



Our Ref: D-16-34025
Your Ref:
File Ref: RC/4/0039
Enquiries: Ross McKim

27 May 2016

Mr Stan Maley
Friends of Geraldton Gardens
7/172 Fitzgerald Street
GERALDTON WA 6530

Dear Mr Maley

FRIENDS OF GERALDTON GARDENS - MAITLAND PARK GARDENS PROPOSAL

I refer to the report submitted to Council by the Friends of Geraldton Gardens (FroGGs) entitled 'Geraldton Botanical Gardens – Maitland Park Landscape Master Plan Report', your presentations to Council at two Concept Forums and your subsequent emails to Cr Douglas and Cr Freer on 23 May 2016.

I apologise for my slow response. We have been undergoing significant restructures within the Infrastructure Services Department. This combined with the resignation of key Engineers has delayed progress on this matter. I have now reviewed your submission and congratulate you on its quality. Before preparing a report for Council to consider your proposal, would you please provide the following additional information:

1. The existing road network surrounding Maitland Park is subject to heavy traffic loadings (morning peak, school start and end, afternoon peak). FroGGs should be aware that the local schools are intending to expand their activities. A submission has previously been put forward by Nagle Catholic College to build a car park in Maitland Park near the Croquet Club. Has FroGGs given any consideration to the impact of its proposal on the existing road network and number of car parks required to service the proposed gardens and other activities in the area?
2. Maitland Park also is subject to heavy pedestrian traffic due to the proximity of local schools. Children will want to take the shortest route between their school entrance, the road crosswalks, drop off points and bus stops. Has FroGGs given consideration to the impact of its proposal on these direct pedestrian routes?





3. Stage 1 does not include any provision for additional car parking. It also does not provide for 'Back of House' activities such as storage sheds for plants, soils, irrigation components, gardening implements, propagation, bunded and locked chemical storage, machinery and worker amenities (lunch room, toilet etc). There is also no provision for loading and unloading areas. How does FroGGs intend to manage these issues?
4. Your report includes an initial estimate prepared by Realm Studios entitled 'Opinion of Probable Costs'. This cost estimate may be low with a number of items not included or only a moderate estimate allocated (drainage, fencing, irrigation, CCTV, playgrounds, drinking fountains, site furniture, shade sails). Public park infrastructure compliant with the relevant Australian Standard can be very expensive. Are FroGGs confident that the capital estimates provided are accurate?
5. The document does not address the issue of 'Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles. How are FroGGs intending to manage CPTED principles, and site security? Is FroGGs intending to fence the site or install CCTV equipment?
6. The document does not address the issue of on-going maintenance costs, renewal and depreciation costs. It also does not provide information on the level of on-going support FroGGs is proposing to provide to the up keep of the gardens. This information along with maintenance figures from other similar gardens would be required by the City to properly consider your proposal.
7. If the City was to provide in-principle support for stage 1 of your proposal (subject to approving detailed engineering designs etc), is it FroGGs intention to seek the required capital funds from grants and manage the construction phase of the project or is FroGGs seeking this assistance (financial and project management) from the City?

If you could provide a written response to these items, I will then prepare a report for Council's consideration that includes your additional information.

Yours sincerely

Ross McKim
DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

