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1 INTRODUCTION

The Town of Gawler has endorsed the proposal to construct a skatepark within their municipality.

Convic Design has been engaged by Council to review a number of locations within close proximity to the centre of town to recommend a preferred site for the implementation of this important sporting facility.

This report initially outlines the general requirements for a successful skatepark, includes a description of the important site selection assessment criteria and then applies these to each of the locations to ascertain the most appropriate site for the facility. This review is set up as a weighted matrix to clearly outline the assessment process.

High population growth is predicted for the region that in the medium term consideration should be given to the establishment of a regional skate facility. There is expected to be a net additional population of 110,000 people in the next 30 years in the Barossa region. The development of a major new sporting hub to serve Gawler and new growth areas has already been flagged, ideal for the inclusion of a regional skatepark facility. This report however is for the site selection of a local sized facility.

1.1 LOCATION OF SITES

The four sites reviewed by Convic Design and Council are all located within 1km of the centre of town.
2 SKATEPARK TYPOLOGY

2.1 Introduction

This section outlines specifically what should be considered for a local level skate park that caters for a range of users and various skill levels.

2.2 Functional considerations

For the purposes of this report, a local level skatepark is defined as a facility that provides ample space and components to enable a variety of different skilled skate & BMX users to frequent the park on a daily basis whilst still providing opportunities for small organised events and competitions.

Note that any skate facility would be subject to site specific design and integrated into its surroundings and so would not necessarily be a single square concrete space.

The following should be included in the facility;

- A minimum of 400 sq/m of rideable area to provide enough space and components to provide for both advanced and beginner users for both transition and street users.
- The areas should contain street elements laid out to create designated session spots whilst also designed to maximise flow wherever possible. Items for consideration (subject to user consultation) could include gaps, hubbas, ledges, rails, banks, fun boxes and the like.
- There should also be an area for transition skaters & BMX such as a transition zone with a mix of heights and components such as hips, roll ins, spines, gaps and the like (subject to user consultation).

2.3 Ancillary considerations

To compliment the above functional area, the following should also be included to ensure the facility functions correctly both for day to day use and during events;

- Materials need to be chosen to ensure maximum function & durability whilst contextually integrated.
- Clearly defined entrances to the skating areas with appropriate robust signage (including safety information, code of conduct etc) & demarcation as applicable.
- Drinking fountains
- Rubbish bins at main entrances
- Viewing areas within the skatepark
- Social seating
- Shade within the viewing and refuge spaces

3 SITE SELECTION CRITERIA

3.1 Introduction

This section summarizes key site selection criteria considered important when assessing the appropriateness for a skate facility in the 4 locations raised by Council. These criteria have been developed using information from the Sport and
Recreation Victorias Skate Park guide and Convic Design’s own professional experience (successfully designed over 300 skate park projects world wide).

These criteria have then been weighted by Council or Convic in order of deemed importance (refer second column in matrix). Convic Design has then applied these to each site and assessed them to calculate a preferred location. This is outlined in the matrix (refer section 4).

### 3.2 Physical site conditions & technical considerations

This first broad criterion is based on the physicality of the various sites and whether they can accommodate a skate park of the required scale and typology required by Council. It also considers technical implications such as drainage and soil conditions.

Questions asked at each site include;
- Is the proposed site of adequate size (approx 400+sq.m)?
- Is the site able to accommodate a variety of design options e.g. bowl, street, urban, plaza?
- Is the site able to accommodate a diversity of skate elements and areas for several small groups or individuals?
- Can the site accommodate the needs of different skill levels?
- Can the site accommodate access for users and spectators including refuge areas with seating, viewing and adequate separation in an inclusive design?
- Does the site have the ability to cater for larger crowds and temporary infrastructure during peak use and events?
- Can the proposed site accommodate potential future expansion?
- Is the proposed site free of existing land use implications, right of way, covenants, easements, service access requirements and/or underground/overhead powerlines, water and gas?
- Are there minimal complex drainage requirements for the proposed site?
- Does the geotechnical classification for the site suggest minimal construction implications?
- Does the topography at the proposed site require minimal construction implications (i.e. no need for significant earthworks, cut/fill or retaining structures)?
- Is there existing potable water and electricity to the site?

### 3.3 Access/transport

This second criterion looks at how easily accessible the site is for users, parents and those viewing the skatepark or events. With the main age group using this facility being children without the ability to drive, it is important to ensure that the facility can be easily accessed by all.

Questions asked of each site on this criterion include;
- Are there pedestrian/footpath connections from transport nodes to the proposed site?
- Is there a safe drop off area (evaluation of existing vehicular traffic arrangement may be necessary)?
- Is there adequate car parking?

### 3.4 Natural surveillance, security and safety

Given we are looking at creating a public sporting facility with the main users being younger generations it is critical to ensure that the facility is open and safe and easily accessed in the case of an emergency.

Questions asked for this criterion include;
- Is the proposed site visually prominent with good public surveillance for safety and for the promotion of the facility and skate activity?
- Is the proposed site a short distance from police response calls and does it provide ease of police access on schedules routes?
- Can the proposed site provide adequate emergency vehicle access (fire and ambulance)?
- Can vehicular access be restricted at the proposed site to prevent skating at night by car light?
- Can the proposed site provide safe entry to and from the site and safe setbacks from busy roads and intersections

3.5 Proximity to amenities (water, toilets, shade, food & drink)

An active public sporting facility such as a skatepark should have appropriate ancillary amenities as outlined in the previous section. This includes shade for viewing and resting, water bubblers and nearby toilets given users can spend many hours using a skatepark in a single session.

Questions therefore asked for this criterion are;
- Are associated amenities such as public telephone, toilets, water, shelter and shade existing and available or cost effective to install at the proposed site?
- Is the proposed site close to shops selling food and drink and is there potential for seasonal, peak time and/or event day food and drink outlets?

3.6 Impact on existing facilities, adjoining uses and users

To assess the suitability of a site, one of the main considerations is how much impact the new skatepark will have on the existing users and use of the space. This can be a contentious community issue and so the following questions have been asked for this criterion;

- Can the proposed site facilitate no net loss of green space?
- Can the proposed site facilitate no impact on ecological systems e.g. wetlands, foreshore and bushland
- Can the proposed site facilitate no net loss of mature or significant trees
- Can the proposed site facilitate no impact on pedestrian or road network and access including existing desire lines?
- Will the location of a skate facility on the proposed site not displace existing recreational or other site users?
- Are there no existing heritage items or indigenous people’s claims for land title or sites cultural significance at the proposed site?
- Is there no history of social activity on a site including those considered ‘anti-social’?

3.7 Distance from housing & incompatible land use

Another major consideration for any new public sporting facility is the potential impact of noise and light to nearby housing. It is important that the new skate facility is placed to minimise impact to surrounding residential areas. We have undertaken acoustic assessments of a number of existing skateparks to ascertain an appropriate distance from residential areas and as a guide 50m is considered an acceptable distance. Please note that this is subject to a more detailed acoustic assessment as each location has different factors such as surrounding noise, landform, prevailing winds etc.

Questions therefore include;
- Is the site location an adequate distance (50m) from residential dwellings and incompatible land uses to avoid potential noise and light intrusions?
- Has the site the capacity to be placed to maximise noise attenuation.
3.8 Management & Maintenance issues

This is subject to Councils expectations on the management of the facility. It depends on the level of on site supervision and maintenance of the facility. Almost all skateparks around Australia other than major CBD facilities are unsupervised and so management may not be important in this case. Maintenance is important to ensure the park can be cleaned easily and regularly.

Questions therefore asked for this criterion are;
- Does the proposed site have the availability of infrastructure to house management requirements including first aid, toilets and potential supervisors?
- How readily accessible is the skatepark to regular cleaning for existing Council cleaning and maintenance teams.

3.9 Context & Amenity

The criteria is most applicable to the socialisation that occurs at skateparks and the importance of providing facilities that are where young people want to be and provide important amenity (sun protection, wind etc.).

The following questions will be asked for each of the sites regarding context and amenity.
- Is the proposed site location where young people want to be or adjacent to where they currently congregate?
- Is the proposed site in close proximity to existing shopping centres, sports or recreation facilities or interested schools?
- Is it possible for the design to compliment the existing visual amenity of the site?
- Is the proposed site within or adjacent to a major community hub or central area?

4 SKATEPARK BUS TOUR

Further to the above site criteria skate users, community members, Councillors and Council staff were part of a bus tour on Sunday 25th September 2011. We visited 6 potential skatepark sites, where everyone made comments about each site and its suitability. Overall the end users had a preferred option being Clonlea Park, which was later discussed in Council chambers. Not all of the sites that were visited were assessed in the suitability matrix as they were deemed unacceptable on the day. Below are brief notes made from observations during the tour.

4.1 Dead Man’s Pass:
Deemed unacceptable due to poor accessibility, no light and no amenities close by. It is currently a vacant car park, opposite the ambulance station. The site has a history of severe flooding.

4.2 Adelaide Road (Croquet green):
Site is too small and in a very high profile busy area. Good accessibility and close to shops. Not enough car parks in the surrounding areas. The site has recently been used for events and received residential complaints about noise/lighting. This site was deemed unacceptable.

4.3 Goose Island (from Julian Terrace):
Local police approve of this site as it has a good police check. It is close to public toilet and is in the user’s preferred 3 options. A large man made depression makes up half of the site, originally used for outdoor music events. There is history of contamination on site (used as a loam pit). Good size and good passive surveillance in a family orientated area close to the main hub of town. The site also has a history of severe flooding due to its proximity to the South Para River.
4.4 Gawler Sport and Community Park (existing skatepark site):
Not close to shops and has a ‘back of house’ feel. The current skatepark is in poor condition and needs its own separate audit to assess its current safety and function concerns. The design of the car park adjacent to the skatepark seems to promote loitering in cars. There is an opportunity to update, renovate and improve the existing skatepark facilities. Within its location next to the ‘Youth Shak’ is a great base to run programmed events from.

4.5 Trevor Bellchambers Swimming Centre:
This site seemed favoured by Council and was also in the users Top 3. It is close to shops and car parking. There are no immediate flooding issues, but the site is in a dip. Existing trees create design constraints. There are toilet facilities in the pool however the pool is closed 6 months of the year. There is a smell when the pool is not maintained over winter months which may offend potential users. Although passive surveillance from the main road is good, other sites offer more prominent views into their space.

4.6 Clonlea Park:
This is the preferred site by users and the Council members on the day. It was also known as the old skate park site, before it was located in the Gawler Sport and Community Park. There are natural earth mounds which may assist with the design of skate elements. The site is part of a larger family reserve, next to toilets, tennis courts and a playground. There strong visual connections ensuring high levels of passive surveillance to the existing BMX facility and down Murray Road. There is ample car parking and a gated entry. The site is a good size with room to expand (there was a general good, positive feel for the site). The only issue is that the area is prone to flooding and becomes submerged in a one in 20 year flood event.
## 5 WEIGHTED MATRIX

The following is an assessment of each of the sites based on the criteria and questions outlined above to ascertain the most appropriate location for a skatepark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSIDERATION/CRITERIA</th>
<th>Importance of Criteria (5 highest, 1 lowest) set by council</th>
<th>Extent of Meeting Criteria (0=does not meet criteria 1- partially meets criteria 2- significantly meets criteria)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical site conditions &amp; technical considerations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposed site of adequate size (approx 400+sq.m)?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site able to accommodate a variety of design options e.g. bowl, street, urban, plaza?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site able to accommodate a diversity of skate elements and areas for several small groups or individuals?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site accommodate the needs of different skill levels?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the site accommodate access for users and spectators including refuge areas with seating, viewing and adequate separation in an inclusive design?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have the ability to cater for larger crowds and temporary infrastructure during peak use and events?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the proposed site accommodate potential future expansion?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposed site free of existing land use implications, right of way, covenants, easements, service access requirements and/or underground/overhead powerlines, water and gas?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there minimal complex drainage requirements for the proposed site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the topography at the proposed site require minimal construction implications (i.e. no need for significant earthworks, cut/fill or retaining structures)?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there existing potable water and electricity to the site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Access/transport**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there pedestrian/footpath connections from transport nodes to the proposed site?</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a safe drop off area (evaluation of existing vehicular traffic arrangement may be necessary)?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there adequate car parking? (subject to traffic study)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Natural surveillance, security and safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the proposed site visually prominent with good public surveillance for safety and for the promotion of the facility and skate activity?</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposed site a short distance from police response calls and does it provide ease of police access on schedules routes?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the proposed site provide adequate emergency vehicle access (fire and ambulance)?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the proposed site provide safe entry to and from the site and safe setbacks from busy roads and intersections</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proximity to amenities (water, toilets, Shade, food & drink)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are associated amenities such as public telephone, toilets, water, shelter and shade existing and available or cost effective to install at the proposed site?</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposed site close to shops selling food and drink and is there potential for seasonal, peak time and/or event day food and drink outlets?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact on existing facilities, adjoining uses and users**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Can the proposed site facilitate no net loss of green space?</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can the proposed site facilitate no impact on ecological systems e.g. wetlands, foreshore and bushland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the proposed site facilitate no net loss of mature or significant trees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the proposed site facilitate no impact on pedestrian or road network and access including existing desire lines?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the location of a skate facility on the proposed site not displace existing recreational or other site users?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there no existing heritage items or indigenous people’s claims for land title or sites cultural significance at the proposed site?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can vehicular access be restricted at the proposed site to prevent skating at night by car light?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there no history of social activity on a site including those considered ‘anti-social’?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance from housing &amp; incompatible land use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site location an adequate distance (50m) from residential dwellings and incompatible land uses to avoid potential noise and light intrusions?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the site the capacity to have the skate facility placed to maximise noise attenuation and light intrusion if applicable.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management &amp; Maintenance issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed site have the availability of infrastructure to house management requirements including first aid, toilets and potential supervisors?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How readily accessible is the skatepark to regular cleaning for existing council cleaning and maintenance teams.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context &amp; Amenity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposed site location where young people want to be or adjacent to where they currently congregate?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposed site in close proximity to existing shopping centres, sports or recreation facilities or interested schools?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it possible for the design to compliment the existing visual amenity of the site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposed site within or adjacent to a major community hub or central area?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistency with Strategic Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposed location of the skate facility consistent with the strategic land use, planning scheme and zoning.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Weighted Assessment of 4 Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>percentage success of site considering all criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%  77%  66%  94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 SITE ASSESSMENT DISCUSSION

6.1 Introduction

This section looks initially at the overall broader location in which all four sites are contained and then discusses the results of the matrix and individual sites. A recommended location is then discussed.

6.2 Overall Summary

The four sites are all spaced around Gawler so many of the broader considerations are quite varied.

The main variance is due to the location of each site in consideration of the centre of town. The further from the centre of town affects various factors including access, site lines and proximity to existing services.

All four sites do not appear to impact significantly on residential areas (subject to acoustic assessment). Several do conflict with potential flooding close to or in their vicinity. These works could possibly determine whether the site is worth pursuing. Other sites have the potential for contamination that will be determined through geotechnical conclusions separate to this document.

Several of the sites are slightly constrained and would therefore strongly affect the design options for the site and dictate the size of the facility and possible future expansion.

The following discussion summarises each of the sites in more detail and then outlines our final recommendation as the preferred location for the skate facility, taking in consideration the weighted matrix contained herein.

6.3 SITE 1 – GOOSE ISLAND

- The first site is located in an existing recreation reserve and is approximately 150m from the main hub and street of Gawler, Murray Street

- It currently features an expansive green space with connecting pathways and mature trees for picnicking under (shade).

- The possible location of the skatepark is in open green space, not in the man made depression closest to the road.

- Public toilets are located within 20m on the walkway

- The closest residents are over 50m away

- The large size of the space and the existing flat topography allows various design options

- The area is prone to flooding due to its proximity to the river (adjacent). In 2003 Goose Island was submerged by 2-3m. New flood mitigation has been installed since this 1 in 20 year flood

- Skate and BMX users regarded this site as in their top 2 choices.

- The site was formally a sand mine and use as a loam pit. The land was then gifted to Council
Summary

Given the above and matrix result of 81%, this site performs well in a number of areas.

The main one is the overall space available for a skatepark and the ability to cater for events and potential future expansion. Given the flat open nature of the location, there should not be significant costs in developing a skatepark, nor disruption to existing facilities or mature vegetation. However a positive drainage solution could become costly for the project given the site is a significant flood plain. Mitigation needs further investigation. A geotechnical report and site survey will inform any further decisions.

Whilst there are residential areas nearby, a skate facility can be located at an acceptable distance and the final design can mitigate noise further. The location is within walking distance to the centre of town and existing associated amenities (toilets). Car parking and drop off areas are adjacent to the site.

Whilst the site is a large open space, locating a skatepark here may impact negatively due to net loss of green space in the centre of town.

Overall the site performs well and rates highly in suitability for a skate facility. The main area of concern is flooding to the site that will impact on the structural integrity of the skate elements. Another concern is the possible contamination of the soil due to historical events. Again, a geotechnical report will shed light as to what type of contamination is present and how this may affect potential works.

6.4 SITE 2 – EXISTING SKATEPARK

- The second site is located at the current Gawler Skatepark site, at the Gawler Sport and Community Park. It is located 850m from the main street, Murray Street. It is also located 230m from the Gawler Oval Train Station.
- Existing ‘Youth Shak’ located in the community buildings
- Young people already congregate here to use the skatepark facilities
- There are existing community facilities located around the skatepark, including netball courts, cricket nets, tennis courts and a soccer field. Gawler Primary School is situated across the road from the skatepark, 60m away.
- The site doesn’t offer high levels of passive surveillance as it is located away from busy roads and passers by. The skatepark currently has a ‘back of house feel’
- Users requested specifically that the new skatepark NOT be situated here.
- The closest residential dwelling is approx 80m away
- This site did not have any immediate flooding issues.

Summary

The site ranked 3rd out of the 4 sites with 77%. When assessed with the criteria outlined in the previous section, it performs well and rates in the mid range in suitability for a skate facility (refer matrix) however it is not highly rated by the local users as their preferred skatepark site. There is already some anti-social behaviour taking place at the existing skatepark and a change of location was critical for the users in terms of remedying some of this anti-social behaviour and starting a fresh.

The site already has many other facilities around it, and the potential to manage the skate facility is far more likely than any other site due to the proximity of the Youth Shak.
This site is not close to the main hub of Gawler which would need to be considered in a design to ensure access to the site considers safety and function of the users and wider community.

Any work on this site needs to consider the current lack of passive surveillance. The success and safety of a skatepark is heavily weighted on how this type of surveillance is available. The youth need to be seen and heard and not tucked away at the back of a reserve.

6.5 SITE 3 – TREVOR BELLCHAMBERS SWIMMING CENTRE

- The third site is located behind the existing open air swimming pool on Victoria Terrace and Main North Road. It is located approximately 460m from the centre of Gawler and Murray Street.

- The open space contains many mature trees that would have considerable constraints on the skatepark design.

- The site is not ideally big enough for a local level skatepark

- Natural surveillance is hindered due to the site dropping off from the road edge down towards the North Para River.

- Residents are located directly over the road, approx 50m away.

- The site shares open green space used by pool patrons. The pool is open 6 months of the year.
Summary

This site is currently being used as a spill out space for pool patrons and picnicking. Its location along the main road allows restricted site lines into the proposed space. Safe access and suitable delineation from the road would need to be considered. On the opposite side of Main Road North are residential dwellings which are approx 50m away. This may not be suitable for noise generated by the skatepark. An acoustic test would determine a sufficient distance in this occasion.

The space is located further from the centre of town compared to other sites and therefore not an existing space that the users rated highly.

Toilet facilities posed an issue as the closest public toilet is inside the pool, which is closed for 6 months of the year.

It was also noted that this site with its current topography has the potential to flood.

This space has not scored well in the matrix due to the current difficulties with the site, as listed above. This site ranked 4th out of the 4 sites assessed with a ranked percentage of 66%. Due to this it would be out least preferred site.

6.6  SITE 4 – CLONLEA PARK

- The fourth site is located next to the existing BMX track. This site is 200m from the centre of town.

- It is located in a major recreation area, Clonlea Park.

- Overall the site is generally made up of green space with some established vegetation.

- The site is located on Murray Street away from well trafficked areas, although cars do have a tendency to speed through the gully area off Murray Street. A natural or manmade traffic calming barrier should be included, the new footbridge will assist.

- Flooding at the site is imminent
Summary

This site scored highest in the matrix with 94%. This is not only the highest out of the parks assessed but also a high percentage in regards to best practise of skatepark site selection in Australia. This site was the preferred site on the day of the bus tour by Council members and the skatepark user group. The site lends itself as the most suitable due to its open space, existing activities and facilities, and large area for future expansion.

The site possesses high levels of passive surveillance due to Murray Street running adjacent to the site as well as being the main road through the centre of Gawler. The BMX Park which is situated across the road is in direct line of site due to the natural raised land form at Clonlea Park.

The site is part of a well used reserve, Clonlea Park. There are community tennis courts, a young children’s playground, toilet facilities, walking trails and plenty of open space for events. Connecting pathways are already in place with a new bridge connection complete.

Survey and geotechnical data will allow us to understand the soil quality and contours better, so the exact location of a skatepark can be determined. The site is prone to flooding, and was submerged in 2003. This is an issue that will need to be considered before design as it could affect the longevity and structural integrity of a skatepark. Other supporting documents from council such as velocity of flooding can also assess the risk at the site. It is expected through Council flood modelling and velocity information, that this site has a low risk of heavy flowing flooding.
7 CASE STUDIES

Below we have included two case studies which Convic have designed where flooding has been a major issue, and successful solutions have been designed and built.

7.1 Redlands Skatepark - Capalaba

The site for the Capalaba skatepark is on a floodplain. Council was involved in flood modelling for the site and establishing the heights for a 1:100 year flood.

Any built structures had to be built up from natural ground level due to the site being a clay capped landfill. Any bowls or transitions elements could not be in ground.

One area of the natural land form dropped away quite suddenly. This meant earthwork was needed to build up and batters were lengthened out considerably to achieve a gradual rise.

The natural ground level was then built up and the skatepark was positioned atop of the 1:100 year flood levels. The images above show the water level during peak flooding around the base of the skatepark in 2009.

7.2 Frankston Skatepark - Victoria
Frankston (VIC) skatepark is the largest in Victoria and built in 2005. A major design of the skatepark was to act as a large levy bank that protects the city centre. It has been built up from natural ground level, and long batter retention exists around all edges of the park.

Large earth batters which are keyed into the existing surface level form up most of the levy bank wrapping around the extent of Samuel Sherlock Reserve. The longest earth batter is approx 130m long. There is a high capacity drainage system underneath the skatepark and in front of the skatepark that allows the park to drain quickly in a storm event.

Protecting assets and retaining existing drainage was of utmost importance for this project.
8  FINAL CONCLUSION

Three of the four sites are capable of having a skatepark with one notably scoring highest in the matrix. The varied locations around the town all contribute different strengths and weaknesses. Clonlea Park is the highest rated location on the weighted matrix as it gives the most flexibility to accommodate a 400+ sq/m facility whilst also providing space for shade, seating, events, extensions and other like recreation facilities.

The site is easy walking distance from the centre of town and supporting amenities.

Goose Island which came second in the matrix is a good option with its central location and high levels of passive surveillance. The concern for Goose Island would be the cost associated with creating a positive drainage solution on a potentially contaminated site.

Ideally it would be good for the chosen space to be centrally located to allow everyone to have easy access and to encourage larger participation. A preferred central location would encourage the wider community to visit the space rather than a remote space which would push the users into a distant location. A remote location would encourage anti-social behaviour through the minimisation of passive surveillance.

Convic look at an integrated landscape approach where both the facility and surrounding context are considered as one to ensure that the facility is part of rather than imposing on the broader environment in which it is placed. This not only ensures greater community acceptance but will also improves ownership and care of the space by the young people who frequent it.

On the day of the Skatepark Bus Tour, a tally of votes was calculated in Council Chambers. All participants (100%) favoured Clonlea Park as the preferred site for a new skatepark facility.

9  RECOMMENDATION

Convic recommends Clonlea Park as the site for a new skatepark in the Town of Gawler. Although the site does have some existing issues with flooding we are confident in the recent Council flood modelling of the area. We know the area can flood in a 1 in 20 year event, however the flood velocity at the site would be minimal and the risk of severe structural damage to a skatepark is somewhat reduced. This would be considered throughout the design process in consultation with our engineers.

When comparing the amount of time the skatepark might spend submerged in a flood event, to the amount of time the skatepark will be usable, it is outweighed.

It is important however that the design of the skatepark assists in any way to prolong its longevity. This may include engineering solutions that prevent structural damage in a flood event, or retaining structures to raise the park. These solutions may have a cost implication, which council should be aware of now. Clonlea Park will require construction considerations such as significant earthworks, cut/fill or retaining structures. It will be mandatory that Council inspect the facility when flooding is a concern.

Clonlea Park has the capacity to allow for further expansion to a new facility, especially with the towns expected growth imminent, it makes sense to consider the future through current decisions.

Included in the appendix to follow are images of flood velocity provided by The Town of Gawler’s engineering and planning department.
Appendix

Hazard category:

Red – Extreme
Brown - High
Blue – Medium
Green - Low

Goose Island Flood Intensity/velocity levels
Clonlea Park Flood Intensity/velocity levels