

**2.1 - MASTER PLANNING INITIATIVE - ASSESSMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION
OF NEW PROJECTS**

WARD : ALL
FILE No. : M/595/16
DATE : 14 October 2016
REF : LG/NK
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director
MANAGER : Community Services

In Brief:

This report follows Council's previous endorsement of the method for managing the outcomes of the Master Planning Initiative and presents the following;

- A preliminary assessment of the 12 major Master Plan projects, including priorities
- Timeline of projects relating to the Long Term Financial Plan and beyond
- Indication of further feasibility requirements
- Indication of priority projects subject to immediate further feasibility analysis

Recommend that Council;

1. Adopt the preliminary assessment of the Master Plan projects
2. Endorse further feasibility analysis of the Cross Park Pavilion Project, Forrestdale Sporting Facilities project, **Creyk Park Project and John Dunn BMX Project**
3. Refer the Master Plan projects for Council's consideration in the next review of the City's Long Term Financial Plan

Tabled Items

1. Nil

Officer Interest Declaration

Nil

Strategic Implications

- 1.1 A strong sense of community spirit
- 1.2 Active community life that is safe and healthy
- 1.3 The community has the services and facilities it needs
- 2.2 Attractive and functional public places
- 2.3 Well managed infrastructure

Legislation Implications

Any works associated with the projects would need to be carried out in accordance with the Building Code of Australia and any other relevant legislation.

Council Policy/Local Law Implications

ENG 13 Asset Management Vision

ENG 14 Landscaping

RECN 1 Lighting on Sporting Reserves

RECN 3 Club/Community Group Application(s) for Council Support of Capital Works Projects.

Budget/Financial Implications

There are no immediate financial implications resulting from the adoption of the recommendations in this report however the information provided is intended to provide assistance to Council regarding future financial decisions.

Based on the assumptions regarding costs outlined in this report the total cost of the 12 Master Plan projects is **\$42,908,000**. Of the total, **\$11,840,000** is assumed in external funding with Loans assumed for the balance of **\$31,068,000**. The timeframe for implementation is assumed at 25 years.

Attachment 1 – *Master Plan Major Projects Schedule* provides an indicative 30 year outlook of the long term financial consequences of implementing the 12 major projects over a 25 year period. This schedule shows the net effect on municipal funds and has been developed using the same methodology as that used for the City's Long Term Financial Plan by taking into account anticipated external funds, ongoing operational and renewal allocations, the cost of loans and anticipated recurrent revenue through fees and charges.

Please note this is a preliminary indicative forecast only and is based on the costs and timings suggested in this report. It is proposed that the *Master Plan Major Projects Schedule* is reviewed annually as part of the City's budget and LTFP review process.

Work is currently underway to align the information in the Master Plan Major Projects Schedule with the City's Asset Management program and to determine what capacity the Asset Management Program has to assist in funding the major projects identified in this report. This work is ongoing however it is anticipated that relevant information regarding the Asset Management program will be available to inform decisions about the Master Planning projects.

Consultation

1. Significant community consultation during the development of each Master Plan
2. Councillor briefings on each of the Master Plans
3. Councillor Briefing summarising all the Master Plans on 13 September 2016
4. City Departments and Executive Management Team

BACKGROUND

The Master Planning initiative has been undertaken to identify the current and future needs for community buildings and public open space (POS) on 12 community hubs in the City's

more established areas. The need to develop a long term plan for the City's ageing community facilities was identified in the *Active Sporting Grounds and Community Hubs Study* which was presented to Council in February 2012 (C7/2/12).

Since that time Council has considered and endorsed Master Plans for the twelve sites as follows;

- Bob Blackburn Reserve, Seville Grove (C20/5/16)
- Creyk Park, Armadale, (C25/7/16)
- Cross Park, Roleystone (C8/3/13)
- Alfred Skeet Reserve, Forrestdale (C9/3/14))
- William Skeet Reserve, Forrestdale (C9/3/14)) (together forming the *Forrestdale Hub*)
- Frye Park, Kelmscott (C25/7/16)
- Gwynne Park, Armadale (C20/5/16)
- John Dunn Reserve, Kelmscott (C31/9/13)
- Karragullen Oval, Karragullen (C25/7/16)
- Morgan Park, Armadale (C25/7/16)
- Rushton Park, Kelmscott (C31/9/13)
- Springdale Park, Roleystone (C8/3/13)

In October 2016 Council considered a report that brought together information on the Master Planning initiative and how the works identified through the process could be assessed and prioritised for consideration in the existing works program and the City's Long Term Financial Plan. Council's decision relating to that report was;

(C38/10/16)

That Council:

1. *Adopt the three schedules for categorising the various Master Plan elements*
 - i. *Those for inclusion in the Renewal and Upgrade Program (attachment 2)*
 - ii. *Those which have no impact on the Long Term Financial Plan (attachment 3)*
 - iii. *New unfunded projects*

Noting the provisions in recommendation 3 for reviewing the proposed works

2. *Adopt an assessment criteria and weighting as follows;*

Need	Multi Use	Availability of Funding	Fit for purpose
40%	20%	20%	20%
1. Low	1. Low	1. Nil	1. Fully
2. Minor	2. Minor	2. up to 25%	2. Mostly
3. Average	3. Average	3. 26% to 50%	3. Average
4. Above Average	4. Above Average	4. 51% to 75%	4. Somewhat
5. Significant	5. Significant	5. 76% to 100%	5. Not at all

3. *Adopt the proposed method for managing the three schedules as follows;*

- *Schedule 1; Asset Renewal and Upgrade works*

A report will be presented to the November meeting of the Technical Services committee that will propose how works in this schedule can be managed including how it can be reviewed and amended by Council if required

- *Schedule 2; No Impact on the Long Term Financial Plan - Note this schedule*
- *Schedule 3; New Unfunded Projects*

A report will be presented to the November meeting of the Community Services committee that will include;

- A preliminary assessment of the 12 unfunded projects including how they are prioritised*
- If projects sit in the timeline of the 15 year timeframe of the current Long Term Financial Plan or beyond that period*
- What further feasibility analysis is required for each of the projects*
- Which priority projects should be subject to immediate further feasibility analysis*

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

Proposal - Summary

The twelve unfunded projects have undergone a preliminary assessment including an indicative timeframe for each. The following table shows the results of that assessment and if the projects sit in the timeframe of the Long Term Financial Plan or beyond that horizon.

The assumed timeframe for completing all 12 projects is 25 years. Note that the priority of a project is not necessarily related to the timeframe but rather to how it has been assessed against the criteria and/or the condition of the facility. Further information on each project is provided in the next section of this report.

MASTER PLAN ASSESSMENT CRITERIA WEIGHTED SCORES										
Indicative timeframe	Weighted Scores				TOTAL	PRIORITY RANKING				
	Need	Multi Use	Availability of Funding	Fit for purpose						
	40%	20%	20%	20%	100%					
	8. Low	4. Low	4. Nil	4. Fully						
	16. Minor	8. Minor	8. up to 25%	8. Mostly						
	24. Average	12. Average	12. 26% to 50%	12. Average						
	32. Above Average	16. Above Average	16. 51% to 75%	16. Somewhat						
	40. Significant	20. Significant	20. 76% to 100%	20. Not at all						
PROJECT NAME	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	beyond 15 years	WEIGHTED SCORES			TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	PRIORITY RANKING	
Champion Centre/Seville Grove Library Upgrade		✓			32	16	12	12	72.00	4
Creyk Park Pavilion Upgrade	✓				32	16	8	12	68.00	6
Creyk Park New Pavilion				✓	8	20	8	16	52.00	9
Cross Park Cricket/Netball Pavilion	✓				32	12	16	16	76.00	1
Refurbished Forrestdale Hall		✓			24	12	8	16	60.00	7
Forrestdale Hub - Potential co-location of sporting facilities		✓			32	20	8	16	76.00	1
Gwynne Park (Phase 1) Integrated Recreation Facility			✓		24	12	8	12	56.00	8
Gwynne Park (Phase 2) Expanded and New Facilities				✓	32	20	8	12	72.00	4
John Dunn Reserve New Community use building			✓		8	4	8	20	40.00	12
John Dunn Reserve BMX Facility			✓		8	8	8	20	44.00	11
Morgan Park Community/Sporting Facility				✓	32	20	8	16	76.00	1
Springdale Park - New Playing Field and Community Sporting Facility				✓	8	12	8	20	48.00	10

It is proposed that three of the twelve projects be subject to immediate additional feasibility analysis. These being;

- Champion Centre and Seville Grove Library (feasibility has already commenced)
- Cross Park pavilion
- Forrestdale sporting facilities

It is noted that further feasibility will, in the main, be conducted ‘in house’ with some minor contract work required which can be accommodated in the current budget allocations.

Proposal - Detail

The questions to be answered in considering each of the criteria were;

Need	What is the level of need for the facility?
Multi Use	What is the potential for the new/upgraded facility to be well used by a wide range of users and be adaptable to changing demands over time?
Availability of Funding	What is the potential to attract external funds for the project?
Fit for Purpose	How ‘fit for purpose’ is the current facility for the uses proposed? (In the case of a new facility that is not replacing one that already exists, the response is ‘Not at all’).

Each of the projects is outlined in this report. Comments are provided relating to the criteria; the composite elements of the project and overall capital cost, asset condition, an indicative timeframe and the requirement for further feasibility analysis.

Champion Centre/ Seville Grove Library Upgrade

	Indicative timeframe	Need	Multi Use	Availability of Funding	Fit for purpose	TOTAL	PRIORITY RANKING			
		40%	20%	20%	20%	100%				
		8. Low	4. Low	4. Nil	4. Fully					
		16. Minor	8. Minor	8. up to 25%	8. Mostly					
		24. Average	12. Average	12. 26% to 50%	12. Average					
		32. Above Average	16. Above Average	16. 51% to 75%	16. Somewhat					
		40. Significant	20. Significant	20. 76% to 100%	20. Not at all					
PROJECT NAME	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	beyond 15 years	WEIGHTED SCORES				TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	PRIORITY RANKING
Champion Centre/Seville Grove Library Upgrade		✓			32	16	12	12	72.00	4

Project Brief

This project has been identified as the second major initiative from the Bob Blackburn Master Plan after the redevelopment of the Aquatic Centre. There is significant potential to create a community service hub incorporating an upgraded Champion Centre and the ongoing use of the Seville Grove Library. This aligns with the current review of the City's Library Strategy and Development Plan which was reported to Council in July 2016 (C26/7/16) and also responds to the ongoing demand for services at the Champion Centre.

It is noted that a feasibility study is currently underway on options for the future use and design of the Champion Centre and Seville Grove Library is being undertaken (ref C20/5/16) with a report to be presented on the outcomes in early 2017.

Elements

- Library repurposing
- Champion Centre upgrade
- Aboriginal artwork
- Integrated carparking

Indicative Cost	\$2,358,000
Anticipated External Funds	\$1,000,000
Muni Funds - Loan	\$1,358,000

The indicative costs allows for a 300sqm expansion and upgrade of the Champion Centre and a refit of the Seville Grove Library. This allows scope for a range of works depending on the results of the current feasibility study relating to the project. The project also includes integration of car parks between the facilities which was originally included on the *Master Planning Initiative Schedule 1; Works for Inclusion in Renewal and Upgrade Programme*, which is being managed by the Technical Services Directorate, however it is logical to include this element as part of the overall project.

Ranking Analysis

The Champion Centre, which is the City’s Aboriginal family support centre is heavily used with further service provision challenged by its current layout. It provides for both the community of geography which has a relatively high proportion of Aboriginal families and a community of interest with many other groups engaging in the centre’s programs. There is a high level of need for the services provided but little opportunity for program expansion in the facility’s current state. It has been assessed therefore, relatively high for implementation in the 6-10 year time frame when current minor works will fail to deliver the flexibility required.

Aboriginal artwork planned for the area will enhance and support the cultural significance of the venue.

Council is currently considering the future use of the Seville Grove Library in the context of the City’s *Library Strategy and Development Plan*. Options for the Seville Grove Library and how it relates as part of the Bob Blackburn Community Hub will be presented to Council as part of the detailed feasibility analysis of this project.

Asset Condition

The Champion Centre is over 30 years old and in good condition; it is functional but requires some attention. There are no major issues with structure or services and it generally meets the current expectations for its use, however as previously identified in the Ranking Analysis, there are design limitations for the level of programming and services anticipated.

Conclusion

This project has been ranked as a priority 4 for completion within the next 6 to 10 years with an indicative cost of \$2,358,000. It is noted that a feasibility study relating to this project is currently underway with the results anticipated to be reported to Council in early 2017. Of all 12 Master Plan projects it is likely that an upgrade to the Champion Centre would attract interest from external funding sources over and above the level indicated on the scoring matrix. For the purpose of forward planning however a reasonably conservative approach has been taken regarding anticipated external funds.

Creyk Park Pavilion Upgrade

	Indicative timeframe				Need	Multi Use	Availability of Funding	Fit for purpose	TOTAL	PRIORITY RANKING
					40%	20%	20%	20%	100%	
					8. Low	4. Low	4. Nil	4. Fully		
					16. Minor	8. Minor	8. up to 25%	8. Mostly		
					24. Average	12. Average	12. 26% to 50%	12. Average		
					32. Above Average	16. Above Average	16. 51% to 75%	16. Somewhat		
					40. Significant	20. Significant	20. 76% to 100%	20. Not at all		
PROJECT NAME	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	beyond 15 years	WEIGHTED SCORES				TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	PRIORITY RANKING
Creyk Park Pavilion Upgrade	✓				32	16	8	12	68.00	6

Project Brief

As noted in the previous report to Council in April 2016 (C17/4/16), the Creyk Park Master Plan identified the need for a pavilion upgrade. The purpose of these works is to improve the internal and external aesthetics including additional storage and improved access.

There are works currently budgeted for in the year 16/17 (1-5 year timeframe), a significant portion of which will be electrical upgrades critical to the power supply for the building. Technical Services officers have ascertained that these upgrades will make up the majority of current budget allocations; hence the other upgrades will need to be funded separately.

Elements

- ~~Pavilion upgrade including electrical, kitchen, toilets and building re-configuration~~
- Pavilion upgrade comprising additional external public viewing/seating deck and associated internal/external reconfiguration-

Amended
by
Council at
Ordinary
Council
Meeting
of 14

Indicative Cost	\$1,120,000
Anticipated External Funds	\$500,000
Muni Funds - Loan	\$620,000

Ranking Analysis

The need for upgrades to this pavilion was identified both through community consultation and the City's Asset Management process; therefore works were already planned by the Property Services team to begin in the 16/17 year. In an already well-utilised facility, these upgrades will further facilitate more multi-use. The facility in its current state has been given a rating of 'Average' in fit for purpose criteria; it is expected that upgrades will significantly improve this outcome for the community and facility users.

Asset Condition

The building is aged and requires some attention in the short term. The amount allocated for current works is required predominantly for electrical upgrades and so additional funds will be required if the overall upgrade as envisaged is to be completed.

Conclusion

This project has been ranked as a priority 6 for completion within the first 5 years at an indicative cost of \$1,120,000. As noted in the Master Plan, City staff will continue to investigate opportunities to activate the area in the northwestern corner of the carpark in an effort to reduce the incidences of anti-social behaviour.

Creyk Park New Pavilion

	Indicative timeframe	Need	Multi Use	Availability of Funding	Fit for purpose	TOTAL	PRIORITY RANKING			
		40%	20%	20%	20%	100%				
		8. Low	4. Low	4. Nil	4. Fully					
		16. Minor	8. Minor	8. up to 25%	8. Mostly					
		24. Average	12. Average	12. 26% to 50%	12. Average					
		32. Above Average	16. Above Average	16. 51% to 75%	16. Somewhat					
		40. Significant	20. Significant	20. 76% to 100%	20. Not at all					
PROJECT NAME	1-5 years	5-10 years	10-15 years	beyond 15 years	WEIGHTED SCORES				TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	PRIORITY RANKING
Creyk Park New Pavilion				✓	8	20	8	16	52.00	9

Project Brief

This project was included in the Master Plan as a long term option, as per the report to Council in April 2016 (C17/4/16). A new pavilion will replace the current pavilion once it reaches the end of its useful life.

Elements

- New pavilion

Indicative Cost	\$4,200,000
Anticipated External Funds	\$1,000,000
Muni Funds - Loan	\$3,200,000

The indicative cost allows for a multi-use community/sporting facility of approximately 1,000 sqm with similar design features and functionality as the City's new facilities in Piara Waters and East Harrisdale.

Ranking Analysis

Based on population growth and usage forecasts, it is anticipated that a new pavilion will be needed in the long term (beyond 15 years); however the current pavilion with significant upgrades will suffice in the meantime. The planned upgrades to the current pavilion will extend the useful life and make a positive impact for current and new users in the short to medium term.

The pavilion is well-used now by a variety of groups. Additionally, it is anticipated that the relocation of cricket fixtures from Karragullen Oval will increase the usage of the pavilion and oval in the next 5 years, however the need for a new facility at this point in time is Low.

Asset Condition

If upgraded, the condition of the current facility will be adequate for 15+ years. Once the building reaches the end of its useful life, this will be a trigger for a new pavilion to replace it.

Conclusion

This project has been ranked as a priority 9 to be completed in the long term (beyond 15 year timeframe) with an indicative cost of \$4,200,000.

Cross Park Cricket/Netball Pavilion

	Indicative timeframe				Need	Multi Use	Availability of Funding	Fit for purpose	TOTAL	PRIORITY RANKING
					40%	20%	20%	20%	100%	
					8. Low	4. Low	4. Nil	4. Fully		
					16. Minor	8. Minor	8. up to 25%	8. Mostly		
					24. Average	12. Average	12. 26% to 50%	12. Average		
					32. Above Average	16. Above Average	16. 51% to 75%	16. Somewhat		
					40. Significant	20. Significant	20. 76% to 100%	20. Not at all		
PROJECT NAME	1-5 years	5-10 years	10-15 years	beyond 15 years	WEIGHTED SCORES				TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	PRIORITY RANKING
Cross Park Cricket/Netball Pavilion	✓				32	12	16	16	76.00	1

Project Brief

This project was identified as a priority in the community engagement during the master planning process as an opportunity to share resources between two sports. Space did not permit building courts and associated facilities for competition netball; however a new building with storage and toilets for use by netball for training will make a significant positive impact on the club's usage. The project formed part of a list of items in the master plan endorsed by Council in March 2013 (C/8/3/13).

Further information on this project is available in a report to the September Community Services Committee with the subsequent decision of Council to;

RECOMMEND C34/9/16

That Council:

Note the proposal for the redevelopment of Cross Park Cricket Pavilion and consider it as part of the master planning strategy.

Elements

- New pavilion housing the cricket club; toilets and storage for use by netball
- Formalisation of the service road entries for both the tennis and football club pavilions may be included in pavilion works once a project scope is finalised.

Indicative Cost	\$770,000
Anticipated External Funds	\$500,000
Muni Funds - Loan	\$270,000

An indicative cost of \$750,000 was provided by the clubs as part of the Master Planning process and was based on preliminary design work that they had undertaken themselves. An additional amount has been included to allow some ancillary road entry works. This additional element was originally included in the *Master Planning Initiative Schedule 1; Works for Inclusion in Renewal and Upgrade Programme*, but has now been included as part of the overall project scope.

Ranking Analysis

It is intended that the Roleystone-Karragullen Senior and Junior Cricket Clubs and the Roleystone Netball Club will share the facility which will be used exclusively by these two sports for operations, functions and storage of equipment.

The Roleystone-Karragullen Cricket Clubs have developed a concept plan and demonstrated a financial contribution for this project, which was outlined in the aforementioned report to Council (C34/9/16).

The level of multi-use of the building is average, given only two sports are serviced through this project. The oval and associated facilities at Cross Park are heavily used for a variety of activities. This project has ranked highly due to the readiness of the cricket club to finance the works, demonstrated need and the fit-for-purpose ranking, which shows that the current building is only 'Somewhat' fit for its intended purpose. It is noted that the indicative cost has been provided by the clubs with rigorous scrutiny by City officers required to ensure its accuracy.

The initial consultation that occurred with the user groups led to the conclusion that a single, larger multi use facility which is probably the ideal result was not particularly practical in this instance. However, in undertaking additional work the opportunity exists to investigate the possibility of developing a new facility that can incorporate other groups as well, such as the Roleystone Football Club.

Asset Condition

The current building is in need of work and requires some improvements. It is timely to consider replacing the building in the short term with a facility that better serves the local community.

Conclusion

Along with availability of funding through contributions from the lead club, the condition of this asset is a trigger for the pavilion works to occur. The project has been ranked as a priority 1 to be completed in the short term with an indicative cost of \$770,000. Immediate further feasibility analysis is recommended.