

## CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Formal consultation on the Draft Park Lands Community Buildings (Sport and Recreation) Policy Consultation occurred between 20 October 2023 and 27 November 2023.

### Feedback received included:

- 19 written responses
- 82 survey responses
- 125 quick poll responses

This was enabled by:

- Council's Your Say page
- Notification of consultation via the Government Gazette, The Advertiser and Council's website
- Community sessions
- Signage on Park Lands community sports buildings
- Direct emails and phone calls to key stakeholders

### What we heard?

From the 82 survey responses, we heard:

- 78% of respondents agreed with the performance criteria relating to fit for purpose facilities for local community sport
- 66% of respondents agreed with the performance criteria relating to prioritising no net loss of Park Lands, while suggesting there needed to be some flexibility to enable fit for purpose facilities
- 75% of respondents agreed with the performance criteria relating to sustainable development

- 47% of respondents agreed with the performance criteria relating to welcoming and accessible facilities, while 46% disagreed due to concerns about a lack of car parking and/or conflicting criteria regarding low scale built form, fit for purpose facilities and no net loss of Park Lands
- 73% of respondents agreed with the performance criteria relating to equitable co-funding

From the 125 quick poll responses, we heard:

- 89% of respondents ranked 'designed to fulfil its purpose' as the highest priority for community sports buildings
- 88% of respondents ranked 'minimal building size and scale' as the lowest priority

From the 19 written responses, we heard:

- Strong support for replacing existing sports buildings with fit for purpose shared facilities
- Support for co-funding with several organisations indicating a desire to partner with the City of Adelaide
- Concerns about no additional car parking, no loss of trees and no net loss of Park Lands (in the context of providing fit for purpose facilities)

## Primary Themes

The primary emerging themes from all points of feedback received (surveys and written responses):

### Fit for Purpose Buildings:

There was strong support to replace existing sports buildings in the Park Lands with new community sports buildings that were fit for purpose in relation to the facilities and users that they were intended to service.

### Quality Design:

There was strong support for new community sports buildings to be inclusive, safe, environmentally sustainable and accessible.

### Shared Facilities:

There was strong support to create shared facilities that serviced multiple sporting groups and non-sporting community use.

### Co-funding Essential:

There was strong support for co-funding of community sports buildings, with multiple references to quality design buildings being beyond the financial capacity of community organisations.

### Greater Flexibility:

Multiple respondents did not agree with the policy regarding:

- no additional car parking, with suggestions that car parking be provided on permeable surfaces
- no loss of trees, with suggestions that any loss of trees be replaced with new plantings to achieve an overall net increase
- no net loss of Park Lands was deemed unrealistic in the context of replacing existing building footprint with fit for purpose shared facilities, with suggestions for multi-level buildings and an overall reduction in the number of Park Lands buildings

## Competing Objectives:

Multiple respondents indicated that the policy objectives of creating fit for purpose shared facilities, no net loss of Park Lands and low scale single level buildings to optimise accessibility, were conflicting.

## Secondary Themes

The secondary emerging themes from all points of feedback received (surveys and written responses):

### Spectator Facilities:

Some respondents questioned the practicality of spectator facilities being temporary, citing a critical link between spectators and recruiting volunteers and new participants.

### Elite Competition:

Some respondents sought clarification of what was meant by 'elite' competition and didn't agree that it should be excluded.

## Context

The objective of the Draft Park Lands Community Buildings (Sport and Recreation) Policy is to guide the replacement of existing community sports infrastructure on the Adelaide Park Lands, with a particular focus on City of Adelaide owned community sports buildings that are (or proposed to be) leased to external community organisations.

The Draft Policy is underpinned by five guiding principles and related performance criteria, derived from a series of Council and Kadaltilla / Adelaide Park Lands Authority workshops and reports between May and August 2023.

Feedback was sought on the Draft Policy to inform its final composition before it is presented to Council in March 2024 for adoption.

## Use of Feedback

Public consultation on the Draft Park Lands Community Buildings (Sport and Recreation) Policy occurred between 20 October and 27 November 2023.

Consultation findings along with a revised Policy will be presented to Kadaltilla / Adelaide Park Lands Authority in February 2024 and Council in March 2024 for adoption.

As part of considering the Policy for adoption, Council Administration will seek Council support for a budget allocation in the 2024/25 Business Plan and Budget to commence implementation of the Policy over seven financial years (2024/25 to 2030/31).

## Survey Responses

The City of Adelaide provides an online Your Say community engagement platform that enables the sharing of information, and capture and collation of feedback from the community.

82 community members and organisations indicated their views on specific elements of the Draft Park Lands Community Buildings (Sport and Recreation) Policy and contributed further comments through an on-line survey.


### Respondents

Respondents were able to provide select demographic information in submitting a survey.

**Ratepayers:** 17% (14) identified as a ratepayer of the City of Adelaide.


**Residents:** City Residents – 14; Other – 68

### Respondent Age




- 13 respondents or 16% are aged between 25 and 35.
- 24 respondents or 30% are aged between 36 and 45.
- 23 respondents or 29% are aged between 46 and 55.
- 10 respondents or 13% are aged between 56 and 65.
- 10 respondents or 13% are aged between 66 and 75.

Are you associated with and/or a member of an organisation that leases sports facilities in the Park Lands?



67 respondents or 82% are associated with and/or a member of an organisation that leases sports facilities in the Park Lands.


## Respondent Gender



60 respondents or 73% identified as male, 20 respondents or 24% identified as female, and 2 respondents or 2% identified as other identity.

## Feedback summary of survey responses

**Chart 1: To what extent do you agree/disagree with Performance Criteria 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 of the Draft Policy relating to fit for purpose facilities to support local community sport?**




- 65 respondents or 78% indicated that they agree with the draft performance criteria.
- 11 respondents or 13% indicated they do not agree with the draft performance criteria.

In answering this question, respondents made the following observations:

- The application of 'fit for purpose' needs to align with the location and users (eg one set of change rooms per oval).
- It will not be possible to meet community sporting standards within existing building footprints. Achieving fit for purpose facilities should take precedence.
- The requirements of spectators (eg family members, supporters) need to be considered and some spectator facilities should be permanent.
- Don't exclude 'elite' sport.
- Accessibility to inclusive and safe facilities is important.

**Chart 2: To what extent do you agree/disagree with Performance Criteria 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 of the Draft Policy relating to prioritising no net loss of Park Lands?**




- 54 respondents or 66% indicated that they agree with the draft performance criteria.
- 15 respondents or 18% indicated they do not agree with the draft performance criteria due to the lack of flexibility around footprint supporting fit for purpose facilities.

In answering this question, respondents made the following observations:

- Replacing existing inadequate and unsafe buildings for better buildings will be a positive outcome for the community and the Park Lands.
- There needs to be some flexibility on footprint, as it's unrealistic to achieve fit for purpose facilities for multiple users without some increase in built form.

**Chart 3: To what extent do you agree/disagree with Performance Criteria 3.1 and 3.2 of the Draft Policy relating to sustainable development?**




- 61 respondents or 75% indicated that they agree with the draft performance criteria.
- 6 respondents or 17% indicated they do not agree with the draft performance criteria.

In answering this question, respondents made the following observations:

- Preferable to replant additional trees rather than require no loss of existing trees in developing new facilities in the Park Lands.
- Environmental sustainability is an essential element of any new Park Lands building.
- Achieving environmental sustainability will require greater investment by the City of Adelaide, as the upfront investment will be beyond the capacity of community organisations.
- There are benefits in incorporating soft landscape treatments (eg local indigenous plants) in the development of new buildings in the Park Lands.



**Chart 4: To what extent do you agree/disagree with Performance Criteria 4.1 and 4.2 of the Draft Policy relating to welcoming and accessible facilities?**




- 39 respondents or 47% indicated that they agree with the draft performance criteria.
- 37 respondents or 46% indicated they do not agree with the draft performance criteria.

In answering this question, respondents made the following observations:

- Accessibility is an essential element of any new Park Lands building and single level designs are the best way to achieve this. However, two level buildings are a better solution for achieving fit for purpose facilities containing spectator amenities, while limiting encroachment on the Park Lands.
- There is a need for car parking to support use of Park Lands facilities, which could be provided utilising permeable surfaces.
- There was some support for indented parking on the fringe of Park Lands.

**Chart 5: To what extent do you agree/disagree with Performance Criteria 5.1 of the Draft Policy relating to equitable co-funding?**



- 62 respondents or 76% indicated that they agree with the draft performance criteria.
- 8 respondents or 10% indicated they do not agree with the draft performance criteria.

In answering this question, respondents made the following observations:

- It is essential that community facilities are co-funded.
- While some supported the proposed co-funding model, some did not agree with co-funding of independent schools, citing City of Adelaide funding needed to benefit the wider community.
- Need to clarify what the process will be when a Park Lands sports building is not co-funded.

## Additional Feedback

While not a requirement in submitting a survey, each respondent was provided an opportunity to provide further feedback in response to their answers to the survey.

45 respondents or 55% took an opportunity to provide additional feedback. Below is a summary of this feedback:

- Many respondents welcomed that the City of Adelaide was developing a policy to address inadequate facilities in the Park Lands and the need for fit for purpose facilities.
- The Park Lands should contain community facilities equal to, if not better than facilities provided elsewhere.
- While acknowledging buildings in the Park Lands required improving, some respondents raised concerns about the condition of playing fields and lighting.
- Clarification was required on what constituted elite competition.
- Some statements were unclear or ambiguous (eg secondary use, non-sporting, core elements).


A full copy of all survey responses is provided in Attachment B.

## Quick Poll Responses

The City of Adelaide provides an online Your Say community engagement platform that enables the sharing of information, and capture and collation of feedback from the community.

Through an on-line quick poll, 125 community members and organisations rated five key features of a community sports building in the Park Lands, from highest to lowest priority.

**Chart 6: Highest to lowest priority of key Park Lands community sports building features**



### Respondents

Respondents were able to provide select demographic information in submitting a quick poll response.

**Ratepayers:** 30% (37) identified as a ratepayer of the City of Adelaide.

### Feedback summary

111 respondents or 89% rated 'designed to fulfil its purpose' as the highest priority for community sports buildings in the Park Lands.

105 respondents or 88% rated 'minimal building size and scale' as the lowest priority.

## Written Responses

An opportunity was provided to write in (email and post) general submissions, separate to the surveys provided.

19 community members and organisations took an opportunity to do so. Four of these submissions were received outside the formal consultation period, however an extension was provided to allow these to be received.

A full copy of the submissions is provided in Attachment C.

### Respondents

Written responses were received from:

- Adelaide Comets Football Club
- Adelaide Community Sports and Recreation Association
- Adelaide Lutheran Sports Club
- Adelaide Park Lands Association
- Adelaide University Sport and Fitness
- Australian Institute of Landscape Architects
- Committee for Adelaide
- Green Adelaide
- Heather Nimmo
- John Bridgland
- John Panagaris
- Matt Schmidt
- Noris Ioannou
- Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing
- Pembroke
- SANFL
- Torrens Rowing Club
- Urban Development Institute of Australia
- Wilderness School

### Feedback summary

Below is a summary of the 19 written responses:

#### **Co-funding**

- Support for co-funding, with suggestions that higher co-funding contributions were required to offset the requirement for high environmental performing buildings and a suggestion to link co-funding to the proportion of publicly accessible space.
- Several organisations indicated a desire to partner with the City of Adelaide in co-funding new facilities.
- References to the City of Adelaide needing to be a partner in any construction on the Park Lands, while others indicated that the role of lessees in the design and delivery of facilities shouldn't be diminished where they had capacity.

## Buildings

- Support for the replacement of existing Park Lands buildings, with suggestions to aim for a reduction in the number of buildings overall.
- Support for multi-use facilities, but questions on how multi-use/shared facilities would be managed.
- Strong support for fit for purpose facilities that are safe and inclusive, while acknowledging that it was unrealistic to achieve fit for purpose facilities and not increase built form.
- Suggestion to recommend use of materials and colours that blend with the 'Park Lands' setting (as opposed to a 'natural' setting).
- Suggestion to reference terms 'water sensitive urban design' and 'biodiversity sensitive urban design'.

## Supporting Infrastructure

- Extend hours of use of the Park Lands through investment in sports lighting.
- Suggestion that spectator facilities 'should' rather than 'must' be temporary, while others questioned why they needed to be temporary, citing a link between spectators and recruiting volunteers and new participants.

## Other

- Request to define 'elite' competition, noting that some facilities in the Park Lands service competition higher than a local level.
- Some respondents did not agree with the Draft Policy regarding:
  - no additional car parking (proposed car parking permeable surfaces)
  - no loss of trees (proposed a net increase in trees through new plantings)
  - no net loss of Park Lands (unduly restrictive)
  - not stating that new buildings must be shared or allow public use
- Several respondents were concerned that the policy did not reference increased participation in female sport.