

Attachment B - Draft Park Lands Community Buildings (Sport and Recreation) Policy – Consultation Submissions

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?

Community run and supported facilities are generally short on funds and their members are generally excited and look forward to attending to participate and meet others - so excluding professional/business organisations is reasonable.

Performance Criteria 1.2 – Must be for community sport participation, excluding elite competition. Non-sporting activities may be a secondary use.

Community sporting spectator facilities secondary to day-to-day use must be temporary.

As a coach at the Adelaide Comets Football Club that used Ellis Park in the West Parklands I strongly disagree with the criteria 1.2. The club has a fantastic newly built facility and has spend a lot of money on a new start of the art pitch for our senior teams to use. Over the past 8 years they have had to play senior games at Santos Stadium and more recently Service FM stadium, The club needs to have a location where all teams play as one. I have 4 kids that play there so to have one play at Service FM is not ideal.

The club also needs fencing and a grandstand of some sort to encourage spectators to attend its senior games and matches. Making these temporary is far from ideal as it relies on volunteers to have to set this up for each game.

The recent women's world cup in Australia saw both China and France utilise the new pitch and facilities of the club. Any decision to allow for general use would see the quality of both significantly diminish

Why is it that the Karen Rolton Oval just a couple hundred meters to the north in the parklands is allowed to have permanent picket fence around its oval and hundreds of car parks. Is this because it is used for football and cricket?? Ellis park has next to no car parks relative to the number of kids involved in playing soccer at the club. This is embarrassing for visiting teams and our own parents who struggle to find safe close parks near to where their children are playing

I agree that ensuring a community facility is fit for purpose should take precedent over the existing footprint. Often, these buildings need to comply with minimum space requirements for change rooms, equipment rooms, social space etc

Sporting Clubs have done well in maintaining areas and making them more accessible for the sporting clubs and community use. At time though these areas are disregarded by a minority. In order to preserve, further enhance and entice professional and recreational users, in keeping with the surroundings, fencing should be allowed (as used by SACA at the Karen Rolton Oval). it is evident from some of the Southern Parklands that are not maintained or leased to sporting clubs that these areas look detrimental and unenticing. furthermore, parklands given to horses, making them inaccessible, should be the councils priority.

Upgrade to Ellis park to let Adelaide Comets play their senior games at home and promote City goers to watch and enjoy the games.

Minimal requirements supporting local community organisations is good

1.2 secondary use is unclear. Weddings, parties, anything?

1.3 community infrastructure within a sports facility hierarchy. Hierarchies are not uniform, nor do they behave consistently. Do the park lands need AFL style hierarchies and their business ethos? Lawyer up.

I broadly support the principles however the stipulation "Community sporting spectator facilities secondary to day-to-day use must be temporary" is unreasonable for some sports. Competitive soccer at a senior level requires a barrier between the grounds and spectators, and a fence to control spectator access. Provisioning these on a temporary basis is impractical and expensive. Tennis courts and basketball courts in the parklands are fenced for convenience without contributing to the game, the same should be selectively applied to soccer pitches.

All of these buildings are and sporting courts with locked gates and no access to the general public are extremely disappointing to see and be around

I think the policy does cover the needs of sporting and recreational uses of the parklands to have permanent support structures.

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?

Minimising hard surfaces is vital, ensuring only sports buildings are constructed to ensure no net gain in building footprint (sport does need buildings there; but many other rec/community activities could be located elsewhere), and living irrigated turf is a must (no artificial should be permitted, but also high priority to actually ensure grass is well irrigated and parklands are green not brown). No fancy buildings needed, just simple environmentally-sustainable/friendly ones to meet local sport needs.

Performance criteria 1.3 "'core' elements of local level provision" is a little vague and potentially open to misinterpretation.

I concur that prioritizing the suitability of a community facility should override the preservation of its current layout. Frequently, these structures must adhere to minimum space standards for areas such as changing rooms, equipment storage, and social spaces. Emphasizing facilities that encourage the use of parklands should be a top priority, as heightened utilization correlates with increased safety and cleanliness of the parklands.

Facilities should be fit for purpose.

Is 1.2 in conflict with 2.3 "Link internal common areas to covered outdoor areas to maximise 'sheltered' community spaces for community gatherings."

Buildings should be about encouraging community sport. But that does not mean that new and better ideas should not be looked at, particularly if it helps improve the quality of the park lands and helps more people access/enjoy them.

Community sport is important to many people across the community. As the population grows demand will grow. Facilities need to be able to cope with this future demand. They should also be fit for purpose- there are numerous examples of recently built sports facilities across metro Adelaide, that are not suitable and have clearly not considered the needs of all users (including spectators of sports) and/or future demand.

I am not sure what this means - "New community buildings will not exceed the 'core' elements of local provision. Council will plan for and support the provision of community infrastructure in the Park Lands that is fit for purpose at a local level within a sports facility hierarchy." - there are quite a few terms in there that require definition in order to properly comment. What is meant by "local?" What is meant by "sports facility hierarchy?"

bring in people to the CBD. make the parklands accessible to all

We can not meet facility standards within current foot print. We are currently limited by the number of facilities to expand into junior sport. This is particularly relevant with the expansion of Botanic High and our cooperative plans to work together on junior sport as they have limited green space.

Our facility needs to cater for male/female sport, junior/senior sport, multiple codes eg cricket, football, soccer, netball etc. We also share our facilities with many other clubs, associations and schools which involves other activities (eg ultimate frisbee, /sports days). As a result, a fit for purpose facility needs to cater for all of this (including change room requirements of peak bodies), umpires/officials, trainers/first aid, a myriad of storage, meeting rooms and sufficient space to provide a safe, secure social space for spectators, parents/grandparents, and the general community

We (or the council) need to ensure you are supporting the tenants and the visitors to the city.

Give the people what they want! and need!!

Need fit for purpose facilities for a variety of activities

The definition of elite sports is pertinent here. All of the "elite" touch football played in the parklands is elite in quality only - players and officials are all unpaid, and community participation is welcomed. Having access to shop, changeroom and toilet facilities at the Park 17 building is of great importance to this competition.

Sporting clubs should be able to have new facilities or upgrades as this is a way to support a healthy lifestyle. It is very important to use the open spaces to relieve the emotional rollercoaster life is.

There shouldn't be any limitations or restrictions on sporting clubs using parklands, including and not limited to, existing or new clubs. Furthermore, no limitations on any enhancements required to sustain the club's future.

Needs to be fit for purpose

With any Facility, the priority should be to design it to be fit-for-purpose to ensure it is adequate to accommodate whatever variety of activities are carried out at the location. The size of the facilities needs to such that it provides a safe social space for all users an spectators.

Old building not wheelchair access able

We urgently need fit for purpose buildings for the wide range of sports and recreation activities that take place in the Parklands, particularly for junior football and cricket and women's sport.

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?

A fit-for-purpose facility should be the entire point of any facility enhancements to ensure a return on social investment for ratepayers, facility users, and CoA council. Key areas the facilities need to cater for include safe change areas for people of all genders and ages, functional use needs (i.e. storage + amenities for sporting organisation, spectators, and parkland visitors), and accessibility.

Facilities need to meet the needs of those bodies involved in their use, particularly in the current climate of providing safe and appropriate rooms for women and children involved in sport.

The non-sporting activity section is a little ambiguous. Is it a time based thing?

Minimise hard surface surrounds - does this factor in Principle 2 or is this more of a temporary thing?

With numerous sporting activities currently using these parklands there is not enough suitable, up to standard facilities to accommodate the number of users currently using these. Includes very sub standard amenities such as toilets, female shower facilities, storage, trainers rooms and a safe place for spectators of all ages.

The facility needs to cater for a wide range of sporting and community needs so that it can be used by the maximal amount of people. This includes netball, football, cricket and other sports for women, men and junior codes. These sports all have a wide range of people involved from players, coaches, umpires, trainers and spectators for which the facility needs to be suitable. Sufficient storage, meeting rooms and accessibility is also paramount.

I agree we need to ensure there is a community facility that is fit for purpose and should take precedence over the existing footprint. These buildings need to comply with minimum space requirements for change rooms, equipment rooms, social space otherwise they do not serve the purpose of the community.

Activating the parklands for the benefit of the community is super important

The proposed facility needs to be 'fit-for-purpose' to ensure it adequately meets the variety and scale of activities at a given location. This should include sufficiently catering for male/female sport, junior/senior sport, multiple codes eg. cricket, football, soccer, netball etc. There is also a need to make the facility accommodating to a variety of other clubs, associations, schools to carry out a variety of sports and activities where the space can be vibrant for all. As a result, a fit for purpose facility needs to cater for all of this (including change room requirements of peak bodies), umpires/officials, trainers/first aid, a myriad of storage, meeting rooms and sufficient space to provide a safe, secure social space for spectators, parents/grandparents, and the general community.

All facilities must be fit for purpose. Our facilities are not fit for purpose on many levels including for females and males (not available at the same time), handicapped, safe and secure.

This includes being usable as a Club facility as well as a sporting facility, including open areas for functions, meetings, meals, gatherings and the like, a catering kitchen and bar facilities. Bar facilities allow most Clubs to raise funds to allow the ongoing running of the club and the sports involved.

a 'fit-for-purpose' facility needs to ensure adequate facilities for the variety and scale of activities at a given location. For example, our facility needs to cater for male/female sports, junior/senior sports, and multiple codes eg cricket, football, soccer, netball etc - this is just for ALSC needs! We also share our facilities with many other clubs, associations and schools which involve other activities (eg ultimate frisbee, /sports days). As a result, a fit-for-purpose facility needs to cater for all of this (including change room requirements of peak bodies), umpires/officials, trainers/first aid, a myriad of storage, meeting rooms and sufficient space to provide a safe, secure social space for spectators, parents/grandparents, and the general community.

Replacement of old, unsafe, inadequate buildings is critical, and priority ought to be given to supporting new facilities that are fit for purpose and cater for multiple sports, activities and community user groups.

Smart, well-designed two-storey buildings are an obvious solution to managing building footprint while still providing facilities that are 'fit for purpose'.

In certain circumstances where on-street parking is both limited (eg clearways) and dangerous given the amount of traffic (eg Goodwood Rd), reasonable car parking be supported. Such car parking can be on permeable surfaces and is not difficult to design and manage in a way that protects the parklands. I note that parking is available for netball courts across the road from the ALSC ovals at no charge and no loss of the parklands and that ACC allows parking on the ovals during the annual Adelaide Show, so this must mean that parking is an acceptable use of the parklands.

" Community sporting spectator facilities secondary to day-to-day use must be temporary. " This sounds counterproductive to me and

I am interested to understand what this means in practice.

I hope it's not a case ofLet's renew Park Lands sporting facilities so more people will come but let's make sure it's still terrible so no one will come.

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?

A 'fit-for-purpose' facility needs to ensure adequate facilities for the variety and scale of activities at a given location. For example, our facility needs to cater for male/female sport, junior/senior sport and multiple sporting codes (for example cricket, football, soccer and netball). All this is just for our club's needs! We also share our facilities with many other clubs, associations and schools which involves other activities (for example ultimate frisbee and sports days). As a result, a fit for purpose facility needs to cater for all of this (including change room requirements of peak bodies), umpires/officials, trainers/first aid, multiple storage and meeting rooms and importantly also sufficient space to provide a safe, secure social space for spectators, parents/grandparents, and the general community.

It is vital for the good health, physical and mental, of the community to have facilities that are fit for purpose- meaning that they are inclusive for all genders, ages and ableness.

See Bridgland PDF response linked to this survey form, mailed same date (22/11/23) to yoursay@cityofadelaide.com.au

The sporting facilities in the south park lands are dated and inadequate for current expectations and use. Moreover they are an embarrassment to Council. Adequate facilities to cater for the variety and scale of sport in the parklands is essential. The facilities need to also cater for officials, first aid, and room for community engagement not only players. It is important to note that most facilities are shared spaces used by a number of clubs and organisations.

A facility which is fit-for-purpose needs to cater for the variety and scale of activities - male/female sport, junior/senior sport, multiple codes (eg cricket, football, soccer, netball etc), umpires, change room requirements for peak bodies, trainers and first aid, meeting rooms, and have sufficient space to provide a safe, secure social space for spectators, parents/grandparents, and the general community.

a 'fit-for-purpose' facility needs to ensure adequate facilities for the variety and scale of activities at a given location. TH. For example, our facility needs to cater for male/female sport, junior/senior sport, multiple codes eg cricket, football, soccer, netball etc - this is just for ALSC needs! We also share our facilities with many other clubs, associations and schools which involves other activities (eg ultimate frisbee, /sports days). As a result, a fit for purpose facility needs to cater for all of this (including change room requirements of peak bodies), umpires/officials, trainers/first aid, a myriad of storage, meeting rooms and sufficient space to provide a safe, secure social space for spectators, parents/grandparents, and the general community.

'fit-for-purpose' facility needs to ensure adequate facilities for the variety and scale of activities at a given location. For example, our facility needs to cater for male/female sport, junior/senior sport, multiple codes eg cricket, football, soccer, netball etc - this is just for ALSC needs! We also share our facilities with many other clubs, associations and schools which involves other activities (eg ultimate frisbee, /sports days). As a result, a fit for purpose facility needs to cater for all of this (including change room requirements of peak bodies), umpires/officials, trainers/first aid, a myriad of storage, meeting rooms and sufficient space to provide a safe, secure social space for spectators, parents/grandparents, and the general community.

The community buildings need to supply facilities which are suitable for the users

A "fit-for-purpose" facility at the given location will help the community sports club, schools and other associations using it.

The parklands should be available for a variety of purposes, including sport and as such needs adequate, fit for purpose facilities to enable that for everyone to be involved. The sporting facilities currently in place in some areas are disgusting and as a female with a baby, there needs to be improvements made so there is somewhere for not only players and officials to change, but somewhere dry and safe, with adequate facilities for people like me to take our children to spectate.

a 'fit-for-purpose' facility needs to ensure adequate facilities for the variety and scale of activities at a given location.

The Parklands were designed for all types of recreation and for this to happen, up to standard facilities need to be in place.

Should not be exclusive for "Sport" as there are other community uses which may not be considered sport that would be appropriate.

Should not exclude "elite level". This is not inclusive. Should be for all levels. Further, elite level sport also attracts community interest through attendance, which would only improve the use.

Also the term "core elements" is not defined and vague. Clubs should be allowed to make submissions and should be considered on their merit, even if breaches core elements of local level provisions. Often and improved provision is completely suitable and appropriate considering growth in a particular sport, or how that area of the parklands has evolved.

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?

i see no logical reason to restrict sporting facilities to accommodating only for 'community sport' we have an opportunity to showcase our sports in well planned and designed facilities on our parklands (as seen with adelaide oval and the SACA cricket stadium). community and elite sport should be able to coexist and our parklands are the perfect place for this to happen (subject to appropriate scale and thoughtful design of facilities).

Agree with the ability to service outdoor community sport, however, with community sport comes community spectatorship and involvement. Facilities should be inclusive and facilitate all aspects of community sport at all times - for example, those who do not or can not play, should be able to participate in the wider club and family atmosphere through spectating and social events, such as those held in permanent club rooms/facilities. If these are only temporary outside of day to day use, this reduces the inclusivity and involvement of the wider club communities. Going above and beyond (ie. exceeding only 'core elements') for club facilities should be in consultation with and at discretion of the sporting club - it may be these elements that attract more players, staff, club members and widen our sporting community, which has a significant positive impact on the physical and mental health and well-being of whoever is involved. The people who use the facilities know what they need best and this should not be overruled by council who do not use these facilities day to day or otherwise. If a facility is made to be fit for purpose with 'core elements' only and not optimised for the use of the club and community with added elements, then this discourages clubs from using the parklands and working with Adelaide City Council due to the perceived difficulties and lack of involvement and optimisation to the facility's purpose.

I think this balance is important particularly the 'fit-for-purpose' aspect. If the facility being developed doesn't have adequate facilities for the variety and scale of activities using it then it is a waste of the whole process. For example, I am involved with Adelaide Lutheran Sports Club and for our club alone we need new facilities to cater for a wide range covering male/female sport, junior/senior sport, multiple codes eg cricket, football, soccer, netball etc - and that is just for ALSC club needs! We then share our facilities with many other clubs, associations and schools which involves other activities (eg ultimate frisbee, /sports days). As a result, a fit for purpose facility needs to cater for all of this (including change room requirements of peak bodies), umpires/officials, trainers/first aid, a myriad of storage, meeting rooms and sufficient space to provide a safe, secure social space for spectators, parents/grandparents, and the general community. If only the balanced infrastructure footprint part of Principle 1 was prioritised then the resulting developed facility would likely not meet the needs of the full user group and the investment put in to redevelop would not be efficient to support the sports community.

It needs to cater for male/female, junior/senior, and multiple sports.

The Performance Criteria generally align with the needs of a public high school in the Parklands.

Changerooms, toilets and some storage areas are required for "non -elite" competitions to be "fit for purpose". School students do not generally access or use showers before or after sport. Sporting clubs which use the sports fields are generally very happy to have playing fields and courts to play their sport. The option of showers has never been an issue with any club or organization requiring playing fields.

At the moment schools would prioritize shade structures covering outdoor areas namely netball, tennis and handball for infrastructure requirements.

The Community Buildings Policy may need to have some clarity regarding free standing shade structures.

Servicing outdoor community sport is a key part of public education which has a symbiotic relationship with the community to provide outdoor playing fields.

Schools generally cater very well for a broad range of sports and are open to providing these facilities.

Facilities need to ensure adequate facilities for the variety and scale of activities at a given location. For example, we play Ultimate frisbee out of the Lutheran clubrooms, and as a female i have to walk through the urinal to get things from the store room, and for anyone to access the toilets, they have to walk through the changerrooms.

A 'fit-for-purpose' facility needs to ensure adequate facilities for the variety and scale of activities at a given location. For example, our facility needs to cater for male/female sport, junior/senior sport, multiple codes eg cricket, football, soccer, netball, ultimate frisbee etc As a result, a fit for purpose facility needs to cater for all of this (including change room requirements of peak bodies), umpires/officials, trainers/first aid, a myriad of storage, meeting rooms and sufficient space to provide a safe, secure social space for spectators, parents/grandparents, and the general community.

Please refer to submission from Pembroke School

A 'fit-for-purpose' facility needs to ensure adequate facilities for the variety and scale of activities at the Lutheran Football and South Australian Flying Disk Association. Our facility needs to cater for male/female sport, junior/senior sport, multiple codes eg cricket, football, soccer, netball, ultimate frisbee. As a result, a fit for purpose facility needs to cater for all of this (including change room requirements of peak bodies), umpires/officials, trainers/first aid, a myriad of storage, meeting rooms and sufficient

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?

space to provide a safe, secure social space for spectators, parents/grandparents, and the general community. At the moment as a female Ultimate frisbee player I feel unsafe in the poorly lit and isolating club rooms.

facilities should be as multipurpose as possible for sport and community, but not for functions and events
good design and sustainability v imp

The policy should support organised sport - ie amateur cricket, football, soccer etc
Organised sport is a major user of the parklands
The definition of community sport should be revised to take in amateur sport

It is important to keep the parklands with as much green space as possible but also to allow for sport and recreation opportunities to occur. By having facilities which are not in continual use it allows for greater use by the local residents.

- SANFL supports the Core Elements of the Draft Policy in line with AFL Preferred Community Facilities Guidelines <https://sanfl.com.au/communityfootball/grants-fundraising-facilities/>
- The AFL Preferred Community Football Guidelines (the Guidelines) documents the requirements for fit for purpose community level football facilities. Implementation of these guidelines must be met to achieve funding program agreements.
- The required building footprint and scale is governed by the Guidelines and can be implemented in such a way that increases the visual amenity of Park Lands in comparison to the existing dilapidated building infrastructure.
- A Performance Criteria should be included that provides for one set of change rooms (1 x home team and 1 x away team) to be allocated per oval.
- An example that delivered these outcomes is Park 9 (Bundeys Paddock). SANFL, Prince Alfred Old Collegians FC worked closely with City of Adelaide and the Park Lands Authority to achieve all stakeholders desired outcomes and produced an excellent result. The original building was not functional, didn't meet guidelines and whilst there was a modest increase in footprint, the resulting visual amenity is excellent. The built form, landscaping and community access has provided a quality outcome for both participation and Park Lands overall. This project is a demonstration of how stakeholders can work together to achieve great outcomes.

n/a please see Question 11

SACA is supportive of the City of Adelaide providing "fit for purpose facilities". It is acknowledged that most buildings in the Adelaide Park Lands were constructed before consideration was given to design elements that are now required and/or expected of community facilities, including:

- gender inclusive change rooms and amenities
- separate change room facilities for officials
- adequate storage space for contemporary sports and safety equipment
- separate spectator amenities
- common areas
- kiosks with adequate food preparation and storage space
- universal access
- environmental sustainable design (ESD)

SACA acknowledges that the Adelaide Park Lands play a very important role in providing for the open space needs of metropolitan Adelaide. This balanced role includes providing opportunities for organised sport such as cricket. School, social and community cricket is regularly played throughout the Adelaide Park Lands during the week and particularly on weekends.

SACA acknowledges that one of the key functions of the Adelaide Park Lands is to provide the opportunity for the community to participate in recreational activities, such as cricket.

On any given week, there are approximately 470 cricketers playing club cricket within the Adelaide Park Lands (not including school cricket). Female participation rates for

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?

cricket are continually increasing and it is envisaged that there will be a significant increase in demand for female friendly facilities. There is also an additional approximately 500 cricketers (cricket season) 500 footballers (football season) per week training and playing at Gladys Elphick / Narnungga (Park 25) precinct Along with cricket players, there are volunteers, supporters, parents and carers that utilise cricket facilities. There is an increasing demand for cricket ovals within the Adelaide Park Lands. This results on increase demand for associated cricket facilities such as changerooms, practice nets etc.

In relation to Performance Criteria 1.2, SACA supports that the majority of participation be community based however the criteria should not exclude other levels of sport which have the potential to provide significant benefits for the City of Adelaide, its residents, businesses and local community by way of social, tourism and economic as well as provide for a more activated, thriving and vibrant City.

This would also support the Adelaide Park Lands Management Strategy (APLMS) 2015 – 2025 and strengthening the role of the Park Lands as a regional destination for competitive sport and a variety of active and passive forms of recreation (Strategy 1.6)

With reference to Performance Criteria 1.3, - when planning for the provision of changerooms, guidelines require one set of changerooms per one oval. Therefore, new community buildings should cater for the appropriate number of changerooms in (1 set of 2 changerooms per oval) in accordance with the number of ovals. The provision of one set of changerooms per oval provides for a safe environment for people to change in and use amenities such as toilets and showers as required. With more and more focus on 'child safe' environments, these facilities become more increasingly important and relied upon.

The emphasis should be on "fit for purpose" sporting infrastructure that provides benefit to those activities which relate directly to the sport. This should exclude the social areas which are not "core" to playing sport which increase the size and purpose of the buildings.

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

We agree with the minimisation of loss, however given the size of sporting facilities and the function required to be fit for purpose, some flexibility or tolerance is required. Removal of existing buildings may reduce the ability for other grounds to be utilised due to the location of an upgraded facility. The inclusion of function and accessibility described in 4.1 requires flexibility of footprint.

Criteria 2.2 may be too restrictive. Suggest rewording from:

"Community buildings will service multiple users and uses"

to

"Community buildings should service multiple users and uses"

There are many uses and needs that the community has and it may be that in the future alternate uses can be identified, but that should not preclude that organisation from being setup - someone has to be first.

More car parking required for facilities that are built in the park lands. Ellis Park the home of the Adelaide Comets shares its tiny car park with the general public, Adelaide HS and the running club at the best of times. No line marking in the car park makes its ridiculous as people often park across what should be 2 car parks. How hard is it to provide some decent line making in this area?

Minimising the footprint to ensure the building meets the sporting requirement is paramount, but this should not mean that no net loss of parklands is prioritised. Often an old building has been built with no concept of what the modern space requirements are and so it doesn't make sense to be constricted to that old footprint. Keeping the footprint small is also difficult once spaces are being used across multiple sport disciplines. Shared spaces often need more storage space, kitchen space and there are conflicting space requirements across various sporting codes.

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

As long as the building serve the full purposes of the planned activities and are in keeping with the design appearance criteria then it is a positive. removing old buildings to create better functioning spaces is great. removal of trees is not an issue if new planting is undertaken to replace these

Minimal footprint to achieve purpose is preferred.

Buildings must be for use of multiple community organisations

Scale of all building should be minimal

2.1 footprint 'fit for purpose' will be vigorously argued, another lawyers' picnic and sustained wave of pressure informed by developer ethics, buckets of money, lobbying and media pressure. NB conflicts of interest and transparency due to 'commercial in confidence'. There appears to be no height limit. Not good enough to say this will be argued case by case.

2.2 define community organisation. Does it include religious groups, political parties?

2.3 low-scale integrated design, visually 'discrete' means separate, apart, not blending with natural surroundings. 'Discreet' means low-key, not obtrusive, so better for park lands. If the language is not clear, it WILL be weaponised.

Guidelines on transparency ethics more safely sourced from SA's ICAC, rather than hiring a consultancy. See 'The Big Con' by Mazzucato and Collington.

Once again in principle "no net loss" sounds reasonable but it is ridiculously naïve. It prioritises maintaining an arbitrary status quo ignoring the changing needs of the community. The current infrastructure is the product of over 150 years of development. Keeping the same footprint assumes that the current foot print is correct for community needs - based on what evidence? "No net loss" is an easy way for the council to avoid having to make hard decisions to prioritise development and investment, instead of looking to community needs and opportunities to improve the amenity of the parklands for everyone's benefit.

Closed gates and no public toilet access, general public locked out of our own parklands facilities. It's a shame that these organisations can't provide some general public facilities as part of their lease agreements

No net loss? This goal is not consistent with the purpose of creating facilities that are appropriate and which activate parks and offer a reason for people to use them. To require no net loss of parklands invites meaningless and costly argument and negotiation. I think common sense should prevail here and the commitment should be for minimising the space required and the term 'no net loss' should be removed.

I refer to the recent book A History of South Australia. Paul Sendziuk and Robert Foster. The authors state that there was an abundance of open space in the Adelaide plains at the time immediately after the European settlement. As well, people had more leisure time at their disposal and community leaders sought activities for them. The solution was a series of Government financed buildings to house libraries, meeting rooms etc. To cater for sport and leisure, Colonel William Light's design of the city became an important asset. He had allowed for open space which is what we now call the Adelaide Parklands. As a result, the Botanic Gardens, and the Zoological Gardens were established in time. As well, the Torrens was dammed and there now was a lake for boating, rowing and swimming. Ovals were designated for football and cricket later in the 1800's, all involving the parklands. None was subject to the requirement of 'no net loss'.

What this history tells us is that there was always a desire to activate these open spaces for a purpose. Each of these activities required some sort of support structure. It may be boating requiring a boat shed or a zoo requiring animal housing or an oval requiring grandstands or other minor ovals requiring change rooms and viewing areas. If the purpose or need was defined, the appropriate structures were erected. There seems to have been little desire to always keep these areas as native woodland. It was all about activating the parks to give people something to do in their leisure time. Again, no principle of 'no net loss' was considered.

I strongly believe that this 'no net loss' principle that is advocated by a vocal group, the APLA, should be questioned on the basis that there are many people who consider this principle unsupportable in this day and age. Common sense and sanity should prevail for these parks to continue to be active and supported as was the original intention.

100% agree, the parklands open space and trees is the first priority, so no net gain in hardstand should be permitted. Working with stakeholders and looking at actual use patterns will help ensure multi-use where appropriate (e.g. where to integrate toilets for sports as well as public).

100% agree with no net loss of parklands - especially as the state government just comes in and takes more of it away as well!

Performance Criteria 2.1 should go further and require the removal of existing buildings / hard stand areas before the planning approval of any new buildings in Park Lands.

Performance Criteria 2.3: is "visually discrete" a typo for "discreet"? I support "using materials and colours that blend with the natural surroundings" - this could be expanded to exclude sporting team signage / branding / murals which are often quite garish.

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

Prioritizing the adjustment of the building footprint to meet sporting requirements is crucial, but it should not come at the expense of neglecting the preservation of parklands. Many older structures were erected without consideration for modern space needs, making it impractical to adhere strictly to their original footprints. Additionally, maintaining a small footprint becomes challenging when spaces are utilized for multiple sports, as shared areas often require increased storage and kitchen space. Complicating matters further are conflicting spatial demands across different sporting codes. The growth in both the number of participants and gender diversity within the code underscores the necessity for providing a secure environment for young athletes, a goal achievable only through appropriately sized and well-equipped facilities.

There should be consideration of consolidation of buildings in close proximity, for example where toilets are located in proximity of another building that is being replaced. There also needs to be consideration of the fact that buildings in the Park Lands may have been built decades ago and are not fit for purpose. It would be impossible to replace some of these buildings to meet current required standards without expansion of the current footprint, considering that multistorey is not desirable. The footprint of future buildings may be restrained by the footprint of old, not fit for purpose facilities, that were built a long time ago. There needs to be sensible evaluation of footprint required to construct fit for purpose facilities that meet with the required standards, whilst recognising they should be efficient with compact layouts and a low scale integrated design.

As above

This is focused on restricting facilities used to support community sport. With the nature of the city and community sport changing, this feels like a narrow approach. Many facilities do not support (and have no capacity to deal with) the fantastic explosion we are seeing in female participation in all levels of sport.

Usage of Parklands has changed and continues to change. Policy should adapt to reflect this change not necessarily to hold onto restrictions defined in the past; whilst open spaces are crucial to community and individual wellbeing, we should be open to consideration of how community and individual usage of space is changing and be prepared to adapt to meet that change - using these open spaces in more contemporary ways, whilst retaining green and open spaces as much as possible.

except to make the building larger

Need to be flexible on footprint to allow fit for purpose renewal.

We hope to have 3 football ovals in the near future and we will need to expand our facilities to cater for junior teams.

Note; no introduction of commercial aspects just existing community purposes.

The replacement of old, unsafe, inadequate buildings is critical, and that priority ought to be given to supporting new facilities that are fit for purpose and cater for multiple sports, activities and community user groups

They are an Adelaide Icon

Replacement of old inadequate facilities

Taking "footprint creep" into account, much of the immediate space around the various buildings could be incorporated into the building footprint without having impact on the surrounding parklands.

Looking again at the Park 17 building, the footprint could be expanded without detriment to the surrounding environment or impacting upon the playing surfaces in any direction.

Sporting clubs should be able to have new facilities or upgrades as this is a way to support a healthy lifestyle. It is very important to use the open spaces to relieve the emotional rollercoaster life is.

There shouldn't be any limitations or restrictions on sporting clubs using parklands, including and not limited to, existing or new clubs. Furthermore, no limitations on any enhancements required to sustain the club's future.

Old building is unsafe and unsuitable for use. Priority must be given to new purpose built facilities.

Replacement of Old or not fit for purpose buildings is essential to providing places for community groups and sports groups. They should be given a lot of priority.

Unsafe and unfit buildings need to be replaced urgently to cater for the range of sporting activities, particularly junior cricket and football and women's sport.

Providing new facilities are fit-for-purpose and cater to users and visitors appropriately first and foremost, minimizing the facility's footprint should be the next priority of design.

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

Current users of the parklands should have some security of tenure and able to upgrade them to meet safety and suitable for purpose amenities. While some trees may need to be removed for upgrades, they should be able to be replaced with other trees elsewhere.

My main priority is ensuring no net loss of the parklands. But knowing there will be a bigger land requirement based on new standards. How will the council be able to amalgamate buildings across different uses in different parts of the park? Especially if there are leases with different building goals and requirements?

The current facilities are old, unsafe and not functional to their full capacity. As such new facilities are needed to cater for the wide range of people who access them as part of various sport and community groups.

Poor quality buildings that aren't fit for purpose need to be replaced with buildings that serve multiple users and activities and should be given for priority

Yes we should ensure that we minimise the footprint to ensure it meets the requirements, however this should not mean there no net loss of parklands and that is the main priority. An old building in the parklands which was built many years ago did not consider modern space requirements as it was not thought of back then, so why would a new building be constricted to that of the old? This doesnt make logical sense.

The primary purpose of the parklands is community benefit. Fit for purpose facilities are critical to support this.

Full replacement of inadequate existing building is essential due to them being old, unsafe and quite embarrassing as they don't adequately cater for all and not viable to refurbish them as it still won't meet the future needs (or safety) and a large waste of money in trying to.

I am keen to see no loss of mature or established trees, which cannot be replaced by multiple small trees that provide no habitat.

Hard to see how " No net loss of Park lands" squares with " Fit for Purpose " when our 1950's facilities, for example, are nowhere near adequate in terms of available changeroom space, spectator areas, toilets, kiosk etc. etc

The replacement of old, clearly unsafe and inadequate buildings is absolutely critical. Urgent priority should be given to supporting new facilities that are fit for purpose and cater for multiple sports, activities and community user groups.

Facilities that are currently at the parklands are old, tired, have the potential to become unsafe and are not as accessible for the whole community.

See Bridgland PDF response linked to this survey form, mailed same date (22/11/23) to yoursay@cityofadelaide.com.au

While addressing community and sporting club rooms in the south parklands, wise and thoughtful planning would see minimal impact on parklands. This would also see an increase in the use and utilisation of the parklands as a community recreational space.

The replacement of old, unsafe, inadequate buildings is critical. Priority must be given to supporting new facilities that are fit for purpose and cater for multiple sports, activities and community user groups.

replacement of old, unsafe, inadequate buildings is critical, and that priority ought to be given to supporting new facilities that are fit for purpose and cater for multiple sports, activities and community user groups.

The parklands are special to citizens of the city and the surrounding areas, and all South Australian citizens.

Since we replacing the existing old and unsafe facility, there will be minimum to no net loss of park lands. The new facility will cater many different sports and community activities.

Sport for some of us is a huge part of our lives and I'm a strong believer that children who participate in sport are better socialised and have a greater sense of community. By having old and run down facilities you are deterring people from coming out and participating and ultimately contributing to mental health issued.

replacement of old, unsafe, inadequate buildings is critical, and that priority ought to be given to supporting new facilities that are fit for purpose and cater for multiple sports, activities and community user groups.

I would like minimal impact on the parklands but common sense has to prevail

There are a lot of un-utilised parklands space and much of it kept in an uninhabitable and unsightly way. "Losing" this for community loss is a good thing, and should be encouraged.

Groups will at times require a larger building, and often this is to upgrade facilities to be more inclusive for female participation. This should not be hamstrung by an unnecessary "no net loss of Park Lands" position.

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

I agree that the design of buildings should blend in with surroundings, but this then contradicts the rest of the policy. Often, to reduce visual impact, you restrict on height, which means requiring more ground space, which conflicts with the no net loss principle.

The only aspect I disagree with is PC 2.1. I don't believe that existing buildings and hard stand areas are the correct measuring stick to define how large new buildings should be. buildings should be of a footprint and scale relative the size of the respective parkland and the number of members/residents it services. the larger the parkland and the more people it serves, the larger it should be.

Again I am pleased that the fit for purpose requirement is highlighted alongside the net loss criteria. I think the replacement of old, unsafe, inadequate buildings is critical, and that priority ought to be given to supporting new facilities that are both fit for purpose and cater for multiple sports, activities and community user groups. I agree multifunctional spaces are important, but caution that the shared facilities part doesn't go too far in compromising fit for use across different user groups. For example, currently our women's changerooms at ALSC is the only space for all women's sport (different codes) and is also the ladies toilets. This makes it hard to support different women's sports occurring at the same time (ie football and netball).

Removing older buildings is a good way of reducing the net loss and upgrading facilities to be "fit for purpose".
Servicing multiple users and uses, allows for seasonal sports and greater access to the sporting fields.

Single story buildings without the need to provide lifts and a range of mechanical services, reduces the operating costs for the Lease holder, further reducing the risk that maintenance will be dependent on the revenue raising ability of a sporting club.
keeping buildings simple in their requirements (keeping basic toilets and changerooms as a priority) will minimize the risk of sporting clubs needing to charge large fees to children and families to support the infrastructure and maintenance.

It is critical that old, unsafe and inadequate buildings are made fit for purpose.

We need replacement of old, unsafe, inadequate buildings and that priority ought to be given to supporting new facilities that are fit for purpose and cater for multiple sports, activities and community user groups.

Please refer to submission from Pembroke School

We need the replacement of old, unsafe, inadequate buildings is critical, and that priority ought to be given to supporting new facilities that are fit for purpose and cater for multiple sports, activities and community user groups and abilities.

Already too much of the original Park Lands is built on, so in future NO NET LOSS and open, green and public should be main principles

A number of buildings used by sporting and community organisation are not fit for purpose due to age, design and growing participation numbers in a community that has a desire to increase its health and wellbeing.

A blanket rule of no net loss of parklands isn't achievable if facilities are to be developed for current purposes and into the future.

It is agreed a building design should be consistent with the environment and be sustainable.

Having buildings that are built for purpose but can also be used by multiple user groups is vital to ensure usage occurs.

- The title of this Principle is partly contradictory to Performance Criteria 2.1. While fit for purpose facility improvements can aspire to minimize the loss of Park Lands, it will not achieve no net loss to Park Lands for all projects.

- The requirement for new community buildings will not always be able to identify the removal of one or more old buildings.

- SANFL is supportive of building infrastructure that delivers multi-use outcomes.

- Existing footprints do not meet participant's expectations for community level football

- While the possibility of modestly increased footprint may occur, fit for purpose buildings will increase participation, inclusion and visitation to the City.

- Examples

- o Park 21 – proximity of building to oval is a significant factor to consider for appropriate use

- o ACSARA at Park 21W is a good example of where co-contribution is required from Council. The Club have be in planning phase for some years and now experiencing project budget cost escalations due to time frames.

- o Blackfriars at Park 2 is an example of dilapidated infrastructure that is not fit for purpose and required investment.

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

o Park 12 – Adelaide University grounds – improvements underway but self funded.
 o Parks 21, 12 and Pulteney have complete installation of lights that unlocks oval capacity for increased participation which further highlights the need for supporting built facilities.

n/a please see Question 11

The Principle states there will be “no net loss of Park Lands” when delivering community buildings that are fit for purpose.

However, under Performance Criteria 2.1 “A new community building will be considered where the City of Adelaide can demonstrate that the footprint will not exceed the fit for purpose requirements of the local level provision and minimise the loss of Park Lands”.

SACA supports new community buildings that will meet ‘fit for purpose’ requirements where this can be demonstrated through the relevant facility guidelines and that the footprint will not exceed the fit for purpose requirements.

There is general support for Performance Criteria 2.2 and 2.3.

The emphasis should be on outdoor areas fit for purpose to allow for sport and passive recreation with some public amenities. The difficult part is to look at how the social areas are treated as there is a crossroad reached between the fit for purpose to play sport and the “desire” to have a traditional social area with kitchens and a bar area. The City of Adelaide has many restaurants and pubs that can and will benefit from post game celebrations that will benefit business and community. These social requirements which are not core to playing sport at the amateur club level are often the reason why sustainable venues are not achievable, hence revenue raising required to maintain buildings or to raise money for the purpose of paying players and officials. This can only be accomplished by larger footprints for social spaces as they try and mimic the larger professional organizations (AFL,SACA,Soccer stadiums).

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

Criteria 3.1 "...no loss of existing trees" is a good guideline however sometimes extant trees are inappropriate, non-native, or even dangerous. A more flexible guideline (with protections) should be used.

Replanting, and/or adding more trees elsewhere should be permitted.

This is essential in all modern buildings

removal of trees is not an issue if new planting is undertaken to replace these.

Maximising minimal impact on parklands is excellent

Fully agree with no tree removal requirement

Agree with fauna habitat establishment requirements

Green building standards as a requirement is excellent

For mental health and biodiversity, most of the park lands need to be wild, very sensitively managed. This council policy may be a call to exploitation, so more explicit absolute no-go areas must be publicised, and followed through by transparent accountability, for public confidence.

Sustainable development is a worthwhile and valuable however the blanket statement "Site selection will be informed by a comprehensive site analysis with no loss of existing trees." is not acting to improve or maintain the sustainability of the parklands. Not removing trees is not the same as committing to increase the biomass and biodiversity of the parklands. Proactively ensuring that any development resulting in the loss of vegetation will include the relocation, replacement of expansion of trees and habitat to improve the amenity of the parklands AND increase the value of green space is far better aligned with the needs of the community than arbitrarily committing to the trees we have, no matter the loss of opportunity.

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

These facilities should have more offerings to the general public in terms of offering such as cafes, toilets, seating , shade and amenity.

'No loss of trees' is a self-defeating requirement. Every decision, every project has its trade-offs and if we adopt the position that 'if only one tree is saved the project is worth preventing' then we are deluding ourselves. Decision makers need to strongly examine those trade-offs and make a call. Trees losses are always marginal and minimal and can always be compensated for with other plantings. The reasons for protecting trees are often overstated.

Some call them the lungs of the city. Research shows that mature trees do produce oxygen but also consume it through respiration and eventually reach a point where that production is negative. As well, mature trees no longer sequester CO2 as they did when young. At best, about 7-8 trees would produce enough oxygen for 2 people so this effect is miniscule. New plantings compensate quite well in time and are developed when the older ones eventually die.

Lead by demonstrating these design principles, and back up Council's environmental support claims.

In the contemporary architectural landscape, the importance of incorporating reasonable sustainability measures into the design and construction of buildings cannot be overstated. As society becomes increasingly aware of environmental challenges and resource depletion, the construction industry plays a pivotal role in mitigating its impact. Sustainable buildings aim to minimize their carbon footprint, conserve energy, and reduce overall environmental degradation. Incorporating energy-efficient systems, utilizing recycled materials, and implementing innovative technologies contribute not only to the well-being of the planet but also to the long-term economic viability of structures. Beyond environmental considerations, there are tangible benefits for occupants, such as improved indoor air quality, enhanced comfort, and lower operating costs. As we navigate the complexities of a rapidly changing world, integrating reasonable sustainability practices into modern buildings is a conscientious step towards a more resilient and responsible built environment. The importance though is REASONABLE.

Designs should be sustainable.

There is a cost to providing 5 star green compliant facilities. This is extremely important but maybe out of reach for some user groups.

A strong environmental focus is fine, but this can not be sought if the Council does not want to provide support to the many community groups who will struggle to fund and operate such standards.

make it happen... chop trees if you have to

Although no loss of existing trees is unreasonable, it would be far better to have an objective where there is a net increase in trees, which would mean an occasional unregulated tree could be replaced with multiple new trees.

Let's ensure there is something for the future generations

There will be a trade of between cost and energy efficiency, green star rating and cost.

A better approach regarding trees would be a requirement for a net gain in trees for the project.

Environmental considerations need to be balanced with limited financial availability of community organisations

No socially responsible organisations should be considering anything other than the most sustainable developments.

I agree with 3.2, but with 3.1, we should look at what is best for that club and social aspect, and not worry too much about which trees are being knocked down. We can always plant new ones in other surrounding areas.

You will need a plan where you replace more than what you may lose. It is very hard not to lose any trees.

Minimizing Environmental damage and Green start ratings are great initiatives but if they are enforced then Council should be offsetting these costs with greater contribution of funds. Not being able to remove any trees is unreasonable and replacement of any trees removed with more trees should instead is a far better idea.

It is important to retain as many trees as possible in the Parklands but any loss of trees that are essential to any redevelopment plans can be replaced tenfold plus with new species that are native to the parklands.

Design sustainability and environment performance should be emphasise in new facilities, but to ensure this, financial assistance from the council will be needed to help cover the additional investment of these green technologies.

Removing trees to install new facilities safely is appropriate but should be minimized. This can also be done tastefully, but only if there is a positive re-planting of new trees

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

in another safe and appropriate location nearby in the parklands (i.e. remove 1 tree, replant 2-3 trees elsewhere) as there is ample open field/grassed unused areas to replant trees

There is a tradeoff between what is affordable and what is desirable, Community groups cannot fund this themselves without council contribution.

I strongly agree with 3.2. I strongly disagree with 3.1, the concept of "no loss of existing trees", I think it should be more like "ideally no loss of existing trees and if any tree is lost then it will be replaced with 10 additional trees"

As Adelaide pursues the Green City title. It would be terrible to not focus on these criteria. Especially in such a visible area of our city.

Environmental considerations are important; however, cost must also be considered in the bigger picture and as such community groups should not be expected to subsidise such things without significant council contribution.

Expecting a no loss of existing trees is unreasonable, so instead looking at replacing trees that may need to be removed in the building process.

No loss of existing trees is unreasonable. Better to allow for loss of unregulated trees providing they are replaced by multiple new trees leading to a net increase in trees

This is essential in all modern buildings

Sustainable is ok and long as commercially viable

A sustainable approach is important however a balance is required in relation to cost for small community groups and associations and further support in boosting this via Council and other external support.

Also, there is a balance of development in relation to parkland trees and while minimising the loss of existing trees (an unregulated tree or two) is important, a net increase in trees and vegetation should be viewed as important and ultimately improving the parklands and space in the future.

I am keen to see 6-7 star green-rated buildings, including 3 bin waste collections for all parkland facilities which is not used in the parklands, however, to provide this will take support from ACC to meet your net-zero carbon and waste and sustainability targets.

I agree in principal but not always easy to achieve given the position of ovals and existing trees.

While environmental performance and Green Star ratings are desirable objectives, there is likely to be a trade-off with cost, and community groups cannot be expected to fund this without Council contribution.

I submit in the strongest possible terms that I consider that no loss of existing trees is unreasonable. It would be far better to have an objective where there is a net increase in trees, which would mean an occasional unregulated tree could be replaced with multiple new trees.

While sustainable development is highly desired and encouraged, the ability to fund such development by non-profit community groups must be taken into consideration.

See Bridgland PDF response linked to this survey form, mailed same date (22/11/23) to yoursay@cityofadelaide.com.au

Sustainability is significant. It also relates to the ability of the community to engage in healthy activities that the parklands has the potential to offer. This impacts fitness, mental health and community engagement to note some.

Environmental performance and Green Star ratings are desirable objectives. They also cost a lot of money for community organisations to comply with, which creates a trade-off with quality of facility and thus community engagement. Community groups cannot be expected to fund this without Council contribution.

The parklands have wonderful trees, and these are vital for a beautiful parklands that serves the needs of its users (human and non-human).

Having a policy where there is no loss of existing trees is unreasonable. It would be far better to have an objective where there is a net increase in trees, which would mean an occasional unregulated tree could be replaced with multiple new trees.

while environmental performance and Green Star ratings are desirable objectives, there is likely to be a trade-off with cost, and community groups cannot be expected to fund this without Council contribution.

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

It is also worth emphasising (strongly), that no loss of existing trees is unreasonable, and it would be far better to have an objective where there is a net increase in trees, which would mean an occasional unregulated tree could be replaced with multiple new trees.

The protection of our environment is critical, and reducing energy usage is essential.

While it is important for a community group to align with environmental performance and sustainable development, council contribution is required to achieve that. Also, the new plan might require cutting off some trees. This can be compensated by planning and planting many more new plants/trees that improve the quality and aesthetic of the park land.

Going green is all well and good, but it comes at a cost and if that cost is too high it will stump vital development. I don't like having trees cut down, but a lot of them aren't even native, so the few that need to be taken down could be offset by adding additional native trees and vegetation in other areas.

that while environmental performance and Green Star ratings are desirable objectives, there is likely to be a trade-off with cost, and community groups cannot be expected to fund this without Council contribution.

Sustainable development is to replace an old unsafe building with an attractive safe new one.

It's fine but sometimes loss of trees will be necessary to achieve the right outcomes for everybody.

All buildings within the parklands should be of high quality design and environmental outcomes

Agree with the reduced environmental impact and use of locally indigenous plantings.

I agree that environmental performance and Green Star ratings are important, however it is only inevitable that there will be a trade-off with cost. Community groups cannot be expected to fund this without Council contribution. If it comes down to these versus the space being fit for purpose and supporting the whole community i would much prefer the most functional space be built once rather than more redevelopment needing to be done in the future as that seems less environmentally responsible.

I also believe a blanket statement of no loss of existing trees is unreasonable. I support keeping mature trees wherever possible but believe it would be far better to have an objective where there is a net increase in trees, which would mean an occasional unregulated tree could be replaced with multiple new trees.

Great initiatives that will reduce the complexity of buildings and put the focus back onto the sports and recreation requirements and not 'conditioning" for spectator comfort. Planting of vegetation and landscaping should be as important a consideration as the infrastructure/building requirements.

Environmental performance is incredibly important, however community groups are not going to be able to fund this without council contribution.

While environmental performance and Green Star ratings are desirable objectives, there is likely to be a trade-off with cost, and community groups cannot be expected to fund this without Council contribution.

It is also worth emphasising (strongly), that no loss of existing trees is unreasonable, and it would be far better to have an objective where there is a net increase in trees, which would mean an occasional unregulated tree could be replaced with multiple new trees.

Please refer to submission from Pembroke School

I would like to emphasise that while environmental performance and Green Star ratings are desirable objectives, there is likely to be a trade-off with cost, and community groups cannot be expected to fund this without Council contribution.

I would like to strongly express that no loss of existing trees is unreasonable, and it would be far better to have an objective where there is a net increase in trees, which would mean an occasional unregulated tree could be replaced with multiple new trees.

With Climate Change we must use every opportunity to cool the City and Park Lands, even covering buildings and sites with vegetation or placing them underground

ESG comes at a cost. This should be factored into development projects without taking away the purpose of the building scope.

Council should increase its capital allocation to take in ESG.

All environmental aspects should be considered for new buildings within the Parklands.

SANFL is supportive of sustainable development that has minimal impact on the environment.

Contemporary, modest projects assist in the reduction of overall operational costs for not-for-profit organisations.

n/a please see Question 11

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

SACA supports that all new community buildings within the Park Lands will maximise efficiency and environmental performance as well as achieve a 5 Star Green Star certification. This is supported through the recently updated Community Cricket Facility Guidelines specifically calling out Environmentally Sustainable Design (ESD).

Whilst it is desirable to have an objective of “no loss of existing trees”, there may be opportunities where the optimum location of a building may require the removal of a tree(s). Some trees may be inappropriate tree species and/or in poor health. SACA supports the “no net loss of trees” as a development may include the planting of additional tree species.

Sustainable environmentally friendly buildings and amenities are a desirable feature for any building in the Parklands.

All buildings will “date over time” and with this in mind, smaller footprints and more plantings and less hard-stand areas will only benefit future generations.

Consideration should be given to activating areas which are not well maintained or utilized.

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?

Criteria are well worded.

More OFF STREET parking needs to be provided. In an age were we are struggling to get our kids off of mobile devices and outdoors playing competitive sport youd think more was being done to facilitate this by councils. All that I see is the constant removal of parking in place of a tree making it near impossible to find a car park for our 500 strong participants at the Adelaide Comets. Its funny how the area next to Ellis park can be turned into a paid car park for events when it needs to at the benefit of the council but on sundays when kids are playing ticket inspectors are out in force trying to meet their targets. Its an absolute joke when you talk about doing this for the community but dont provide what is needed to support this

Single-storey buildings that are accessible to all is important within the parklands. Although more car parking in the parklands would be convenient, I understand the prohibition of parking within the parklands and encourage indented parking along the roadway.

heightened building should be permissible if it achieves the desired outcome and in keeping with surroundings and meets the aesthetic guidelines

All buildings should be single storey except in exceptional circumstances. Anything above single ground level buildings makes accessibility for all people problematic.

The engineering for 'indented' parking measures should be a 'light-touch' exercise in water-wise sustainability and creativity, not more cement bulk.

It should not reduce or impinge upon park lands.

The parklands need to be accessible to everyone and they need to have facilities such as toilets, shade and seating for everyone. There also need to be more food and beverage offerings scattered throughout the paklands

It is common sense to be smart about design but again there are trade-offs - a single storey building needs a wider footprint whereas a second storey offers viewing and amenity for those who watch but cannot participate.

Car parking on the parklands is unnecessary for most community sports.

But in some cases 2-story may be suitable with lifts to ensure big enough indoor space without encroaching on open space and trees. Kiosks not needed everywhere.

Some smaller/narrower paths may be suitable in some locations too. Only implement more indented parking if no trees are removed in doing so.

Performance Criteria 4.1 - I'm not sure about "Provide generous shelter and shade and amenities including seating, handwashing facilities, drinking fountains, kiosks, and toilets" --- as this may encourage large and sprawling developments. Consider instead "suitable" shelter.

Performance Criteria 4.2 - Illegal access and parking of vehicles in Park Lands is a major issue that needs to be addressed. "Car parking will not be permitted on the Park Lands, with the exception of loading and unloading, drop off and pick up, and disability parking." — I'd strengthen this to only limited loading / unloading for a single vehicle of a tenant / leaseholder. I'd also remove "drop off and pick up" as this is unnecessary, vague and open to gross misuse.

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?

Ensuring accessibility for all in parklands is crucial, making single-storey buildings a key consideration. While additional parking within the parklands would be convenient, I acknowledge the prohibition of parking within these areas and endorse the use of indented parking along the roadway.

Modern facilities should include accessibility in design.

"accessible for all" is a bit rich when there does not appear to be any focus or thought around female participation in sport and the changing nature of community sport as a whole.

I strongly agree that facilities should be accessible and welcoming for all.

However, as a regular user of sports facilities across the parklands for many years, I think that some provision must be made for parking. It is not realistic to expect people to access facilities via public transport or other means. Many people come into the city to access these sports. Some travel a long way. Public transport provision in metro Adelaide is woeful and people cannot be expected to use it. Nor should they be expected to travel a long way into the city and then try to find some other way to travel to the sports facility. The clubs have many participants. Adelaide Comets for example, have many players and so the club needs to train most nights and for several hours. To accommodate, they have to start training sessions early. I have found myself leaving work early in order to get my son to Comets by 5.30. There is no way that I could get home from work, travel into the city and find parking and then travel to the Comets facilities before 5.30. This is just an example to demonstrate that limiting parking options is not realistic.

Demand for participation at Comets is likely to increase too - especially as better provision is made for female participation.

As a further example, at weekends, many soccer teams have visiting teams and supporters. When this happens, there is almost always a parking problem. It is not realistic to expect these people to park far away and then travel to the facility via some other means. Some provision must be considered.

bring in people to the CBD. make the parklands accessible to all

All ability access essential for all development should be the standard. See below for Park 12 example.

It is naive to think that single level buildings could be built that are 'fit for purpose' AND result in no net loss of parklands. Smart, well-designed two-story buildings are an obvious solution to managing building footprint while still providing facilities that are 'fit for purpose'.

Single level buildings can not include all the required infrastructure on the required footprint.

2 story, fit for purpose buildings would keep the footprint on parklands minimal

The very nature of sport-driven community activities in the parklands, combined with the extreme limitations of South Australia's public transport system means that virtually all participants will be driving (and thus needing parking) at the sporting facilities in the parklands. Anything that can be done to reduce the need for vehicles should be considered, but not at the cost of ensuring safe and plentiful access to parking. With respect to community level touch football in particular, the games are often immediately after work for many participants, and as such they will travel directly from work, so parking is paramount.

Traffic around the area and parking on the street is incredibly unsafe. I am amazed more people haven't been hit whilst parking or crossing the road.

Being restricted to single level buildings is too restrictive. Well designed two story buildings should be used so that footprints of buildings can be minimised. If they are designed correctly they can be complementary to the surrounding areas and not look out of place.

It would be naive to think that single level buildings could be built with no net loss of parklands. Smart well designed 2 story buildings are an obvious solution to providing fit for purpose recreational buildings with required facilities to serve all the recreational fields without exceeding building footprint requirements.

As a regular user of facilities in the parklands and seeing firsthand the explosion in use over the past decade with new sports, age groups, and all genders using the facilities to meet their sport and recreation needs, it's hard to see how single-level facilities are fit-for-purpose for modern sport & rec needs. Single-level facilities are simply too small to cater to all groups and demographics. Instead, well-designed, fit-for-purpose two-storey facilities can minimise footprint and provide adequate amenities for users and visitors.

Off-street parking is also something that should be addressed. For example, the football, soccer, and cricket fields on Goodwood Road are receiving increased levels of junior participation, bringing more and more young families to the area. However, the only parking available is on-street parking, which has the potential for danger.

Providing safe parking spaces off the main road and close to the facilities should be strongly considered.

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?

For current and future users to maintain or minimize their facility footprint, a two-story building may be the most appropriate building to meet their requirements and the building codes that are currently in place.

For safety and convenience, particularly where families and children are involved, off street parking adjacent to the facility is a must. In some instances, parking restriction apply on main roads around the parklands making it even more difficult to find a park.

I strongly agree with 4.1. I strongly disagree with 4.2, you need to take responsibility for parking, and if that means using parklands for visitor parking, then so be it. If you are suggesting that you want to "optimise visitor safety along roadways" then you will need to move that parking off the roadway. I am surprised there has not been a major accident Adelaide Comets grounds on West Terrace on Saturday and Sunday where you are forcing the majority of attendees to park on West Terrace or Sir Donald Bradman Drive

Limit the type of paths. Would prefer smaller dirt paths when possible.
Love that there is no parking on site.

Accessibility is a huge factor. As long as the netloss of parklands is still the priority

There is no question that a two story complex would reduce the buildings footprint on the parklands and provide an excellent attractive looking structure that would meet all of the expectations of the current users going forward. A smart idea!

A smart, well-designed two story building is the best solution for ensuring building footprint is optimised and facilities are fit for purpose. Given on street parking is limited, and there is a high volume of traffic along Goodwood Road the inclusion of a reasonable amount of car parking should be supported. This can be on permeable surfaces, and is not difficult to design in a way that would still protect the parklands.

Smart well designed 2 story buildings are an obvious solution to the competing demands of minimising footprint and providing fit for purpose buildings

Single-storey buildings that are accessible to all are important. More car parking in the parklands would be convenient, I understand the difficulty of parking within the parklands and are happy with indented parking along the roadway.

We gotta get more people into the parklands. They're great!,

The proposed 'fit for purpose' facility will need to be larger to accommodate the current needs and meet the variety of uses and a single level buildings will not meet the requirements. Smart, well-designed two-story buildings are an obvious solution to managing building footprint while still providing facilities that are 'fit for purpose'. In certain circumstances where on-street parking is both limited (eg clearways) and dangerous given the amount of traffic (eg Goodwood Rd), that reasonable car parking be supported. Such car parking can be on permeable surfaces and is not difficult to design and manage in a way that protects the parklands.

Our facility is basically off limits for women , elderly, people with a disability, or anyone with any sort of mobility issue.

I submit that it is naive to think that single level buildings could be built that are 'fit for purpose' AND result in no net loss of parklands. Smart, well-designed two-story buildings are an obvious solution to managing building footprint while still providing facilities that are 'fit for purpose'.

Further, in certain circumstances where on-street parking is both limited (for example clearways) and dangerous given the amount of traffic (for example Goodwood Road), that reasonable car parking be supported. Such car parking can be on permeable surfaces and is not difficult to design and manage in a way that protects the parklands.

It seems unreasonable to expect a building be fit for purpose and accessible to the wider community across ages, gender, and ableness without some instances of increased footprint as a trade-off. Further as it currently stands the traffic and ability to cross is getting more and more hazardous.

See Bridgland PDF response linked to this survey form, mailed same date (22/11/23) to yoursay@cityofadelaide.com.au

The current south park lands facilities are a disincentive to the use of the park. Sustainable, well planned and appropriate facilities are needed. Multiple sports and groups use the parklands and these need catering for. As the footprint of any new facilities should have minimal impact on net loss to parkland space (your Q3) it is important that these be fit for purpose, not fit an unworkable criteria.

It is naive to think that single level buildings could be built that are 'fit for purpose' AND result in no net loss of parklands. Smart, well-designed two-story buildings are an obvious solution to managing building footprint while still providing facilities that are 'fit for purpose'.

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?

In certain circumstances where on-street parking is both limited (eg clearways) and dangerous given the amount of traffic (eg Goodwood Rd), that reasonable car parking be supported. Such car parking can be on permeable surfaces and is not difficult to design and manage in a way that protects the parklands.

it is naive to think that single level buildings could be built that are 'fit for purpose' AND result in no net loss of parklands. Smart, well-designed two-story buildings are an obvious solution to managing building footprint while still providing facilities that are 'fit for purpose'.

We would also emphasise that in certain circumstances where on-street parking is both limited (eg clearways) and dangerous given the amount of traffic (eg Goodwood Rd), that reasonable car parking be supported. Such car parking can be on permeable surfaces and is not difficult to design and manage in a way that protects the parklands.

Ensuring easy access to community buildings for all participants, especially aged, disabled and infirm. Access to reasonably priced parking is also essential to this cohort.

A "fit-for-purpose" cannot be built in a single level considering that there should be no net loss in the park lands. A well planned two storey building is required to suite the purpose. The location has restricted street parking and results in dangerous situation during events. This can be mitigated by having a car park facility that is designed to protect the park lands.

You cannot support multiple users over an entire parkland/black with small facilities. If you were to do that you would need multiple facilities, thus taking up more space. To reduce footprint you need to build up.

Smart, well-designed two-story buildings are an obvious solution to managing building footprint while still providing facilities that are 'fit for purpose'.

A sensible building that lessens the footprint impact on the parklands and is fit for pupose is a smart way to go.

Single level buildings are not the only way to design an "accessible" building. This principle is misleading in that respect.

Providing shelter and shade is great, but contradicts with no net loss principle. Are shaded areas considered a "loss" of parklands?

Strongly agree with community accessibility for all. However, finding a balance between minimising environmental footprint and community accessibility should be prioritised without compromising the ability to make visually appealing and modern buildings that can be used for sporting and functions as well as every other use. This promotes even more increased use of parklands and parkland buildings. For example, Adelaide Comets Football Club club rooms are completely accessible to both ground and first storeys via a lift, while also not having increased footprint in the build.

I am also interested to know how parking is not allowed / facilitated in most parklands, but the parklands including grass on Greenhill road are actually used as a carpark for events such as the Royal Show?

I don't think it is viable that all new developments could be single level buildings that are still 'fit for purpose' for a wide user group AND result in no net loss of parklands. Smart, well-designed two-story buildings are an obvious solution to managing building footprint while still providing facilities that are 'fit for purpose'. There is also ne reason that they won't be accessible. Additionally for where I play and train there are times where on-street parking is both limited (eg clearways) and dangerous given the amount of traffic (eg Goodwood Rd) and in these circumstances i think reasonable car parking should be supported. Such car parking can be on permeable surfaces and is not difficult to design and manage in a way that protects the parklands.

Facilities need to cater for current and future needs, not those when the current park lands facilities were built. There has been a significant increase in patronage and usage of the parklands and the sporting facilities that support this need to be of a modern standard.

Performance Criteria 4.1 and 4.2 show a balance between being able to support changerooms and toilets with accessibility for access and servicing needs.

Keeping the buildings simple and not introducing commercial infrastructure will lessen the need for associated infrastructure such as commercial rangehoods and Sa Water retention tanks etc.

These inclusions (commercial infrastructure) appear to 'privatise'.

If we want to ensure there is minimal impact to the parklands, then in order to make them fit for purpose, they will be required to be more than single level.

It is naive to think that single level buildings could be built that are 'fit for purpose' AND result in no net loss of parklands. Smart, well-designed two-story buildings are an obvious solution to managing building footprint while still providing facilities that are 'fit for purpose'.

We would also emphasise that in certain circumstances where on-street parking is both limited (eg clearways) and dangerous given the amount of traffic (eg Goodwood

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?

Rd), that reasonable car parking be supported. Such car parking can be on permeable surfaces and is not difficult to design and manage in a way that protects the parklands.

Please refer to submission from Pembroke School

It seems more likely that you will get the right outcomes by building 2 story buildings. To think that single level buildings could be built that are 'fit for purpose' AND result in no net loss of parklands is a tricky outcome to get. Smart, well-designed two-story buildings are an obvious solution to managing building footprint while still providing facilities that are 'fit for purpose'.

I would also emphasise that in certain circumstances where on-street parking is both limited (eg clearways) and dangerous given the amount of traffic (eg Goodwood Rd), that reasonable car parking be supported. Such car parking can be on permeable surfaces and is not difficult to design and manage in a way that protects the parklands.

no need for drop off parking on Park Lands except in cases of disability--please minimize all parking on PL and any new hard surfaces should definitely be permeable, planted over, pref w native plants, esp grasses

Fit for purpose designed buildings will increase participation in the parklands.

All community buildings should be accessible to all members of the community, including the facility itself and the parking and paths. We are not apposed to a building being 2 levels if it allows for greater spectator viewing. But no greater than 2 levels high.

- This is a key objective of the AFL Preferred Community Football Facilities Guidelines.
- The development of high quality, welcoming and accessible facilities is also a key priority for SANFL as identified in the SANFL Infrastructure Strategy 2022-2032.
- Single level buildings are desirable however a potential solution to reduce overall footprint is to go multi-storey.

n/a please see Question 11

SACA supports achieving requirements of Crickets' Facility Guidelines which will likely require a larger building footprint than most existing Park Lands buildings to meet modern day, safe and inclusive environments. In this case, we refer to Cricket Australia's 'Community Cricket Facility Guidelines'. This Guideline provides a consolidated technical resource to aid the planning, design and development of community cricket infrastructure. Information included within the Guidelines will assist the local community, clubs and Council plan, design and deliver, inclusive and fit for purpose facilities.

Generally, when planning for the provision of changerooms, guidelines require one set of changerooms per one oval. Therefore, new community buildings should cater for the appropriate number of changerooms in accordance with the number of ovals.

The prioritisation of single level buildings for optimal accessibility and use to create a welcoming environment for users is acknowledged as preferable, however to provide 'fit for purpose' community buildings and reduce the impacts of building footprints, two level community buildings may be more appropriate.

Appropriate car parking strategies for users of the buildings require appropriate consideration at the planning and design stage to ensure access for those utilising Park Lands sport, recreation and open space facilities. Sporting users / participants general carry sizeable playing and training equipment with them to playing fields and nearby parking/access is generally required.

Welcoming infers the facilities belong to the community. Privatization and club logos are not welcoming to a visitor.

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

Money talks!

Having Council co-fund means progress is more likely - a great initiative.

This is absolutely essential. Generally, Community buildings within the parklands are in a worse condition than sporting facilities outside the City of Adelaide owing to the co-funding model used by other Councils. It is the only way to ensure the facilities are kept at a high standard as most sporting clubs are not for profit entities that do not have access to the sort of Capital required to build modern infrastructure.

this is only if there are more than one user group or organisation wishing to share that space

I disagree with ACC co-funding buildings with elite private schools under any circumstance

Any time ACC co-funds a project that capital development MUST be available for use by the wider community

Private 'educational institutions' are already taxpayer funded more generously than government schools, which educate many more students with special needs, who have a life-altering requirement for facilities and natural environment. Think about that when allocating funding.

Not sure how this adds value

If you are going to allow development on our parklands then it should have some kind of benefit for everyone, and not just a small group

NO comment

Not all state sporting associations have access to funds - some smaller sports would struggle for 25%. But I gather maximum Council funding 50% suggests the other 50% could all be state/federal funding, so there is still potential that the state sports association would not directly need the cash funding as the state/federal grant would be considered as coming from the state sports association?

Performance Criteria 5.1 --- on p4 I'd suggest splitting "educational institution" into two categories: public educational institution; and private educational institution. And I'd suggest that the maximum Council cofunding contribution for private educational institutions be 0%. It's not appropriate for City of Adelaide ratepayers to subsidise the sporting activities of private schools. This money is better directed to servicing the needs of the broader community.

This is imperative. In general, community buildings within the parklands exhibit a lower standard compared to sporting facilities outside the City of Adelaide, primarily due to the co-funding model employed by other councils. Adopting this model is crucial to maintaining facilities at a high standard, especially considering that most sporting clubs operate as non-profit entities without access to the capital required for modern infrastructure development. It is essential for the council to closely examine the condition of other sporting clubs and community buildings, reflecting on their current state. A noteworthy example is the cricket club on West Terrace.

The policy has no allowance for instances where multiple organisation's utilise the facility. In the case of Educational Institutions, who may be the primary leaseholder, there may also be one or more not for profit community clubs that hold sub-licenses for the facility. The recommendation is that the co-funding for Educational Facilities is increased to 50%. This does not mean that Council would co-fund 50% on each occasion, but it would allow flexibility and discretion to be applied to fund on merit.

Is the criteria in 5.1 required to be met if not co-funded. I assume it is?

Works well if all parties are genuine in their efforts to develop functional and useful facilities that allow better use of the park lands and recognise the changes happening in community sport in Australia.

FAIR

ACC as the owner of these facilities need to invest/co invest financially. Perhaps there is some rationale for ACC to increase lease cost to recoup in this setting? Public toilet facilities should be a ACC responsibility. Improving, installing playgrounds, BBQs and planting trees should also be a core ACC responsibility.

Spend the money on what people want not what you think they want

The Project meets the co-funding criteria

This is probably the aspect of the document with which I have the least to say. I'm no longer involved in the management or organisation of any sporting bodies, only at a participatory level.

Co-funding makes sense.

It is important that Council Co funds the buildings which it owns and maintains and at least matches funds that have already been allocated by the State government..

Sporting and recreational clubs provide so much social benefits to local communities, but they are often run on shoe-string budget. Co-funding is a must to provide safe and fit-for-purpose facilities for these sporting groups.

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

To provide facilities that are both fit-for purpose and well designed to look good in the parklands would require funding support from the council.

All buildings should be available to the community.

The Council should pay for all renovations and upkeep of the community buildings. Or at least pressure the State Government for additional funding.

Bunch of tight asses. By trying to save money many of these community buildings will be restricted to the use of a few people who can pay for it.

I strongly agree

This is a must. What we usually see is that community buildings within the parklands are in a worse condition than sporting facilities outside the City of Adelaide due to the co-funding model used by other Councils in Adelaide. Most sporting clubs are not for profit entities that do not have access to the sort of Capital required to build modern infrastructure on their own.

There are many great not for profit community groups doing great things in the parklands for decades. We need to support these groups. They are not commercial organisations - they are run by generations of committed volunteers

At the end of the day, no club can "own" a building if they do not own the land and ACC stands to gain many high-functioning buildings through co-development, so must be willing to contribute to the building. Without the buildings and associated clubs, much of the parklands will remain unused, or used by very few and this is contrary to ACC existing policies for the PARKlands to be for all South Australians.

I am fine with the funding model proposed.

The project for our Club meets the co-funding criteria in the draft policy.

See Bridgland PDF response linked to this survey form, mailed same date (22/11/23) to yoursay@cityofadelaide.com.au

This just makes good sense

This just makes sense, although sometimes the sporting group 's reason for existence and the type of members involved with the club need to be evaluated as well.

Not every organisation has the money needed for large scale projects, and as the improvements are to better council land, then co-funding is essential.

I agree but this is inconsistent with principle 1.2 which excludes users defined as "elite competition"

I agree co-funding is an important aspect of supporting community groups to keep our parklands facilities usable, safe and inviting for the whole community

No opinion.

Please refer to submission from Pembroke School

agree there should be equitability principles applied to users as per the table suggested on page 4, with state/ schools given resource subsidies of wealthy private schools

Council over the years has invested minimal into the maintenance and capital improvement of parkland sporting and community buildings.

Unfortunately a number of buildings are not fit for purpose or meet the expectations of users.

The maintenance has been left to sporting and community organisations. Costs of maintaining buildings and surrounding areas has significantly increased over the years.

Most sporting and community organisations don't have the funding to undertake capital improvement.

Capital improvement through renovations or new build should be the responsibility of Council as the landlord. Council should work to explore grant opportunities with the State and Federal Governments to secure additional funding for capital improvement projects. Council should lead this approach with the support of sporting and community organisations

If a building is improved sporting and community organisations should only be expect to pay a small increase in fees to Council.

Parkland buildings are non commercial and therefore it is difficult to generate revenue. With a decreasing volunteer base clubs struggle to continue to drive fundraising revenue. This is why it is a struggle for a community or sporting organisation to contribute a material amount toward capital improvement projects.

I understand that that there will need to be guidelines on place but also that there are big differences between sporting clubs or associations across all levels of management, depending on members, sponsorship etc. I'm not sure that one club or association will always fit financially within the category listed. Lease length will also need to reflect level of investment.

SANFL supports diverse participation and the proposed Project Co-funding criteria. We acknowledge the project priority list as documented in the Summary Document – Investing in Community Infrastructure – Sports and Recreation and advocate for the priorities of parks 21W, 20, (Pulteney) and Park 6 (Wilderness).

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

n/a please see Question 11

SACA supports transparent and equitable co-funding of community buildings and associated facilities as proposed in the Draft Policy.

SACA acknowledges that the Policy will also inform the City of Adelaide's approach to investing in City of Adelaide owned community buildings and associated infrastructure that are (or proposed to be) leased and licensed to external community organisations.

In addition, a process should be outlined for the development of buildings and sporting facilities that Council does not contribute funding for. This will provide clarity and transparency in order to navigate the approval process/es required to progress facility developments that may not be listed as a Council priority and where funding available outside of Council can be sourced to deliver projects.

Funding should only be considered if it is a facility which solely operated and managed by the City of Adelaide. All other funding should be Sport and Rec measured against the core requirements set by the city of Adelaide.

A rate payer does not benefit directly from contributing to a private sporting organization- the contribution in staffing and policy writing for the Council administration is significant as a rate payer.

Do you have any additional feedback you would like to provide on the Draft Policy?

The Adelaide Comets Football Club is one of the most successful and well represented clubs in South Australia with a huge junior contingent. The club has endured significant costs in developing a FIFA approved playing surface for its senior teams to play at the same location as its juniors. Its one of the only clubs that doesnt have a permanent home playing base for its senior players and this needs to change.

Why is it that the Karen Rolton Oval just a couple hundred meters to the north in the parklands is allowed to have permanent picket fence around its oval and hundreds of car parks. Is this because it is used for football and cricket?? Ellis park has next to no car parks relative to the number of kids involved in playing soccer at the club. This is embarrassing for visiting teams and our own parents who struggle to find safe close parks near to where their children are playing

This is a huge step forward for the City of Adelaide. Council needs to move away from adhering to building structures in accordance with existing footprint and concentrating on fit for purpose facilities. Our soccer club at Park 27b is utilising a very small and delapidated building that was built by the club in the 1970s and is no longer fit for purpose. The building was built at a time when there were 6 boys teams. There are now 27 teams utilising the space, including 4 girls teams and so the building size is inadequate. The common area only holds a mazimum of 15 people and there aren't separate change rooms for girls players. There is nowhere for players to sit and eat together after training and if it rains, parents cannot retreat to a warm, dry room. A fit for purpose building is required that means the minimum requirements of Football SA.

there are a mass of examples where shared space between community groups, sporting organizations and other entities can benefit everyone while not impeding progression, expansion and improvement of green spaces. shared club and community rooms and spaces are a great idea and will help deliver better use of areas. councils focus should be on areas that have been neglected and lack appeal rather than impacting areas that are already being utilised. secondary to this, areas which are inaccessible should be opened up to community spaces

Minimal impact on the parklands, no loss of any existing trees, no exclusive use of any facilities built on the parklands, no facility should be permanently licensed to serve alcohol.(Large areas of the parklands are designated dry zones , licensing for alcohol service for community groups would be hypocritical)

The assessment process needs the highest transparency. Reject any insistence on 'commercial in confidence'. If a proposal cannot comply, let it be known up front that it will not be considered. No ethics consultancy needed. See 4. (2.3)

Do you have any additional feedback you would like to provide on the Draft Policy?

I find the tone and intent of the policy ultra-conservative and not responsive to the evolving needs of the community. The draft policy is an excuse to not act and shows a lack of vision.

Decision makers need to be able to examine trade-offs. Otherwise decisions will not be able to be made. I suspect there is a considerable silent opinion out there that does not support rigid conservation rules that interfere with the needs of the community going forward. Our forebears did not have to put up with those restrictive rules regarding open space and as a result we benefit from their thinking and actions. We need to do the same for the future enjoyment of the next generations.

There seem to be ongoing issues with some fields between Council, private schools and sporting associations in terms of maintenance, repairs, fixing water leaks, irrigation frequency - as well as the quality of the sports buildings...

While I definitely support the priority for the touch football / Pembroke building at Park 17 to be made more functional, I would say it is a higher priority to improve the quality of the playing fields. They need more frequent watering, and proper maintenance in between seasons. There are mud patches in summer from leaks, there are sand pot holes from where the fields were messed up in winter, and it is really dangerous with so many ankle, knee and other injuries. I know the focus of this project is the buildings, but note that there is no point in upgrading buildings if the playing fields aren't improved.

The parklands are meant for the community's use and enjoyment. The percentage-wise impact of having an outstanding facility is be minor, but its influence on the community is substantial. The Council should take a more proactive approach to foster a desire for residential and occupational engagement within the CBD, attracting individuals from beyond its boundaries. Community clubs situated outside the CBD demonstrate considerably more value in their facilities.

No

Terrible that there is no mention/recognition of female participation in community sport. It is a fantastic opportunity that should be embraced and supported, not stifled with thoughts of how things were in the past.

Community groups that are often struggling to provide facilities and social networks so desperately needed by many in our city, should be encouraged and given the opportunity to develop facilities that will allow better participation, as well as that allow the originations themselves to be sustainable.

get more development into the CBD parklands

Currently our members with limited mobility sit in the rain or 40 degree heat to watch sport at park 12 as we have no lift access to members area of the grandstand. This is an excellent example of cooperation required as extra footprint is required for us to meet the facility standards and look after the community.

The parklands and various facilities are used by people from all over Adelaide. They are enjoyed and appreciated for their central location by so many people. There seems to be a small group of vocal people and not necessarily city ratepayers who are very vocal about the use of the parklands. What about the majority who actually use the parkland regularly?

My main concern is ensuring that Principle 2 is upheld. We know already that once the park has been claimed for development it doesn't return to the community easily. The loss of 80 hectares since 1837 means that on average, we have been losing an average of 4,500 square metres annually. That's the size of about 7.6 tennis courts, on average, every year. Chipping away at the Park Lands occurs gradually, in small chunks; e.g. just a pathway, just a small fenced-off area, just an extension of a building, lost to a variety special interests. They all add up.

The Bute Football Club is a country team on the Yorke Peninsula in which we currently sub lease parts of the parklands from ACSARA.

We have anywhere from 30-40 users twice a week that are predominately Uni students or members that are in Adelaide for work.

Without these grounds we are hamstrung as it is so difficult to find available space for our members to train anywhere in Adelaide at the moment. We have been lucky enough to have been given the opportunity for the last 4-5 years and hope this can continue. The facilities are very much run down with limited space for users of all sports and recreational activities. Especially for Female athletes. I strongly encourage & support the development of these new facilities as i believe that these activities are the glue that holds communities together. Thank you for taking the time to read this. Regards Jarrad

Council needs to begin to move away from adhering to building structures in accordance with existing footprint and concentrating on fit for purpose facilities. Our soccer club at Park 27b is extremely small and is using an extremely run down building that was built by the club in the 1970s and is no longer fit for purpose. The building was built at a time when there were 6 boys teams. There are now 27 teams utilising the space, including 4 girls teams. The building is not suitable for this amount of players. The common

Do you have any additional feedback you would like to provide on the Draft Policy?

area which is under cover holds a maximum of 15 people and there are no change rooms for girls players to use in their own right. In the winter the under cover area is barely that, parents get wet and the cover is very poor. A fit for purpose building is required that means the minimum requirements of Football SA.

Park 21W would be almost completely under utilised if not for ACSARA

All Councils provide sporting facilities for clubs and associations in their region, and not only limited to the sporting aspect of the club. Our facilities are the worst in the Aussie rule, netball, cricket and other leagues that we participate in. This is a terrible reflection on ACC. Please compare Council provided facilities across the City to understand our challenges. Many teams do not shower or remain after a game due to the state of our change rooms and inability to cope with two sexes, umpires, handicapped people or more than 20 at a time.

It is great to see the ACC seriously addressing the facilities issue in the Park Lands. In our circumstance, they are well passed their used by date. As a Parklands stakeholder for want of a better term, we are mindful of our responsibly to welcome others and assist community events where and when possible and as a result have shared the use of the oval and facilities with various groups, including a local soccer club, the Adelaide Footy league Umpires, Adelaide 500 and so on for many, many years.

We already have significant funds set aside to support a redevelopment and would love the opportunity to work with the Council, School, and the other teams / groups that use Park 15 to get the sort of facilities that can sustain us for the next 70 years.

Community sports clubs are the beating heart of country areas, why can't we have the same in the city?

See Bridgland PDF response linked to this survey form, mailed same date (22/11/23) to yoursay@cityofadelaide.com.au

Thank you for the opportunity to comment

As a business owner in the city, who spends 90% of my time here, having the parklands to go for a walk or play sport is convenient and vital to my mental health. You need to provide facilities I feel comfortable bringing my children to and somewhere for me to not only play, but then change/shower and spectate.

The parklands belong to all South Australians and the tens of thousands who travel to the city to participate in activities on them deserve better.

Our parklands are beautiful, and have given many South Australians incredible value and memories, particularly in relation to the sporting fields and natural environment.

We have an opportunity for SA to blow the other States out of the water by continuing to expand, and improve sporting clubs on the parklands to bring more people and activity to our city centre. i believe our focus should be on facilitating good design outcomes rather than restricting progress

Many community groups and sporting facilities are already creating a welcoming and accessible environment, and continuing to do so despite barriers from a variety of sources (at times, the council). Adelaide Comets are a perfect example of what can be created when a space in the parklands is used to its full potential - a welcoming football community and family, with equal opportunity and resources for women (including senior/junior teams, dedicated female change room and toilets, dedicated health staff working with women's teams), as well as strong connections to promote inclusivity - eg. One Culture Football club, power wheelchair football clubs.

We have also invested in a Health and Wellbeing Program and officer within the club, to promote health and wellbeing resources and ensure we are optimising all aspects of our community.

I have been involved with ALSC for over 10 years. It's the fantastic community of people that keeps me coming back even though I no longer live or work in the city. I'm excited to imagine my young family growing up in the club as we grow a juniors program. However this all rests on us being able to provide safe and functional facilities to support our club. Our current facility is neither of those things and it saddens me that other people searching for a sporting community may be put off by this. I am glad the council is implementing a community buildings policy and hope it helps our much needed redevelopment proceed in a way that supports the wider sporting community that use our facilities

The replacement of old, unsafe and inadequate buildings is crucial and priority ought to be given to supporting new facilities that are fit for purpose and cater for multiple sports, activities and community user groups.

It would be great to clarify what constitutes "elite" sport.

Does this depend upon players being paid or sponsored to play for a club?

Please refer to submission from Pembroke School

Do you have any additional feedback you would like to provide on the Draft Policy?

As a longterm resident of the City I am pleased ACC is dealing with this issue with a good overall strategy which puts the environment and community needs first. Thank you, Kathleen Patitsas

The Adelaide Cricket Club supports the creation of a parkland building policy and framework.

The purpose is sound however Council as the landlord should take the lead to ensure buildings in the parklands are fit for purpose. Sporting and community organisations can and should support Council in these endeavours however they can only contribute so much as not for profit organisations to maintaining and improving buildings and facilities in the parklands.

Please refer to SANFL's supporting letter dated 27 November 2023 from Head of Facilities and Government Relations, Belinda Marsh.

'Hi, my name is Madeleine Price, I met you in the parklands on your 'Have your say' day when it was 40 degrees! I'm the captain and treasurer of the Mercedes Old Collegiate Soccer Club's women's side. We have 3 men's teams and 1 women's team.

Up until the end of the 2020 season Mercedes College (both old scholars and high school) had been playing on the Waite Oval playing fields owned by Adelaide University in Urrbrae for years - infact I had been playing at those grounds since 2006 with the school and old scholars. Before the 2021 season Adelaide University told the school that none of their teams could play there anymore as they wanted all of the pitches for their Rugby teams instead. This forced Mercedes to try find a new home for 2021 and beyond. The Old Scholars Club then found SAWSA.

In 2021 and 2022 we used SAWSA for both trainings and games and now as of 2023, we now hire SAWSA to train at night (for the average but passable lighting), and we hire Wita Wirra to play our games on the weekend (better pitch drainage and facilities). We currently have to hire 2 grounds as neither one is adequate enough.

Some dotpoints that we spoke about on the have your say day that you told me to write down about each location -

SAWSA:

- SAWSA the ground itself has horrible drainage and the womens team had 2 games cancelled in 2021 and 1 in 2022 due to pooling water.
- We also had another game cancelled due to poor line marking (but that is a FFSA issue...)
- The toilet always overflows and often there has been sewerage on the floor staining/wetting the flooring.
- There is never toilet paper and when we played games at SAWSA 2 seasons ago we would be embarrassed to tell our opposition that those were the 'club rooms / facilities' we have. We literally said to them 'enter at your own risk'.
- That building holds the nets to the goals so we have to go in there to fetch the bins that hold the nets every time. There is no lighting through the bushes to get there and honestly we have to go in pairs it is so dark and we don't feel comfortable walking there more than 10m from the lit pitches.
- The building also seems to get broken into a lot and we never were able to keep any training gear there without fear of it being stolen.

Wita Wirra:

- Finally we have a changeroom with a place where our teams and spectators can use! However, mid season, the septic tank the building is currently connected to caused the sewerage to leak back through the pipes and into the building - the whole place smelt for weeks.
- Additionally on the sewerage, a couple of times throughout the season (one before the main leak and one just recently that I can think of), some of the toilets would not flush and they had faeces/toilet paper just sitting in the bowl. It seems like based on the tank system out the back of the building the toilets become not functionable after a certain amount of flushes and then it take ages to get them fixed.
- When we started playing there at the beginning of the year, the irrigation was leaking in one of the corners of the pitch causing pooling. I emailed Adam Gunn from COA who passed me on to Kevin Baker from COA to which I didn't get anywhere with him helping us out. Our club had to get an independent plumber to a) fix that corner and b) quote to fix the rest of the system, to which that was \$1000s.
- We also can't train here on Tuesday nights as the lighting is not sufficient enough. Hence we have to hire 2 pitches.

This is really not sustainable for a small club who do rely on sponsorships to keep us afloat rather than charging our players more to cover these types of costs.

Do you have any additional feedback you would like to provide on the Draft Policy?

Thankyou so much for the opportunity to voice how we use the parklands. I really hope that along with the building upgrades you can persuade the other COA divisions to upgrade some lighting and irrigation and make the parklands a great place to play. We absolutely love the location and will keep playing there, it just has some nuances for us.

If you need more information I'm happy to be contacted.

Madeleine Price, 0411 494 194

In the Glossary under 'Core Elements – Associated Infrastructure', there are notes for 'Sports Courts' and 'Netting/Fencing' detailing sports specific surfaces cannot be fully fenced and cannot exclude community access outside of training and competition times. Where there are safety issues identified ie cricket practice nets, SACA advocates for the needs of practical considerations to consider safety issues.

As the peak body for cricket in South Australia, the South Australian Cricket Association (SACA) is responsible for managing, promoting and developing the game of cricket in South Australia.

SACA would like to congratulate the City of Adelaide on developing the Draft Park Lands Community Buildings (Sport and Recreation) Policy. SACA acknowledges that the Adelaide Park Lands play a very important role in providing for the open space needs of metropolitan Adelaide. This balanced role includes providing opportunities for organised sport such as cricket. School, social and community (through a number of different cricket associations) is played throughout the Adelaide Park Lands during the week and on weekends.

Following the growth in female participation in cricket, combined with healthy increases in multicultural, indigenous and all abilities player categories, a key focus will be to ensure redeveloped, new and upgraded/retrofitted cricket facilities are gender inclusive and infrastructure promotes an accessible, safe and attractive environment.

Population and participation growth is impacting the availability of existing facilities with limited land available to develop new facilities especially in the metropolitan area.

There is currently an under provision of supporting off-field infrastructure at a number of cricket grounds across the State. There is an under provision of inclusive clubrooms and changeroom areas, as well as basic amenities such as toilets, shade and shelter, especially at clubs secondary or third playing fields.

SACA is commitment to the upgrade of cricket facilities by way of two grant funding programs.

Australian Cricket Infrastructure Fund

The Australian Cricket Infrastructure Fund (ACIF) provides funding for community cricket facility projects, with a focus on growing participation and promoting accessibility and inclusivity. The ACIF will contribute up to \$5 million in 2023/24 (\$500,000 in South Australia) into community facility projects, representing Cricket's continued commitment to infrastructure funding. The ACIF is open to all clubs, associations, schools, councils and cricket facility managers, acknowledging the important role that these partners play in providing facilities for community cricket across Australia. We invite and encourage all clubs, schools and the City of Adelaide to apply for funding available through this program <https://www.saca.com.au/community/grants-and-scholarships/australian-cricket-infrastructure-fund>

Places to Play

The South Australian Cricket Association (SACA) is committed to developing high quality facilities that provide a welcoming environment for all players, officials volunteers and fans. As part of SACA's increase in investment in community cricket infrastructure, SACA is offering the opportunity for schools and Councils to receive a grant to install a new cricket pitch (hard wicket) on one of its ovals or open spaces. SACA is particularly keen to unlock new opportunities for 'Places to Play' throughout the Park Lands

Do you have any additional feedback you would like to provide on the Draft Policy?

and supports the planning and incorporation of new cricket pitches at Park 21, 27B and Park 6 as well as the replacement of 2 cricket pitches lost at Park 2 within Park 4 and any other locations available.

In the core requirements it mentions kitchen facilities but avoids the terms "licensed area or bar" - is this implying that future buildings will not be given liquor licenses which are secondary considerations and take up a considerable part of the building footprint?

How do you define elite vs non elite organizations?

Is payment of players a consideration?