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1. Introduction
The City of Gosnells (the City) recognises the many social, health, environmental and economic benefits in providing appropriately located, functional and attractive public open space (POS) to the community. These spaces are instrumental in shaping suburbs into communities by providing positive lifestyle and recreation opportunities, venues for interaction, events and programs and active sports pursuits.

The City values the benefits of POS and to ensure future protection, provision and management of these sites meets the ongoing needs of the community, the City has developed a Public Open Space Strategy (the Strategy). The Strategy, through its framework of recommendations and holistic approach guides, coordinates and informs POS planning from the strategic level through to the operational level within the City. The implementation of the Strategy recommendations will ensure an improved POS provision for the community in the future.

It should be noted this document supersedes the City’s Local Open Space Strategy, adopted by Council in December 2010.

1.1 Purpose
The purpose of the Public Open Space Strategy is to guide and coordinate decisions relating to the provision and standard of Public Open Space in the City of Gosnells.

1.2 Vision
To provide sustainable, safe, accessible and appropriately developed public open space to meet the community’s needs in an efficient and effective manner.

1.3 Objectives
The objectives of the Public Open Space Strategy are:

- To provide a variety of POS that is attractive, functional, fit for purpose, sustainable and integrated into the surrounding urban form, thereby contributing towards the health, recreational and social needs of the community.
- To achieve efficiency in land use planning.
- To provide POS that is consistent with the principles of the Safe City Urban Design Strategy (2001).
- To optimise the use of Council resources to achieve effective POS outcomes, i.e. design, acquisition, consolidation and management of these spaces to meet community and City requirements.
- To ensure areas of environmental significance are suitably protected and potential negative development impacts are minimised.
- To guide statutory planning decision making processes to enable the future provision of POS.

1.4 Classification of Public Open Space
The City has five classifications for POS;
Local
• Neighbourhood
• District
• Regional and
• Biodiversity Asset

Each classification has its own functionality, specific infrastructure and maintenance requirements. The City believes a well-designed and dynamic community should have a variety of POS to meet the diverse needs of residents. Further explanation of the City's POS Classifications can be found in Appendix L.

1.5 Value of Public Open Space

POS is an integral element in creating positive lifestyle opportunities and connected communities. POS engenders a sense of place and adds quality and character to a neighbourhood. Due to close proximity to residences, (5-10 minute walk) POS is generally used daily by the community either by walking through it, driving past it, or recreating in it.

POS provides a number of functions to the community; including pedestrian links to schools, shops and public transport, venues for passive recreation activities, program venues for community groups, rest spots and places for quiet contemplation, active sports pursuits and visual relief from urban surrounds. More recently POS also assists with urban water management requirements and / or protection of environmental areas.

The benefit POS has to the community includes:

Health
POS provides residents with lifestyle opportunities that will improve their overall health and wellbeing. Through venue provision for sport club activities and events, POS can build social capital within the community.

Economic
The City boasts a number of award-winning spaces and unique facilities from Walter Padbury Park and Stretton Way Reserve to the tree top walk at Centennial Pioneer Park. These spaces attract visitors to the area and are frequently used for outdoor events and programming, which in turn can generate economic and social benefits for the community.

Environmental
Conserving areas of remnant vegetation and protection of biodiversity is important. POS provides environmental services such as air and water purification, wind and noise filtering, and / or microclimate stabilization. The preservation of nature links, corridors and buffer areas also assist in the protection and liveability of natural assets within an urban environment.

Crime reduction
Quality POS that is designed, developed and activated by appropriate
infrastructure and programming is proven to bring communities together, reduce opportunities for property crime and relieve mental fatigue and aggression.

POS that provides a variety of functions for the community is fit for purpose, accessible, and has good passive surveillance opportunities will be highly utilised by the community. The City, through its framework of recommendations strives to achieve POS that benefits and contributes to the City of Gosnells being a great place.

1.6 Advocacy and Consultation
The City manages POS on behalf of the community and as such is committed to engaging the community through all stages of the Strategy through a comprehensive consultation process. In addition, the City will advocate for the public's right to access quality POS through consultation with relevant stakeholders, including state government departments, the land development industry and other key agencies.

2. Use of the Strategy
The Strategy clearly establishes the City's direction for POS and will provide a key reference document for City officers involved in the planning, development and management of the City's POS. It will also assist agencies, community groups, clubs and individual residents to understand the City's position in relation to strategic open space planning, development and management.

3. City of Gosnells Community Plan (2011-2021)
The City of Gosnells Community Plan - Our Future: 10 Point 10 Year Commitment (the Community Plan) sets clear direction and priorities for the provision of facilities and services. The Community Plan identified the need for a considered approach to the future planning of POS through Strategy Point 4: and the specific Activities identified within:

Strategy Point 4: Obtain the Best Value from City Assets

Activities 4.1 Develop strategically located City owned land following a detailed cost benefit analysis

4.2 Dispose of Lazy Land Assets

4.3 Optimise the use of City assets

The implementation of the Strategy will enable the City to meet the requirements of Strategy Point 4 of the City's Community Plan.

4. Demographics and the impact on POS

Housing lot and size, relationship to demographics
The City has a mix of residential development ranging from established communities, suburbs undergoing urban renewal, rural areas and growth corridors. Research shows housing stock (lot configuration and size) can be a contributing factor in defining the demographic of a suburb. In turn the demographic of a suburb can be used to assess demand and plan for social infrastructure, in particular, POS. It has been shown different demographics particularly, age groups, have different uses and needs for POS and public facilities.
Impact on POS Provision

Southern River and parts of Gosnells and Martin are estimated to have the largest population growth over the coming decades, predominately through greenfield development. This development will provide a broader range of housing choices and is an attractor to new families looking for affordable living opportunities. With this, the City will see a rise in families with children and families with mortgages to the area (Forecast ID, 2011).

POS demands for this demographic include quality POS developed within walking distance of residences. In particular young families require the provision of District Open Space (DOS) developed for active recreation pursuits. DOS provides an important hub for activity, community identity and local pride. Furthermore it provides a venue for children to learn and participate in outdoor activity and exercise (Middle, Tye, Costello, & Hedgcock, 2012).

The City’s established suburbs of Maddington, Beckenham, Kenwick and parts of Huntingdale and Gosnells are expected to undergo a degree of urban renewal through density increases. These changes will increase population and are likely to attract a diverse demographic to the area. Both factors will place additional pressure on current POS. Whilst there is not a 'typical' demographic for residents of medium to high housing density the demand for POS is for high quality, multi-functional, accessible open spaces, particularly local and neighbourhood spaces, to meet the diverse needs of this community (City of Charles Sturt, n.d.).

Finally, the predominantly rural area of Martin (East) and Orange Grove attracts established and mature families. Due to the vast amount of private open space located in this area the POS demands is significantly lower than the rest of the City.

Additional socio-economic indicators and the impact on Public Open Space

Further to the above, additional socio-economic demographic indicators that impact participation in recreation and health activities are income, employment and education levels. Statistically the City has lower levels of these indicators compared to the WA average (Forecast ID, 2011).

Providing functional, accessible public spaces becomes paramount for a community with a high level of growth and or lower socio-economic indicators. POS provides accessible, free of cost access to spaces for social interaction, passive recreation and much more. The benefits of POS are amplified to communities with the above indicators, as access to these activities and or facilities does not exist in their private space (Cohen, McKenzie, Williamson, Golinelli, 2007)

5. Policy Context

The City is guided by a number of State Government strategies, policies, and legislation that inform and impact the development of POS. Building upon this, the City has a local planning policy framework. Listed below are the key documents the City utilises in the development of POS:

- Directions 2031 and beyond (metropolitan planning beyond the horizon)
- Liveable Neighbourhoods, 2009 (a Western Australian Government sustainable cities initiative)
- Planning and Development Act, 2005
Historical policy influences and current trends

In addition to current policies, it is vital to consider history when analysing how POS has been planned and developed in the City. Prior to the 1950’s the provision of POS was sporadic and poorly developed.

In 1955 a plan known as the Stephenson-Hepburn Plan was adopted by the State Government. This set a number of recommendations for the provision of POS, including the normal requirement that land developers vest to the Crown ten percent of their subdivisional areas for the purpose of public recreation. The ten percent allocation is now required under Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) Development Control Policy DC 2.3 – Public Open Space in Residential Areas (hereafter referred to as DC 2.3). The relevant local government then becomes responsible for the management of the Crown land. As per DC 2.3, the ten percent requirement is still used today though there has been a reduction in the amount of POS that is available for recreational purposes.

This has occurred as while POS was once considered solely for recreational use it is now expected to accommodate other functions such as drainage and conservation. The inclusion of these features often has more influence over where POS is located and how it is developed than community and recreational need. Such features will also impact on the amount of space that can be used for recreational purposes. That said, with the trend towards building higher density developments with less private outdoor space, POS is expected to play a more important role in catering for the community’s recreational needs in the future.

Key Issues

Listed below are the key issues that the City confronts in identifying, acquiring, developing and maintaining POS. Additionally, under the heading ‘historical’ is a list of
issues affecting the usability and functionality of POS stemming from past POS policy and implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Key Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Identification and Acquisition | **Impact of environmental and water management considerations**  
Contemporary planning frameworks place greater focus on environmental values and water management practices. As such, any POS identified and acquired through the structure planning and subdivision processes, is not likely to be able to be used exclusively for recreation purposes. |
|                        | **Acquisition of land in greenfield areas**  
In most cases, POS is located such that it is not equitably shared amongst all developing landowners within a given precinct. One key challenge is establishing and administering cost sharing arrangements that seek to spread the burden of providing land for POS. Whilst the City may establish a cost sharing arrangement, as above, that in itself does not compel landowners to give up their land for POS purposes, which, in many cases, leads to residential development occurring before the provision of any POS. |
|                        | **Acquisition of land in brownfield areas**  
Generally, brownfield areas involve smaller lots that have been subdivided at some point in the past. That being the case, it is particularly difficult to acquire additional areas of useable and practically-sized POS in such locations, unless the Council is prepared to reserve land under the Scheme or require a structure plan over a given area (in which case, the 'greenfield' challenges would apply) |
| Functionality          | The proposed POS site will require preliminary assessment to confirm:  
- It is fit for purpose, and  
- Classification, accessibility, and interface of the POS.  
Often approval is granted for POS development with insufficient information submitted; subsequently the POS is compromised and not fit for purpose at the end of the development cycle. |
| Financial Impost of POS| Historically the City, due to a number of reasons has purchased land for POS purposes, rather than acquiring sufficient land through the subdivision process. |
| Development            | **Impact of Environmental constraints and Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD)**  
Environmental constraints and WSUD increase the complexity of the POS design and development. |
|                        | **Financial impost of POS**  
Financial costs to develop POS has increased due to the following:  
- Higher community expectation and needs, industry standards, developer and local authority benchmarking standards.  
- POS having to serve a variety of functions (drainage and environmental),  
- The minimum development level endorsed by Liveable Neighbourhoods does not meet community expectations and often further works are required to be completed by the City. |
|                        | **Fragmented landholdings**  
In greenfield precincts, the required areas of POS are spread over a number of separate landholdings, with landowner’s often having different development intentions and timeframes. This leads to challenges in developing the POS, particularly when not all required parcels are
assembled at a given time. Coordination of POS design is also problematic for land owners and the City when the project extends over an unspecified timeframe.

**Development of Parks and Recreation (P&R) land**

There are large tracts of unmanaged P&R land within the City. Challenges associated with the development of this land includes:

- Increased costs as the land can be heavily constrained.
- Potential loss of traditional POS sites (within subdivided areas)
- Management and coordination of the final agreement and or management order can be difficult due to the many partners involved.
- In the absence of an overall strategy for the delivery of P&R land, it is difficult to determine which lands are strategically important.

**Water Availability**

Availability of a sustainable water source can be challenging in areas of the City.

**Financial impost of POS**

Community expectations and industry standards have increased. This has resulted in higher service levels which has impacted on the ‘whole of life’ cost for POS.

**P&R land**

A lack of clear delineation (on the ground) between P&R land managed by the City and P&R land not managed by the City creates confusion for residents and is problematic for maintenance activities. Topography and other constraints are not fully investigated prior to the management handover creating difficulties as P&R land is not always accessible, for maintenance activities.

**Impact of Bush Forever and WSUD**

Bush Forever sites and the use of WSUD impacts and creates another level of maintenance and therefore additional costs for the City.

**Historical POS Policy and sporadic POS planning**

The following challenges have resulted from historical and sporadic POS planning:

- Poor passive surveillance opportunities
- Poor connectivity to the POS
- Poor distribution of POS
- Limited infrastructure and or enticement for usability

Table 1: POS Key Issues

Contained within Appendix K, are the Key Issues addressed against the City’s POS Strategy Directions.

7. **POS Evaluation**

To determine the City’s future POS requirements, the City conducted a detailed evaluation of the current POS provision. The aim of this process was to evaluate each site in relation to functionality, distribution, accessibility, tenure, level of infrastructure and maintenance standard. The evaluation was conducted in three specific stages; Land Identification, POS Audit and POS Assessment.

Listed below are the key results and observations from this evaluation. The evaluation did not include areas set aside for conservation purposes (restricted access to the public) and P&R land not maintained by the City.
7.1 Results

The City currently maintains 339 parcels of POS, a total of 975 hectares. Of the 975 hectares there is a mix of tenure, reservation, distribution and standard of POS across the City. Individual suburb results from the evaluation are listed below:

Beckenham

- Does not meet the 10% DC2.3 requirement with only 5.27% provided.
- Beckenham has a mixed provision of POS. While it has significant POS such as the Mills Park sporting complex, there are several parcels of POS in Beckenham that are little more than the size of a residential housing block and are of limited recreational value.
- Over 90% of POS in Beckenham is reported to have limited passive surveillance opportunities, and poor interface onto the POS.
- Over 65% of POS was considered to have a low level of infrastructure and amenity value to the community. These factors limit and impact the functionality and usability of the POS and increase the vulnerability of these spaces to anti-social behaviour.
- Distribution and connectivity to existing POS was also considered poor with just fewer than 40% of residences falling within the recommended 400m walking distance and only 7% of existing POS serving a connectivity function to the community.

Canning Vale

- Meets the 10% DC2.3 requirement with 13.32% provided.
- Canning Vale has relatively good local and neighbourhood park provision. Typically, POS in Canning Vale is located strategically at the center of neighbourhoods and is relatively easy to access for nearby residents. The level and quality of park infrastructure is considered high. Over one third of all parks in Canning Vale are Specified Area Rate (SAR) parks meaning that local residents pay additional rates to maintain these parks to a higher standard.
- There is a lack of District Open Space (DOS) required for active recreation pursuits. Middle, Tye, & Middle research (2011) recommends, 6.5m² of DOS per person should be set aside for active recreation. Based on the 2011 population statistics and Middle’s et al research Canning Vale and Southern River is deficient of DOS by 16 hectares. It should be noted that this is a conservative figure as it does not include the social infrastructure (clubrooms, changerooms, carparks etc.) to activate and make the space usable to the community.
- The most dominate POS function is passive recreation and drainage, with over 75% of parks serving a drainage function. There are also large areas set aside for conservation purposes. Drainage and environmental features has impacted on POS in terms of size, function, cost of development and usability.
Gosnells

- Meets the 10% DC2.3 requirement with 10.62% provided.
- Gosnells has a mixed provision of POS. While it has significant open spaces such as Centennial Pioneer Park there are several parcels of POS in Gosnells that are little more than the size of a residential housing block and are of limited recreational value.
- 70% of POS in Gosnells was reported to have limited passive surveillance opportunities, and interface onto the POS.
- Over 50% of POS was considered to have a low level of infrastructure and amenity value to the community. These factors limit and impact the functionality and usability of the POS and increase the vulnerability of these spaces to anti-social behaviour.
- Distribution and connectivity to existing POS was also considered poor with just over 60% of residences falling within the recommended 400m walking distance and only 43% of existing POS serving a connectivity function to the community.

Huntingdale

- Does not meet the 10% DC2.3 requirement with only 6.79% provided.
- Over 65% of POS was reported to have limited passive surveillance opportunities, and poor interface onto the POS. Accessibility was considered average with over 65% of POS falling within 400m walking distance, however connectivity was considered poor with just under 45% of POS serving a connectivity function.
- There are some larger parcels of POS in Huntingdale that are considered to have poor interface, low level of amenity and limited opportunities for passive surveillance.
- Huntingdale has the single largest sporting complex in the City at Sutherlands Park, which is owned by the City.

Kenwick

- Does not meet the 10% DC2.3 requirement with only 5.72% provided.
- Over 70% of POS in Kenwick is reported to have limited passive surveillance opportunities, and poor interface onto the POS.
- Distribution and connectivity to existing POS was also considered poor with just fewer than 65% of residences falling within the recommended 400m walking distance and only 20% of existing POS serving a connectivity function to the community.
- A significant number of parcels of POS in Kenwick have relatively poor amenity value, with 50% of POS considered to have a low level of infrastructure. Large portions of residential areas have no easy access to local or neighbourhood
parks. These factors limit and impact the functionality and usability of the POS and increase the vulnerability of these spaces to anti-social behaviour.

**Langford**

- Meets the 10% DC2.3 requirement with 20.12% provided.
- For a suburb with less than 5,000 local residents, Langford is well provided with POS. While it only has approximately 20 reserves in the suburb, it has a significant regional sporting facility (Langford Oval), a two hectare entry statement park (Langford Ave Reserve) and approximately 44 hectares of Canning River Foreshore.
- Whilst the land allocation is adequate the service level provided to the community was considered low with over 50% of POS areas having a relatively poor amenity value and POS infrastructure in need of replacement and/or enhancement.

**Maddington**

- Does not meet the 10% DC2.3 requirement with only 6.39% provided.
- There is a variety of POS in Maddington. Whilst there is well located POS and significant spaces such as Harmony Fields, the suburb is riddled with POS that is little more than the size of a residential housing block, with limited recreational value to the community.
- Over 70% of POS in Maddington is reported to have limited passive surveillance opportunities, and reduced interface onto the POS. A significant number of parcels of POS in Maddington have relatively poor amenity value.
- Distribution and connectivity to existing POS was also considered poor with just fewer than 35% of residences falling within the recommended 400m walking distance and only 22% of existing POS serving a connectivity function to the community. These factors limit and impact the functionality and usability of the POS and increase the vulnerability of these spaces to anti-social behaviour.
- There are large parcels of POS in Maddington that due to water and soil restrictions are limited in their capacity to provide greater functionality to the community, over a neighbourhood park. It is therefore considered portions of these POS could be utilised for different purposes in the future.

**Martin**

- Does not meet the 10% DC2.3 requirement with only 3.16% provided.
- Despite the relative lack of DC 2.3 land, Martin is a semi-rural area with a regional park; Ellis Brook Valley (291 hectare reserve) which is vested in the City for Parks and Recreation.

**Orange Grove**

- There is no requirement for any DC2.3 land to be provided in Orange Grove as there is no residential zoned land within the suburb.
Orange Grove only has five reserves in the suburb; however, with a total population of approximately 550 people, the need for POS is relatively low, especially considering that Orange Grove is a predominantly rural area.

Southern River

- Does not meet the 10% DC2.3 requirement with only 7.86% provided.
- There is a lack of DOS required for active recreation pursuits. Middle, Middle & Tye research (2012) recommends, 6.5m² of DOS per person should be set aside for active recreation. Based on the 2011 population statistics and Middle’s et al research Canning Vale and Southern River is deficient of DOS by 16 hectares. It should be noted that this is a conservative figure as it does not include the social infrastructure (clubrooms, changerooms, carparks etc.) to activate and make the space usable to the community.
- In Southern River, the most dominate POS function is passive recreation and drainage, with just under 70% of POS serving a drainage function. Large areas are also set aside for conservation purposes. Drainage and environmental features has impacted on POS in terms of size, function, cost of development and usability.

Thornlie

- Meets the 10% DC2.3 requirement with 21.66% provided.
- Whilst the land allocation and distribution is adequate, the service level provided to the community was considered low with over 50% of POS having a relatively poor amenity value.
- Approximately 50% of the POS in Thornlie required development and or enhancement.

7.2 Observations

- Following the evaluation it became evident that there is a disparity in the development standard of POS between suburbs. This can be attributed to historical decisions, water availability, soil types, land use demands, and in the past, the absence of an overall strategy for the City.

With this and notwithstanding the quantum of POS provided within each suburb; to rectify the current development and service level disparity will require a significant investment by the City.

- The distribution of POS throughout the City has been influenced by a number of different trends and influences, as outlined above, which has resulted in an uneven distribution of POS between the City’s newer and older suburbs.

- Thornlie, Huntingdale, Gosnells, Beckenham and Maddington predominately cater for the active recreation pursuits (DOS) within the City with over 75% of the City’s DOS located in these suburbs. Over 90% of DOS has been achieved through the City purchasing and or land being bequeathed to the City for recreation purposes.
In the City there are large tracts of P&R land along the Canning and Southern River foreshores and the Darling Range escarpment. Further investigation of the recreational, environmental, and drainage needs and tourism opportunities, coupled with the potential resource strain is required in the future.

The financial impost to the City in developing POS continues to be a challenge given the limited resources available. Increased and changing community expectations, coupled with the reduction of private open space to accommodate the recreational and or social pursuits of the community has created greater pressure and demand for public spaces; these factors impact the overall cost of development and on-going delivery of these sites to the community.

7.3 Outcome
Following the evaluation process, and based on the key findings and results a number of recommendations were created to improve the overall POS provision within the City. These recommendations seek to rectify areas deficient in POS by identifying where and how additional land can be acquired; improve service and functionality levels through enhancement and dispose or partially dispose of land that is considered to be surplus or does not serve a public recreation function. These recommendations can be delivered through the City’s Strategy Directions.

8. Strategy Directions

8.1 Designation of Public Open Space by Outline Development Plans
That all new Outline Development Plans and all modifications to existing Outline Development Plans / Guided Development Schemes, allocate Public Open Space in accordance with Liveable Neighbourhoods and the endorsed Public Open Space Strategy plans, contained as Appendix A-J.

8.2 Acquisition of Public Open Space via subdivision
That the City seek to acquire, through the subdivision process, areas of Public Open Space in accordance with any adopted Outline Development Plan and/or the endorsed Public Open Space Strategy plans, contained as Appendix A-J.

8.3 Acquisition of strategically important sites for Public Open Space
That the City investigate opportunities to acquire strategically important sites for Public Open Space within the district. The acquisitions may include; crown land, land required for POS within an approved statutory framework, or privately owned single lots adjacent to existing Public Open Space.

In considering such opportunities, the City shall have regard for likely future demand for Public Open Space, the desire to achieve consolidated parcels of Public Open Space, and any applicable financial constraints.

8.4 Cash-in-Lieu
That, for any proposed subdivision creating three or more lots, the City will, in accordance with Local Planning Policy 3.2 - Co-ordination of In-fill Development, recommend to the Western Australian Planning Commission that it imposes a Public Open Space (cash-in-lieu) condition, unless actual land is required pursuant to Recommendation 8.1 or 8.2 above.
8.5 Disposal of surplus Public Open Space
That the City seek to dispose of any areas of Public Open Space that are surplus to current and anticipated requirements, in accordance with any adopted Outline Development Plan and/or the endorsed Public Open Space Strategy plans, contained as Appendix A-J.

Any profits from the sale of residual land (regardless of tenure) will fund the future enhancement and acquisition of Public Open Space as part of the Public Open Space Strategy.

8.6 Strategic subdivision of underperforming areas of Public Open Space
That the City investigates the strategic subdivision of underperforming areas of Public Open Space, in accordance with the endorsed Public Open Space Strategy plans, contained as Appendix A-J.

In investigating such subdivisions, the City will seek to create an urban environment that will build upon the character of the suburb, maintains a reasonable amount of Public Open Space, provides appropriate interface with the open space and through design improves functionality and accessibility of the space to the community.

Any profits from the sale of residual land (regardless of tenure) will fund the future enhancement and acquisition of Public Open Space as part of the Public Open Space Strategy.

8.7 Management of Public Open Space
That the City, as funding and resources allow, maintain Public Open Space, in line with the City’s maintenance schedule for the community’s benefit, throughout the City.

The City will endeavour, as funding and resources allow, enhance three Parks per annum, in line with the City’s POS classification framework. In prioritising any competing upgrades, the City shall have regard to existing maintenance standard, nearby recreational opportunities and community demand.

8.8 Improving access to existing areas of Public Open Space
That the City, as funding and resources allow, improve pedestrian access to existing areas of Public Open Space throughout the district. In prioritising any competing improvements, the City shall have regard to existing maintenance standard, nearby recreational opportunities and community demand.

That the City to investigate options of incorporating POS as part of existing libraries, recreation centres and other community significant buildings, in areas which are deficient in POS.

8.9 Assessment of Parks and Recreation land
That the City shall make an assessment of all Parks and Recreation land within the City, reviewing areas that are currently developed and prioritising undeveloped areas for improvement as required. The assessment will consider land in relation to future potential use and significance for the local area including environmental, drainage, recreational and or tourism opportunities and community values.
9. **Suburb Maps**

Attached as Appendix A-J are suburb maps illustrating the City’s vision for POS. These maps will assist and inform stakeholders of the City’s specific intentions for POS in each suburb. The maps should be read in conjunction with the following legend:

**Retain**
Illustrated by a green shade is land currently maintained by the City for public recreation purposes.

**Where POS is required, via Statutory Framework**
Illustrated by a blue dashed line are ODP and Guided Development Scheme areas where POS (land contribution) is required.

**Future POS, approved via Statutory Framework**
Illustrated by an orange shade is POS (including the configuration) that has been approved through an ODP and or Guided Development Scheme process but is yet to be developed.

**POS required via subdivision**
Illustrated by a yellow shade are sites from which the City will seek a land contribution (i.e., a portion of the site for POS), via subdivision.

**Strategic Subdivision of underperforming areas of POS**
Illustrated by green hatching are areas of POS whereby the City plans to rationalise portions of the POS to increase passive surveillance opportunities and or the amenity of the existing POS.

**Disposal of POS**
Illustrated by a black hatching are sites listed for disposal.

**Managed Parks and Recreation land (P&R) land**
Illustrated by a light green shade with a dark border are areas set aside through the Metropolitan Regional Scheme for Parks and Recreation and are maintained by the City.

**Unmanaged P&R land**
Illustrated by a light green shade are areas set aside through the Metropolitan Regional Scheme for Parks and Recreation but are not maintained by the City.

10. **Review**

The Strategy will be required to be reviewed periodically. It is strongly recommended that for the periodic reviews the base assessment method remains unchanged to retain the integrity of the existing Strategy. The City shall also where appropriate and as opportunities arise, support the continual improvement to POS policy (both state and local), strategic partnerships, and operational activities and procedures. This will enable the City to continue to deliver efficient and effective POS outcomes.
11. Implementation

The Strategy is a long term plan outlining future recommendations for POS within the City of Gosnells. Although every care has been taken to assess future POS requirements in a holistic manner the City understands that with a lengthy implementation timeframe, situation and circumstances will change. It is also recognised that due to budgetary constraints the development component implementation of the Strategy will be, to some extent, contingent on the successful disposal of unsuitable POS. This factor contributes towards uncertainty in the overall implementation of the Strategy, particularly regarding financial viability, establishment of timeframes and community perception.

It is therefore the City’s preference to implement the Strategy in a staged approach (via 6 year Implementation Plans) based on available funding, statutory requirements and future development opportunities. Within the Implementation phase of the Strategy, the City will prioritise the Strategy’s recommendations based on available resources, funding and Council priorities.
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Appendix K: Key Issues and Strategy Directions

Listed below are the key issues the City responds to relating to acquisition, development and maintenance of POS. The City will respond to these issues through the implementation of the Strategy Directions, (Section 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Key Issue</th>
<th>Strategy Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification and Acquisition</td>
<td>Impact of environmental and water management considerations</td>
<td>8.1, 8.2, 8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition of land in greenfield areas</td>
<td>8.1, 8.3, 8.4, 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition of land in brownfield areas</td>
<td>8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.8, 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functionality</td>
<td>8.1, 8.2, 8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Impact of Environmental constraints and Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUB)</td>
<td>8.7, 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial impost of POS.</td>
<td>8.4, 8.5, 8.6, 8.7, 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fragmented landholdings</td>
<td>8.3, 8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of Parks and Recreation (PnR) land</td>
<td>8.7, 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Availability</td>
<td>8.7, 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Financial impost of POS</td>
<td>8.4, 8.5, 8.6, 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of Parks and Recreation land</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>Historical POS Policy and sporadic POS planning</td>
<td>8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, 8.6, 8.7, 8.8, 8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Key Issues and Strategy Directions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Classification</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Site Features and Infrastructure Provision</th>
<th>Community expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>Local Parks service the informal recreational needs of the immediate community.</td>
<td>May include: Small playground with limited play opportunities and sand softfall (example: swing with small combination unit). - Bench seating - Trees and grass (Natural shade) - Dry or partially irrigated pathways and minimal hardstand</td>
<td>The community can expect the Park to be: - In walking distance of their residence (approx. 400m or 5 minutes) - Small in size - Serving the immediate catchment area - Providing a sense of place - Providing passive surveillance opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Park</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Parks service the recreational and social needs of a community, suburb or precinct.</td>
<td>May include: - A medium to large playground with a variety of play opportunities with rubber or sand softfall. - Variety of hardstand (paved areas) - Trees, planting, vegetation and grass (Natural shade) - Higher provision of seating and shelter (Gazebo, shade structures) - Shade sails - Barbeque (Bbq) and picnic facilities - Drinking fountain - Path network (circulating) - Partial or full irrigation - Car parking – suitable to size and purpose (on street and constructed off street) - Casual sporting infrastructure (basketball hoop, hit up wall etc.) - Lighting (where appropriate) - Universal access to play equipment</td>
<td>The community can expect the Park to be: - located 800m from residences or a 10 minute walk - Variable in size - Ideally centrally located within the catchment area (suburb) - Providing a sense of place - Providing passive surveillance opportunities - Providing (where possible) links for pedestrian and or cycle ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Classification</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Site Features and Infrastructure Provision</td>
<td>Community expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| District Parks (Sport) | District Parks service the formal sporting requirements of the community. Spaces within District Parks can also serve as informal play areas for the local community and or families visiting the site for formal sporting activities. | May include:  
Active area  
- Specialised oval infrastructure (floodlighting, goals, pitches etc.)  
- Ancillary built infrastructure (pavilion, changerooms, public toilets)  
- Carparks and signage  
Passive area  
- A medium to large playground with a variety of play opportunities with rubber or sand softfall.  
- Higher provision of seating and shelter (Gazebo, shade structures)  
- Shade sails  
- Bbq and picnic facilities  
- Drinking fountain  
- Lighting (where appropriate) | The community can expect the Park to cater for the formal and informal sporting and recreational and social requirements within the City.  
The Park will also:  
- Provide a sense of place  
- Provide passive surveillance opportunities  
- Provide (where possible) links for pedestrian and or cycle ways |
| Regional Park | Regional Parks are parks that are of regional significance for ecological, recreation or landscape purposes. | May include:  
- A medium to large playground with a variety of play opportunities with rubber or sand softfall.  
- Variety of hardstand (paved areas)  
- Trees, planting, vegetation and grass  
- Higher provision of seating and shelter  
- Shade sails  
- Bbq and picnic facilities  
- Drinking fountain  
- Path network (circulating)  
- Car parking – suitable to size and | The community can expect the Regional Parks to provide a unique passive recreational experience and or provide protection for the biodiversity requirements of the area.  
The Park will also:  
- Provide passive surveillance opportunities  
- Provide (where possible) links for pedestrian and or cycle ways |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Classification</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Site Features and Infrastructure Provision</th>
<th>Community expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Biodiversity Assets (Nature) | Parks that have been set aside for conservation purposes, i.e., Bush Forever sites, Conservation Category Wetlands etc. | May include:  
  - Boardwalks  
  - Fencing  
  - Walk Trails  
  - Interpretative signage  
  - Additional native plantings | The community can expect these areas will be protected to manage the biodiversity values and ensure the ecological integrity of natural ecosystems for future generations. |

**NOTE:** POS is classified under its most dominate function.

Classifications were formed using the “Classification Framework for public open space”, created by the Department of Sport and Recreation (2012).
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