

Hawthorndene Oval Apex Park Working Group Report

Opening Remarks (for Council presentation by one participant)

Who are we...?

We are a blend of stakeholders and community.

We use the oval in different ways and we come mainly from surrounding areas - H / Blackwood / Glenulta / Belair

The process

We started by identifying what we value about the area - community, nature, outdoors, mixed uses, egalitarian, peace and beauty.

We met over 4 sessions over the last 2 weekends. Council wanted our input into:

- The CLMP
- The ramblers proposal - specifically the facility, nets, hours and types of use, liquor license.

We refined and clarified the issues we wanted to discuss throughout the process.

We have gone through a process of gaining information, asking questions and raising concerns. This weekend has been devoted to working through and generating solutions.

It's been really intense - everyone has committed to the process. Lots of people have come with strong views. Lots of tension and lots of goodwill. We have seen a genuine effort to understand different positions. We still don't all agree, have built some understanding and crystallised our concerns. We hope we have provided some direction for Council.

Facility

Round 1

Benefits (from Friday night)

- Brings people together
- Activates the oval in different ways, another use
- Facility is proposed and designed for others to use – not exclusive
- The existing facilities on the oval need an upgrade
- **Can you think of anymore benefits in addition to this?**
- Upgrade of current public toilets as a new facility/building is a benefit to the community
- Benefit for the club Coromandel Valley Ramblers and those members

Tensions (from Friday night)

- Size(foot print)
- Clubroom vs a simple change room – change room alone doesn't seem too bad
- Increase in congestion (people and cars)
- Use conflicts with what parts of the community want
- Unbalanced – may lead to exclusive use for a select few
- Not sure the economics make sense

Can you think of any more tensions in addition to this?

- Reduces public activations because it's an activity that can put other people off using the space and reduces the opportunity when those games are taking place.
- Building is currently too big
- Currently proposed toilet which has access issues due to only rear entry can pose a safety issue (children), and congestion issues.
- Need for more than one public toilet to the current toilet footprint
- There is a need to retain the green open space we currently have. Free public space ovals are very few these days
- There is no community benefit for an exclusive licensed club room

What ideas do you have for how these tensions and benefits might be able to be realised / resolved?

- Smaller changeroom where the afternoon tea options can be used
- Preference is for multiple toilets which are accessible from the front of the building and for community use/public use.
- Single toilet will require more maintenance
- Disability toilet doesn't have urinal for men
- If the overall footprint of the building was substantially reduced and the number of toilets made available to the community was increased with baby change facilities made available then this would make it more accessible
- Smaller scale building reduces the tension
- Small scale change room, storage and toilet upgrade only
- Only leave a and b cricket group as it currently is, then a single changeroom is only

<p>needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at existing sites that reflect this • Existing site - Weymouth oval to be considered for club room upgrade • Current shelter to be upgraded for spectator viewing, offering the needed shelter and offering space for the public to use • Add barbeque to the existing shelter • Major rethink to the design for greater community usage eg the changerooms/toilets be community accessible.
--

Round 2 Facility

Which idea/s have merit? (Considers the needs of all stakeholders, demonstrates a fair compromise and the community could live with?)	Pro's (benefits of the idea, what value will it bring, how will it help align with the future uses?)	Con's (consequences of the idea, unintended consequences, any risks associated with this solution that need to be managed?)	Is this possible/viable? (Can it be done, is it even an option? Check-in with Council and other stakeholders)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preference is for multiple toilets which are accessible from the front of the building and for community use/public use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You don't lose any facility but community gets greater amenity. • Existing toilets are not adequate 	<p>Doesn't resolve other issues around the building.</p> <p>Will require some redesign</p>	Possible
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller footprint complete redesign that keeps the fundamental features. • Fundamental features: 2 changerooms, accessible WC, 4 toilets, umpire rooms 	<p>Much more acceptable to community.</p> <p>Less visual impact.</p> <p>Save trees.</p> <p>Still benefits club in a lot of uses and upgrade to facilities.</p> <p>Improved for</p>	<p>Loss of amenity to club and facility available for shared use.</p> <p>Losing potentially storage options and other valuable features of the clubroom.</p> <p>We potentially lose multipurpose use for</p>	Possible

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider omitting multipurpose space and canteen 	<p>community, is inclusive.</p> <p>Reduces the community tension.</p> <p>Less environmental impact.</p> <p>Visually less intrusive.</p> <p>No canteen means no competition for Joan's Pantry</p>	<p>community.</p> <p>Lose ability to have it as a clubroom.</p> <p>Smaller viewing deck, watching kids and children etc, everyone is in rain or sun for example.</p> <p>Funding issue potentially for the club.</p> <p>SACA has indicated this is already a very small building compared to other clubs. SACA finds it more sustainable to invest in one building rather than multiple at one venue.</p> <p>What can be cut out? Ramblers' view is that every element is essential.</p> <p>Smaller building can't be much smaller without losing things.</p>	
--	--	--	--

Anything else you want to add....

There was broad agreement that the existing toilets need upgrading. There was also broad agreement that it was reasonable to have changing rooms for junior players to change in, and that there would need to be two changerooms to ensure gender inclusivity. There was also broad agreement that any new facility should provide multiple toilets available to the public, including accessible toilets.

Points of tension about the existing design were:

- Size of the building - some participants thought it was visually intrusive and impacted the environment adversely
- Need for a multipurpose space - some participants thought this was a valuable community facility, others saw it as an unnecessary addition to the building
- Need for a canteen - some saw this as unnecessary and others were concerned about the impact on Joan's Pantry

There was no consensus on these points but these were issues that were discussed at length and needed further work.

It was not clear that there was broad support for the facility at all. Some participants maintained that the preferable solution was no facility.

Other queries:

Is it possible to lower the height of building to the lowest possible to improve visual impact (cons- loss of viewing/deck and community usage)?

Architect could be asked to come up with alternative designs that come up with ideas that can be looked at properly.

Other viable options could be looked at but were not due to time constraints at this point, which are worthy of consideration.

Omit canteen due to competition with Joan's Pantry.

Suggestion for redesign: make two of the toilets outward-facing so one is accessible from outside and one from inside the change room.

Round 3 - Summary for Council

Which solution/ idea appears to have broad support? And why does it have that support?

- Upgrade to publicly accessible public toilet facilities
 - Noting a desire also for more community accessible space in the plan
- Change rooms, designed in compliance with regulations.
- Most people are keen to minimise the building footprint.

The community has a broad agreement that an upgrade of community facilities is necessary, and want to make sure that only what is required and supported is approved and undertaken.

Tested some elements individually due to the granularity of the elements in the proposal and associated issues (see John's photos):

- Toilets 100%
- Changerooms 100%
- Storage 80%
- Multi-purpose w/ or w/o Canteen/Kitchen split towards not living with it
- Decking/shelter split




Explain why this position is in the best interests of the community?

- The community does not want features included beyond what is necessary.
- The community has a strong priority to maintain the character and atmosphere of the oval and its current environment. Green space.
- The community wants to make sure we maintain that balance of shared formal and informal use
- Having a greater access to the building and being able to utilise decking is beneficial for the community

What can't the group live with - from your perspective?

- Inadequate toilet facilities - currently we have four, and the proposal leaves only one which we believe is inadequate.
- Negative impact to the character of the oval
- Some members noted issues around:
 - loss of the shared use space, future opportunities
 - reducing the proposal to something which isn't fit for purpose
- Some members noted:
 - Permanent loss of the vibe of the atmosphere; once you build it then it is there and going backwards is unlikely
- Location of the building. Whether location and plan have had sufficient scoping and community consultation.

Facility – Photos indicating levels of support for the group

Question Asked	Sociometric result
Do you support an upgrade to the toilets?	
Do you support changerooms at HO	
Do you support storage facilities at HO	

Do you support the proposed Multi Purpose Facility and Canteen



Do you support the proposed Multi Purpose Facility with no Canteen



Do you support the deck / shelter at the facility



Training Nets

Round 1

Benefits (from Friday night)

- Will decrease the footprint of the club on the oval proper – confined to that area
- Can be used widely by many users – softball, baseball etc
- Promotes balance

Can you think of any more benefits in addition to this?

- Attract kids into the sport - more accessible.
- Removes fear of balls hitting people

Tensions (from Friday night)

- Don't know enough yet to comment, not enough information
- Duplication across other ovals/locations
- Large footprint
- Blight on the landscape, noise pollution
- Leads to increased used of cricket club

Can you think of any more tensions in addition to this?

Concept - 2 nets

Only 2 persons can use net at a time - what are the others doing during this time?

Unknown what the final number of nets is

Concern that trees may need to be removed

Could impact existing trees

Potential Visual impact

Joan's disadvantaged by competing sales from Ramblers during training.

Car parking is an issue during training - congestion, displaces potential Jones customers and Apex park users

20 - 30 cars for a match

- Permanent footprint and install which destroys that unique green space (1890 onward)
- They are imposing in size, impactful, and affect the visual amenity of the area
- These are built for one purpose and only available when being used by the club
- Environmental hazard and impact on tree roots and fauna
- Training pitch surfaces raising temperature

What ideas do you have for how these tensions and benefits might be able to be realised / resolved?

- Run training sessions at both ovals - spread the training
- Locate nets away from where they could impact trees
- Locate nets to minimise visual impact,
- Locate nets off main oval so mixed use can continue on oval
- Improve design - new style retractable, small storage area needed. Pullout. Put away after training.

- Use green or black instead of silver mesh
- Improve design (extra piece of netting to protect bowler and stop balls coming out - from a straight drive) - similar to the V2 design at Weymouth.
- Ramblers could undertake to not sell products that compete with Jones Pantry during net training (if Jones starts evening operations)
- Parking conflict not necessarily due to nets:
 - a. Exclude or time limited parking area at entrance to oval from use by Ramblers training people.
 - b. Parking areas closest to Jones excluded or time limited in relation to use by Ramblers in training
 - c. Shuttle bus for training from larger car park outside area
 - d. Car parking requirements for training may not conflict with Joan's as it is out of hours but may conflict with Apex park users?
 - e. Kiss and drop area provided for encouraging reduced parking use and increase safety for arriving players.
 - f. Private local homes renting out driveways for people to use for parking during training and matches and visits to Joan's.
 - g. Some other wacky ideas about underground / multi story car parks, repurposing park space for temporary car parks.

Round 2 Training Nets

If there were to be training nets, where on HO would they be best located?

- Where they do not impinge upon the oval space, to ensure the usage and safety of oval users is maintained during their informal activity
- Where they do not remove trees.
- Where they are closer to the club house to minimise the total oval usage area during practice, allowing for casual users to still have access.
- Where it will not dominate the view.

If there were to be training nets, what features would you want to see (ie permanent / retractable, size, colour etc)

- The intent of these features/guidance is to make them invisible in the landscape
- Must be retractable
- At most two nets, but the preference is that only one net be built.
- Neutral colour - matt black is the only colour which humans look through and past without registering it
- Alternative & innovative surfaces other than concrete or fake turf. Council has an opportunity to be a leader in this space in conjunction with SACA. (What a PR opportunity!)

If there were to be training nets, who should be able to use them?

- Both the public and clubs should be able to use them.
 - If they're retractable, how will they be available to others?
 - Keys/Bookings/Responsibility/Costs
 - They should be available from both council and club
 - Bookings made through a publicly available portal
 - There should be no charge to the public to book and use the nets
 - Look to the management of the Tennis Courts for precedent in how to. Consistency is important
- There will need to be guidance/restriction on hours available (Tennis courts).

Is there anything else you want to make sure that Council knows about / considers if there was an application / approval for training nets

- Can they be at Weymouth oval (Built or upgrade existing)?
 - Nets are more appropriate at a venue other than a green space like HO
- One community view is simply; Don't build them at HO!
- Do the nets need to be together?
 - Could they be 1 permanent and 1 retractable?
 - Could they be ½ permanent, and extendable?
- Reminder that any proposal needs to be presented with complete detail, which has been missing from this section of this consultation.
 - Dimensions
 - Photos
 - Locations
 - Materials
 - Colours
 - Multiple options on each of these aspects
- Management and maintenance responsibility ideally by the lease holder
 - Or consistent with Council's existing arrangements with other clubs/leaseholders re: publicly available sporting facilities
- The club bears the cost of removal in the future "Make Good Provision".
- Council to have a clear feedback and monitoring system to gather ongoing issues, comments, observations from all stakeholders.

Round 3 – Training Nets Summary for Council (Note: not supported, to read round 2 detail)

Which solution/ idea appears to have broad support? And why does it have that support?


1. The inclusion of nets is entirely dependent on approval of the development proposal for the building. You can't have one without the other.
2. A preference for co-location with the building to reduce impact on the spread of the facility.
3. Community do not wish to have trees removed, impact on the visual amenity, or increased parking.
4. If approved, the nets must be 'invisible' in the landscape.

Explain why this position is in the best interests of the community?

The constraints of the site make the nets hard to imagine. Without a better understanding of the requirements/needs/details it is impossible to come to a conclusion.

What can't the group live with - from your perspective?

The lack of information (please see main body of the document).

Question asked	Sociometric results
<p>Can you live with the Round 3 summary as written?</p>	 <p>Note: Given this wasn't supported, the group agreed that the Round 2 work (not the Round 3 summary) was more accepted. As a result the participant who spoke to this topic focussed on the Round 2 detail.</p>

Liquor License

Round 1

Benefits (from Friday night)

- Makes the club play by the rules.
- Ensures the club is doing the right thing.
- Creates / enforces compliance. Lots of risk if not complying with conditions
- Potential to decrease tension with neighbours as it becomes a controlled activity.

Can you think of any more benefits in addition to this?

Tensions (from Friday night)

- Potential to increase tension with neighbours
- Negatives of alcohol – culture, anti-social, safety
- Is it redundant?
- Impacts on the charm/appeal of the oval
- Will it brand the oval as 'owned' by club?
- Broad public health issues around alcohol consumption. Sociological thing... if people see it as alcoholic venue, people won't see it as an inclusive venue.
- Fund raising aspect doesn't make sense. They can fund raise in other ways. Eg fees
- For this to be effective fundraising, there is a motivation to drink more alcohol. This is a conflict of interest with some members of the local community.
- Challenge retaining people in sport. A few pain points. The big one is when kids start drinking... false choice between zero alcohol and keeping them within clubs. With moderate and responsible alcohol consumption, we keep in the loop and model positive behavior for young adults.
- Fund raising is difficult for clubs.
- Opportunity for sale in public space will create problems outside of the cricket club.
- Will draw a subset of people to the club eg interlopers.
- Rubbish issue and general environmental/ambience.
- License to members only or general public.
- Where will people drink is an issue.
- Business impact for Joan's pantry.
- Impact on close and very close neighbours.
- Volume of punters eg hangers on the club goes up.
- People's perception of the area will change, this is a significant change potentially away from the charm/safety/atmosphere/aesthetic etc
- Some would love it to be a dry zone.
- Perception of decreased safety and inclusivity of the space especially as loss of safety and inclusion for particularly, women, children and the aged.
- Community reaction to extended and formalised alcohol consumption.

Can you think of any more tensions in addition to this?

What ideas do you have for how these tensions and benefits might be able to be realised / resolved?

- Potential for the Club to commit to “alcohol free” events
- Dry zone
- Liquor licence is limited to activities the Sturt Ramblers cricket club and no other hirees
- Limited to Ramblers cricket clubs events.
- Consumption constrained to the facility only eg deck and inside.
- Change to Cricket Australia, SACA and Ramblers culture that is not alcohol based.
- Ramblers to advocate on the delinking of cricket culture in particular and alcohol
- To provide an example that organised sport, teamwork and healthy activity is not linked to alcohol consumption. This will provide strong positive modelling.
- Ramblers can completely de-link the scheduling of juniors and alcohol consumption.
- SACA and Ramblers opportunity to provide direction through their clubs and members on a positive and inclusive culture.
- Has to be limited in hours, has to be confined to the footprint.

Round 2 Liquor License

If there was to be a liquor license what conditions would you want to see in relation to hours of use?

During and after adult matches. No alcohol available during or after junior matches. Half of the group agrees with alcohol at Hawthorndene oval after training sessions.

Options:

Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday - 4 supported

Thursday, Saturday - 7 supported

Ramblers open to Thursday only

Saturday only - 11 supported

If there was to be a liquor license what conditions would you like to see regarding the sale of alcohol?

Must be consumed within the facility.

Half of the group agrees only mid-strength or ‘light’ alcohol is available. Including the sale of spirits, e.g. shots, and premix that is not mid-strength or lower. This is to reduce over consumption of alcohol.

If there was to be a liquor license, what else should be considered as a condition of that license?

Not available to the general public.
 Breathalyzer that is available.
 Water freely available.
 Code of conduct as part of the lease

Anything else you want to add?

Licence if requested, is only applied for after the first year.
 Trial conditions for different scenarios regarding the type of alcohol sold.
 Questions?
 Does food need to be provided when alcohol is being sold?
 Are there conditions on Joan's Pantry's liquor licence?
 Are there any lessons learnt from responsible consumption at Joan's pantry?
 Is a liquor licence necessary for the proposal to go ahead?
 SACA position - moderate considered consumption to retain young adult males. But alcohol consumption has a negative reputation for younger players. Largest growth area is females young and older and alcohol is a turnoff for women and children.

Round 3 – Liquor License Summary for Council

I'm reporting on the group's thinking about what conditions should apply for a liquor licence.

Which solution / idea appears to have broad support? And why does it have that support?


To note: Significant division exists among participants on whether there should be a licence or not.

Consumption of alcohol needs to be responsible and not create problems.

If there was to be a licence:

- + Provide drinking water
- + Ramblers Code of Conduct on consumption
- + The more limited times of operation, the more support it had. Some support earlier finish time on Saturday - for example 8pm.
- + No alcohol sales at junior training and matches
- + Consumption limited to deck and premises - so the consumption doesn't spill out to the wider park and impact other users and local residents.
- + support for a time limited trial of the liquor license to see how this impacts the

community.
<p>Explain why this position is in the best interests of the community? Limits drunken, dangerous and anti-social behaviour Seeks to limit exposure of juniors to the culture of alcohol. This is also in the interest of the cricket community: enables them to continue having good relations with other park users.</p>
<p>What can't the group live with - from your perspective? Antisocial and dangerous behaviour associated with alcohol on and around the oval.</p>

Question asked	Sociometric result
<p>Can you live with the Round 3 summary as written?</p>	

Hours / Types of Use

Round 1

<p>Benefits (from Friday night)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reasonable proposal / balanced use with community ● Cant say its positive yet – want to know more ● Love watching cricket being played – prefer that over dogs on the oval (risk of incident) ● More people are able to use the Oval <p>Can you think of any more benefits in addition to this?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clarity of use - everyone can know when the oval is being used for what (also so residents can report to Council if oval is being used outside permitted hours/use - provides emotional safety so people can hold the oval to permitted use and feel supported to complain)
--

- Structured usage allows community to be informed if there are changes (eg when T20 matches are scheduled)

Tensions (from Friday night)

- Impact on surrounding homes – more use, more traffic/noise?
- Unsure right now / Don't know enough about what is proposed to make a call on the tension points – haven't seen the future use / confused about what Club wants
- Unfair (perceived exclusive/dominant use by one group of users)
- Car Parking – more pressure, potential to seal the carpark (enviro impacts)
- Does an increase in use on weekday afternoons/evenings reduce/restrict the use for the community – popular time

Can you think of any more tensions in addition to this?

- How much of the oval will be used for each activity? All of the oval or only a part?
- Extent of informal use on weekday afternoons/evening - there is no measurement of this at present; anecdotal evidence of many users at these times, so query whether cricket would allow for more people to use oval (also depends on answer to previous question)
- Health and safety issues from stray balls
- Concerned 'usage creep' of use by organised activities and loss of community input into process
- Summer months are the most valued and popular months for informal use

What ideas do you have for how these tensions and benefits might be able to be realised / resolved?

- Clear schedule of use (especially important in Summer months but can be used all year round), publicly available and maintained/updated - available on Mitcham Council website and on noticeboard at oval and/or Joan's and other local businesses (eg GD, schools)
- Maintain existing hours of use/status quo (no additional use by organised sport)
- Any change in hours to be guided by general principle: organised sport to have priority on weekends, informal use to have priority on weekday afternoons & evenings, use to be shared on weekday mornings/midday.
- Several evenings a week to be dedicated to informal use with no organised sport.
- Training to be confined to $\frac{1}{3}$ or $\frac{1}{4}$ of the oval
-

Round 2 Hours and Types of Use

The cricket Club have said they may use the oval for games and training. Do you think the hours proposed by the Club for their use of the oval are reasonable and acceptable?

(Note we would like you to think about a scenario of use with the facility only and also one with the facility + training nets in place).

- Outlines hours of use looks like a reasonable balance between two ovals given club's growth, but
 - HO has far more informal use than WO - would it be better for training to remain at WO?
 - Incompatibility between informal use and training (safety, wandering dogs, children etc)

If not, what is reasonable and acceptable?

- Continue to use existing training facilities at WO

What other types of use should be promoted / permitted at HO?

- Adult and youth exercise - outdoor gym equipment
- BBQ at the shelter
- Creek line rehabilitation and nature play
- Sturt Linear trail - runs through - active transport
- Kaurna Cultural Awareness

What could be improved about the club's proposal to better balance use/access of the Oval?

- Licence for training could be for a portion of the oval (e.g. around $\frac{1}{3}$ oval around training nets)
 - In-compatibility of formal and informal activities e.g. balls, animal, children
 - Design of nets (e.g. hybrid fixed/flexible nets)
 - Safety
- Keep all training at WO
 - No storage at WO currently
 - Need to consider balance across both ovals with other usage rates in mind
 - Need to measure usage and define 'balance' e.g. go-pro footage
- Review operations and hours of use in 6 months and periodically thereafter
- Provide hours of use information to the community (online / on-site notice board) for clarification and remove conflict

Is there anything else you want to ensure Council knows in relation to use (hours and types)?

- Time of use impacts on parking availability for all users
- There actually isn't space for nets or parking so not much point planning for hours of use under the presumption of having a home base

Round 3 – Hours / Types of Use - Summary for Council

Which solution/ idea appears to have broad support? And why does it have that support?

- Partial licence ($\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{3}$ oval) for two training nights per week
 - Prefer no training Friday night (personal preference, Joan’s Pantry)
 - Finishing by 6pm on at least one of those nights, preferably both
- Time of use information to the public (online and on-site notice board)
- Trial of usage with review (6 month and periodic)
- Council assessment of usage - to inform balance of use at each oval and across ovals
 - Observational data from video footage

Explain why this position is in the best interests of the community?

Provides a compromise
 Based on data
 Commitment to review
 Safeguards in place to prevent usage creep (e.g T20 quid pro quo, Mortlock oval model)

What can’t the group live with - from your perspective?

Full oval license most evenings per week

Question asked	Sociometric result
<p>Can you live with the Round 3 summary as written?</p>	