED AND INCLUDED IN THE PLANNING PROCESS?

The needs of special interest groups can be determined as part of the broader and community engagement process.

Rating Guidelines

1 – Dismissed without justification

2 – Dismissed with some minor justification

3 – Somewhat incorporated with justification for omissions

4 – Entirely incorporated

3.7 HOW SECURE IS COMMUNITY GROUP POTENTIAL TENANT'S COMMITMENT TO USING THE PROPOSED FACILITY /PROGRAM?

Commitments from community groups and potential tenants/users groups can be obtained as part of the consultative process. An exchange of letters is recommended.

Rating Guidelines

1 – No tenants or user groups secured

2 – A few verbal commitments

3 – Some verbal and written comments

4 – Sufficient written commitments to ensure a high user rate

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

3.8 TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE INDIGENOUS AND NON-INDIGENOUS HERITAGE IMPACTS BEEN ADDRESSED?

Indigenous and non-indigenous impacts can be assessed through the consultative process, a review of local planning schemes or by engaging an anthropologist or heritage consultants.

Rating Guidelines

- 1 – Not addressed
- 2 – Somewhat addressed
- 3 – Almost fully addressed
- 4 – Entirely addressed

4. POLICY

4.1 HOW WELL DOES THE PROPOSED FACILITY COMPLY WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOOD?

Liveable Neighborhoods, the Western Australian Planning Commissions planning and design guidelines, promotes integrated urban form, high level of passive surveillance, pedestrians friendly streetscapes and a hierarchy of POS and facility distribution. In regional areas, this may be less relevant. In this instances, rate the facility a 4. The same should apply to program based solutions.

Rating guidelines

- 1 – Entirely at odds with livable neighborhoods design and distribution principles
- 2 – Somewhat at odds with livable neighborhoods design and distribution principles
- 3 – Somewhat complies with Livable Neighborhoods design and distributions principles
- 4 – Entirely complies with livable neighborhoods design and distribution principles/NA

4.2 TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE FACILITY PROMOTE THE OBJECTIVES OF NETWORK CITY?

The City promotes high-medium density nodal developments connected through a network of accessible roads and public transport options. In regional areas, this may not be relevant. In this instant rate the facility a 4. The same should apply to program abased solutions.

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

Rating Guidelines

- 1 – Entirely at odds with Network City Principles
- 2 – Somewhat at odds with Network City principles
- 3 – Somewhat complies with network Principles
- 4 – Entirely complies with Network City principles/NA

4.3 HOW WELL DOES THE FACILITY / PROGRAM MEET DSR'S SD4 POLICY GUIDELINES?

The policy review should identify the core intent of the department of Sport and Recreation's Strategic Directions policy statement and evaluate the alignment of the proposed facility or program development with the policy.

Rating Guidelines

- 1 – Entirely at odds with the SD4 Policy
- 2 – Somewhat at odds with SD4 Policy
- 3 – Somewhat complies with SD4 Policy
- 4 – Entirely complies with SD4 Policy

4.4 HOW WELL DOES THE FACILITY/PROGRAM MEET RLEVANT LOCAL GOVERNMENT POLICIES?

The policy review should identify relevant local government policies, procedures and community facility's and service strategic plans.

Rating guidelines

- 1 – Entirely at odds with the local government policies and plans
- 2 – Somewhat at odds with the local government policies and plans
- 3 – Somewhat complies with the local government policies and plans.
- 4 – Entirely complies with the local government policies and plans

4.5 HOW WELL DO FACILITY /PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT OF THIS KIND SUPPORT THE LOCAL AUTHORITY'S CORPORATE PLAN?

Corporate strategic plans provide an overarching direction to local government. They usually consist of a vision statement, set of guiding principles, key initiatives and performance indicators.

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

Rating guidelines.

- 1 – Entirely at odds with the local government strategic plan
- 2 – Somewhat at odds with the local government strategic plan
- 3 – Somewhat complies with the local government strategic plan
- 4 – Entirely complies with the local government strategic plan

4.6 TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE PROPOSED FACILITY/PROGRAM COMPLY WITH REGIONAL COMMUNITY FACILITY AND SERVICE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES?

Many Local governments participate in regional recreational advisory groups. Many have developed facility and program based strategic plans. These should be identified as part of the policy review process. Where these have not been prepared rate the facility/program a 4.

Rating guidelines

- 1 - Entirely at odds with the regional strategic plan
- 2 – Somewhat at odds with the regional strategic plan
- 3 – Somewhat complies with the regional strategic plan
- 4 – Entirely complies with the regional strategic plan/NA

4.7 TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE PROPOSED FACILITY/PROGRAM REFLECT THE WA STATE SUSTAINABLE STRATEGY?

The WA state Sustainable Strategy (SSS) guides a number of key government policies and initiatives. An overview should be prepared as part of the policy review.

Rating guidelines

- 1 – Entirely at odds with the WA SSS
- 2 – Somewhat at odds with the WA SSS
- 3 – Somewhat complies with the WA SSS
- 4 – Entirely complies with the WA SSS

4.8 HOW WELL DOES THE FACILITY/PROGRAM PROPOSAL REFLECT OTHER STATE GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES?

The policy review should identify any other state government initiatives that are relevant to the proposed facility or program. If no other policies are deemed to be relevant rate the facility a 4.

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

Rating guidelines

- 1 – Entirely at odds with other state government initiatives.
- 2 – Somewhat at odds with other state government initiatives
- 3 – Somewhat complies with other state government initiatives.
- 4 – Entirely complies with other state government initiatives

5. LOCATION

5.1 TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE LOCATION AND DESIGN OF THE FACILITY INTERGRATE WITH THE SURROUNDING URBAN FABRIC?

Integrates with surrounding urban fabric can be measured in terms of the facility's connections (e.g. footpaths, roads) to nearby land uses, sightlines and views, architectural consistency and the extent to which land use conflicts are possible. For some program solutions this criteria may not be considered relevant. In this instances it should be rated 4.

Rating guidelines

- 1 – No integration and land use conflicts likely
- 2 – No integration, but no negative effects
- 3 – Somewhat integrated
- 4 – Fully integrated/NA

5.2 HOW ACCESSIBLE IS THE FACILITY/PROGRAM VIA PUBLIC TRANSPOR?

Accessibility via public transport can be measured in terms of proximity and frequency of buses and trains for the facility or program. Consideration should also be given to the extent to which public transport frequency matches peak usage times.

Rating guidelines

- 1 – Very inaccessible
- 2 – Somewhat inaccessible
- 3 – Somewhat accessible
- 4 – Very accessible

5.3 HOW ACCESSIBLE IS THE FACILTY/PROGRAM FOR PEDESTRAINS AND CYCLISTS?

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

Accessibility for pedestrians can be measured in terms of proximity and network of cycle ways and footpaths. Ped-shed analysis may also assist in rating this criterion.

Rating guidelines

- 1 – Very inaccessible
- 2 – Somewhat inaccessible
- 3 – Somewhat accessible
- 4 – Very accessible.

5.4 TO WHAT DEGREE DOES THE STANDARD GAP ANALYSIS INDICATE A NEED?

Location decisions relating to facilities and programs should, in part, be tied to a standard based gap analysis. Guidelines are provided as part of Stage One.

Rating Guidelines

- 1 – Entirely inconsistent with provisional standards
- 2 – Somewhat inconsistent with provisional standards
- 3 – Somewhat consistent with provision standards
- 4 – Entirely consistent with provision standards

5.5 HOW READILY ARE LOCAL SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS ABLE TO ACCESS THE PROPOSED FACILITY PROGRAM?

Use of facilities and programs by schools and education institutions is an important contributor to the long term viability of facilities and should be promoted where possible.

Rating Guidelines

- 1 – Not accessible
- 2 – Occasionally accessible
- 3 – Regularly accessible
- 4 – Fully accessible

5.6 WHAT DEGREE OF VISIBILITY AND EXPOSURE WILL THIS FACILITY/PROGRAM HAVE WITHIN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY?

Visibility and exposure has marketing accessibility and safety benefits.

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

Rating Guidelines

- 1 – No visibility or exposure
- 2 – Some visibility and exposure
- 3 – Good level of visibility and exposure
- 4 – Excellent level of visibility and exposure

5.7 TO WHAT EXTENT WILL THE FACILITY/PROGRAM GENERATE ACTIVITY THAT WILL ENHANCE COMMUNITY SAFETY

It is now accepted that the safest community spaces are the busiest, particularly at night. The extent to which a program or facility generates day, night weekday and weekend activity can be used as an indicator.

Rating Guidelines

- 1 – Limited activity
- 2 – Activity, but limited to a few hours a day
- 3 – Good level of activity
- 4 – Excellent level of activity

6. DESIGN

6.1 HOW STRONG ARE THE SYNERGIES BETWEEN THE POTENTIAL USER GROUPS AT PRESENT?

This requires an indication of the compatibility and connectedness between potential user groups. Complementary seasonal users will generally rate high. Groups that are already working together and groups are collaborating or lobbying for proposal will rate high.

Rating Guidelines

- 1 – There is identified antagonism between potential user groups
- 2 – There is potential for conflict in demand for facility between the user groups.
- 3 – User groups are highly compatible and operate counter cyclical
- 4 – Groups have already collaborated and are making a joint approach for the facility or program.

6.2 TO WHAT DEGREE DOES THE DESIGN OF THE FACILITY/PROGRAM, ALLOW FOR FLEXIBILITY AND CHANGING FUNCTION?

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

Whilst facilities and programs must be fit for a purpose, the more multi-purpose they are, the greater appeal and applicability they have to a cross-section of the community. Very Specific or single purpose facilities and programs rate poorly.

Rating Guidelines

- 1 – Design is specific and for a single purpose and will not accommodate alternative use applications
- 2 – Design places limitations on the range of activities that can be undertaken
- 3 – Design flexible and allows multiple use/application with some alteration
- 4 – Design is highly flexible and allows variety of uses/applications without alterations.

6.3 TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE PROPOSED FACILITY OR PROGRAM PROMOTE SHARED USE?

Shared use facilities generally rate high from a feasibility point of view as they encourage synergies, expand the catchment potential or increase its financial robustness. Programs that promote or enhance the level of shared use of facility should be rated high.

Rating Guidelines

- 1 – A single user group will control and dominate use
- 2 – A limited and fixed number of users will share access
- 3 – Regular users will make most of the use but other groups will encourage to access the facility or program
- 4 – The facility or program will accommodate a wide variety of uses at different times and for different purposes

6.4 TO WHAT DEGREE DOES THE DESIGN INCORPORATE ESD (ECOLOGICALLY SUSTAINABLE DESIGN) PRINCIPLES?

ESD Includes solar passive orientation, environmentally friendly building materials, renewable energy sources, grey water reuse, waste recycling and energy efficient plant and equipment. In the case of program solutions this criteria is not relevant and should be rated 4.

NB: Considerations should be given to the facilities design to minimize the Ecological Footprint (EF).

Rating Guidelines

- 1 – Does not address ESD principles
- 2 – Somewhat addresses ESD principles

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

3 – Generally addresses ESD principles

4 – Completely addresses ESD principles/NA

6.5 TO WHAT DEGREE WILL THIS FACILITY ALLOW FOR PASSIVE SURVEILLANCE TO ENHANCE COMMUNITY SAFETY AND MEET CPTED PRINCIPLES?

Facilities that are visible to nearby neighbors, businesses and passers-by are afforded protection by onlookers. Exposure to the street, open car parks and sensitive landscaping to prevent secluded zones are highly desirable. In the case of program solutions this criteria is not relevant and should be rated 4.

Rating Guidelines

1 – Facility is heavily screened and secluded from the community with areas that allow secluded gatherings

2 – Facilities is generally visible but has numerous screened or secluded areas near public circulation routes

3 – Facility is generally visible from surrounding land uses or passing traffic with very few screened or secluded areas near public circulation routes

4 – Facility is high visibility from surrounding land uses and passing traffic with no screened or secluded areas near public circulation routes/NA

7. ENVIRONMENT

7.1 TO WHAT DEGREE WILL THE PROPOSED FACILITY/PROGRAM PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORT MODES?

Ready access to the facility is important to enable and encourage utilization. The shorter the connections within the community and the greater the variety of access options the better. In the case of program solutions this criteria may not be relevant and should be rated 4.

Rating guidelines

1 – Facility is located in a distant or remote location with limited non-car access

2 – Facility is located in a distant location with reasonable pedestrian / cycle links and some public transport connections

3 – Facility is in reasonable proximity to its major catchment population with reasonable pedestrian and cycle connections with some public transport connections

4 – Facility is in close proximity to its major catchment population with strong pedestrian and cycle connections and is well serviced by public transport routes/NA

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

7.2 TO WHAT DEGREE WILL THE PROPOSED FACILITY ENHANCE THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT?

Development of a facility on a degraded site to enhance the amenity value of an area is generally welcomed. Clearing of natural bush land, however, is generally less well accepted. In the case of program based solutions this criteria may not be relevant and should be rated 4.

Rating guidelines

- 1 – Facility development will reduce areas of natural bush land and cause waste discharges into the surrounding environment
- 2 – Facility development will prevent area rehabilitation or improvement and present waste discharge issues
- 3 – Facility development will limit further degradation of the area and effectively manage waste discharges
- 4 – Facility development will rehabilitate and add form and function to a degraded area and effectively manage waste discharges/NA

7.3 TO WHAT DEGREE WILL THE PROPOSED FACILITY OR PROGRAM ACCOMMODATE COMMUNITY BASED ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS?

Community based environmental programs can be defined as initiatives or activities that raise community environmental awareness or promote sustainable household behaviors, *e.g. tree planting, recycling programs, water wise campaign, etc.*

Rating guidelines

- 1 – No capacity for community based environmental programs
- 2 – Limited capacity for community based environmental programs
- 3 – Reasonable capacity for community based programs
- 4 – Extensive capacity for community based environmental programs

7.4 TO WHAT DEGREE WILL THE FACILITY ASSIST IN MINIMISING WASTE TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND ALIGN WITH THE STATE GOVERNMENT'S WASTE 20/20 OUTCOMES?

Management and design issues will determine how responsive the facility will be to waste minimization initiatives. In the case of program solutions this may not be relevant and should be rated 4.

Rating guidelines

- 1 – Facility has no recycling program
- 2 – Facility has limited recycling program

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

3 – Facility has some recycling activities and moderates energy use

4 – Facility uses clean fuel, captures rainwater, contains storm water, permits grey water reuse and engages in recycling and minimizes energy use/NA

8. OPERATIONS

8.1 TO WHAT EXTENT WILL THE FACILITY/PROGRAM BE ABLE TO RECOVER OPERATING COSTS FROM USER FEES?

Expense recovery is a key performance indicator for community facilities and services. A financially viable facility or service will be able to generate sufficient income from its activities to meet its operating costs.

Rating guidelines

1 – Costs will be met almost entirely by sources other than user fees

2 – Costs will be met largely by sources other than user fees

3 – Costs will be met substantially from user fees and other operating income

4 – Costs will be met entirely from user fees and other operating income

8.2 TO WHAT EXTENT ARE OTHER PARTIES ABLE TO CONTRIBUTE TO OPERATING COSTS?

Where facilities and services are likely to incur a trading loss or operating deficit, it is useful to spread financial costs across more than one party. Given that community facilities and programs are usually built on government owned or controlled land, it is often the host LGA that is left to meet any operating shortfall. It is an advantage if this deficit can be offset by contributions from others, such as the Department of Education and Training, commercial operations or surrounding LGA's in the case of regional facilities and programs.

Rating guidelines

1 – Operating costs will be met almost entirely by the host LGA with little to no contribution from operating income

2 – Operating costs will be met by operating income and contributions from the LGA

3 – Operating costs will be met by operating income, contributions from the LGA and other parties

4 – Operating costs will be met entirely from user fees and operating income

8.3 TO WHAT EXTENT WILL THIS FACILITY OR PROGRAM FACILITATE FULL TIME USE (ALL HOURS, ALL SEASONS)?

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

Due to the expense of establishing community infrastructure and services the aim is to maximize utilization of facilities. Those that are only seasonal or only used for limited periods, rank lower than those used all hours and all year round.

Rating guidelines

- 1 – Facility/program is seasonal and primarily out of hours
- 2 – Facility/program is seasonal and tending to all hours
- 3 – Facility/program is all year round and primarily out of hours
- 4 – Facility/program is all year round and tending to all hours

8.4 TO WHAT EXTENT WILL THIS FACILITY/PROGRAM PROVIDE LOCAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES?

Facilities and services generally require some staff or paid labour input, even if it is only contract labour for repairs and maintenance. Where staff is required to manage the facility or program it provides an economic stimulus to the community.

Rating guidelines

- 1 – There will be very minimal staff input required for this facility/program
- 2 – There will be moderate staff required to run this facility/program
- 3 – There will be some reasonable staff employment opportunities for local staff as a result for this facility/program being established
- 4 – The facility/program will cause considerable local employment and offer career development and training opportunities within the local community.

9. FUNDING

9.1 WHAT IS THE LIKELIHOOD OF THE CAPITAL COST OF THE PROJECT BEING FULLY FUNDED?

As part of the pre-feasibility process, funding investigations should be carried out.

Rating guidelines

- 1 – Nil
- 2 – Small Chance
- 3 – Moderate Chance
- 4 – Every likelihood

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

9.2 TO WHAT DEGREE DOES THE COUNCIL HAVE ADEQUATE RESERVES SET ASIDE FOR THIS PURPOSE?

Local government reserve funding is a potential revenue source and an indicator of Council support for the project.

Rating guidelines

- 1 – No reserve allocation at all
- 2 – A reserve allocation that will meet less than 10% of the total project cost
- 3 – A reserve allocation will meet between 10% and 25% of the total project cost
- 4 – A reserve allocation that will meet more than 25% of the total project cost

9.3 WHAT IS THE LIKELIHOOD OF FINANCIAL (CAPITAL AND MANAGEMENT) CONTRIBUTIONS FROM MORE THAN ONE LOCAL GOVERNMENT?

Funding from other local governments is a good indicator that the project has a regional focus. It is particularly relevant when the facility/program's catchment extends across more than one municipal boundary.

Rating guidelines

- 1 – Has no impact outside the host local authority area and no capacity to attract funding from other LGA's.
- 2 – Has limited impact outside the host local authority area with little to no chance of attracting financial support from other LGA's
- 3 – Has moderate impact outside the host local authority area with a reasonable chance of attracting financial support from the other LGA's
- 4 – Has considerable impact outside the host local authority area with a strong chance of attracting financial support from other LGA's

9.4 WHAT IS THE LIKELIHOOD OF FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS FROM OTHER ENTITIES (E.G. STATE, NOT FOR PROFIT SECTOR, DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS?)

The potential for multiple funding sources/project partners should be encouraged wherever possible.

Rating guidelines

- 1 – Is it unlikely to attract funding support from any external party or government agency
- 2 – Has limited appeal to funding agencies but has support from other potential user groups

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

3 – Has relevance to some grant programs and good support from other potential user groups

4 – Has broad based appeal and will readily attract funding from State and Federal agencies as well as the community and commercial sector

9.5 WHAT LEVEL OF PRIORITY DOES THE HOST LOCAL AUTHORITY ASCRIBE TO THIS FACILITY?

Community infrastructure and services are expensive and often there are many competing demands for funding within a community. The higher the priority a local authority places on this proposed facility the more likely it will be to succeed.

Rating guidelines

1 – Not considered to be necessary by the local authority

2 – Deemed to be useful but not necessary a priority of the local authority

3 – Deemed to be an important development supported by the local authority

4 – Deemed to be an essential and immediate priority development driven by the local authority

STAGE TWO – PROGRAM/FACILITY SUSTAINABILITY MATRIX

	Criteria	Criteria	Criteria	Criteria
1.0	Social Wellbeing	13%	Example scores shown below	
1.1	To what extent will this facility/program proposal enhance the social wellbeing of the community?		4	3
1.2	To what extent will this facility/program add to the sense of the community?		3	4
1.3	To what extent will this facility/program bring different parts of the community together?		4	4
1.4	To what extent will this facility/program cater for all age groups?		3	4
1.5	To what extent will this facility/program cater for both genders?		2	3
1.6	To what extent will this facility/program address known social issues in the catchment population?		4	2
1.7	To what extent with this facility/program increase participation rates?		3.5	4
1.8	To what extent will this facility/program cater for the disadvantaged in the catchment population?		3	3
Social Wellbeing Subtotal			3.31	3.38
2.0	Catchment Dynamics	9%		
2.1	How well do existing and projected participation rates match the proposed facility's/program's function?		2	4
2.2	How distinct is the catchment population for this facility/program from other facilities or programs?		2.5	2
2.3	How well does the target population of the proposed facility/program match the age profile of the existing catchment population?		2	4

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

2.4	How well does the income profile of the catchment population reflect the income vs. participation profile of the proposed facility/program?		4	3
2.5	How well does the cultural flavour of the proposed facility/program mirror the catchment population?		3	3
Catchment dynamics Subtotal			2.7	3.2
3.0	Community Stakeholder Engagement	12%		
3.1	To what degree does the local community (nearby residents) support the proposed facility/program?		2	3
3.2	To what degree does the catchment population support the proposed facility/program?		3	2
3.3	How likely is the local council(s) to support development of the proposed facility/program?		4	4
3.4	How likely is the state government (DSR) to support development of the proposed facility/program?		4	4
3.5	How likely is the state sporting association(s) to support development of the proposed facility/program?		4	4
3.6	How well have the needs of special interest groups been interpreted and included in this planning process?		3	3
3.7	How secure is community groups/potential tenants' commitment to using the proposed facility/program?		2	3.5
3.8	To what extent have Indigenous and non-indigenous heritage impacts been addressed?		3	3
Community and Stakeholder Engagement Subtotal			2.83	3.08

	Criteria	Criteria	Criteria	Criteria
4.0	Policy	7%	Example scores shown below	
4.1	How well does the proposed facility comply with the recommendations of Liveable Neighbourhoods?		2	4
4.2	To what extent does the facility promote the objectives of Network City?		3	3
4.3	How well does the facility/program meet DSR's SD4 policy guidelines?		2	4
4.4	How well does the facility/program meet relevant local government policies?		4	2
4.5	How well does facility/program development of this kind support the local authority's Corporate Plan?		2	3
4.6	To what extent does the proposed facility/program comply with regional community facility and service development strategies?		3	4
4.7	To what extent does the proposed facility/program reflect the WA State Sustainability Strategy?		2	3
4.8	How well does this facility/program proposal reflect other State Government initiatives?		1	3
Policy Subtotal			2.38	3.25
5.0	Location	13%		
5.1	To what extent does the location and design of the facility integrate with the surrounding urban fabric?		4	2
5.2	How accessible is the facility/program via public transport?		4	2
5.3	How accessible is the facility/program for pedestrians and cyclists?		3	3
5.4	To what degree does the standards gap analysis indicate a need?		3	3
5.5	How readily will local schools and education institutions be able to access the proposed facility program?		3	2

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

5.6	What degree of visibility and exposure will this facility/program have within the local community?		2.5	4
5.7	To what extent will the facility/program generate activity that will enhance community safety?		3	4
Location Subtotal			2.7	3.2
6.0	Design	12%		
6.1	How strong are the synergies between the potential user groups at present?		1	1
6.2	To what degree does the design of the facility/program allow for flexibility and changing function?		3	1
6.3	To what extent does the proposed facility/program allow for shared use?		3	3
6.4	To what degree does the design incorporate ESD (ecologically sustainable design) principles?		2	4
6.5	To what degree will this facility allow for passive surveillance to enhance community safety?		3	4
Design Subtotal			2.4	2.6

	Criteria	Criteria	Criteria	Criteria
1.0	Social Wellbeing	13%	Example scores shown below	
1.1	To what extent will this facility/program proposal enhance the social wellbeing of the community?		4	3
1.2	To what extent will this facility/program add to the sense of the community?		3	4
1.3	To what extent will this facility/program bring different parts of the community together?		4	4
1.4	To what extent will this facility/program cater for all age groups?		3	4
1.5	To what extent will this facility/program cater for both genders?		2	3
1.6	To what extent will this facility/program address known social issues in the catchment population?		4	2
1.7	To what extent with this facility/program increase participation rates?		3.5	4
1.8	To what extent will this facility/program cater for the disadvantaged in the catchment population?		3	3
Social Wellbeing Subtotal			3.31	3.38
2.0	Catchment Dynamics	9%		
2.1	How well do existing and projected participation rates match the proposed facility's/program's function?		2	4
2.2	How distinct is the catchment population for this facility/program from other facilities or programs?		2.5	2
2.3	How well does the target population of the proposed facility/program match the age profile of the existing catchment population?		2	4
2.4	How well does the income profile of the catchment population reflect the income vs. participation profile of the proposed facility/program?		4	3
2.5	How well does the cultural flavour of the proposed facility/program mirror the catchment population?		3	3
Catchment dynamics Subtotal			2.7	3.2
3.0	Community Stakeholder Engagement	12%		
3.1	To what degree does the local community (nearby residents) support the proposed facility/program?		2	3
3.2	To what degree does the catchment population support the		3	2

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT FUND ASSESSMENT MATRIX GUIDELINES

	proposed facility/program?			
3.3	How likely is the local council(s) to support development of the proposed facility/program?		4	4
3.4	How likely is the state government (DSR) to support development of the proposed facility/program?		4	4
3.5	How likely is the state sporting association(s) to support development of the proposed facility/program?		4	4
3.6	How well have the needs of special interest groups been interpreted and included in this planning process?		3	3
3.7	How secure is community groups/potential tenants' commitment to using the proposed facility/program?		2	3.5
3.8	To what extent have Indigenous and non-indigenous heritage impacts been addressed?		3	3
Community and Stakeholder Engagement Subtotal			2.83	3.08

	Criteria	Criteria	Criteria	Criteria
7.0	Environment	7%		
7.1	To what degree will the proposed facility/program provide opportunities for alternative transport modes		3	4
7.2	To what degree will the proposed facility enhance the physical environment?		3	4
7.3	To what degree will the proposed facility/program accommodate community based environmental programs?		4	4
7.4	To what degree will the proposed facility assist in minimizing waste to the environment?		3	3
Environment Subtotal			3.25	3.75
8.0	Operations	15%		
8.1	To what extent will the facility/program be able to recover operating costs from user fees?		2	4
8.2	To what extent are other parties able to contribute to operating costs?		4	1
8.3	To what extent will this facility/program facilitate full time use (all hours, all seasons)?		3	3
8.4	To what extent will this facility/program provide local employment opportunities?		3	2
Operations Subtotal			3	2.5
9.0	Funding Availability	12%		
9.1	What is the likelihood of the capital cost of the project being fully funded?		2	2
9.2	To what degree does the Council have adequate reserves set aside for this purpose?		3	3
9.3	What is the likelihood of financial (capital and management) contributions from more than one local government?		2	4
9.4	What is the likelihood of financial contributions from other entities (e.g. state, not for profit sector, developer contributions)?		3	3.5
9.5	What level of priority does the host local authority ascribe to this facility/program?		3	4
Funding Subtotal			2.6	3.5
10	Sustainability Rating	100%	2.88	3.07