



Figure 4-5 Scenic Drive Combined Car Park – Lower Scenic Drive



■ Figure 4-6 Dog Off-leash area, Anzac Park



#### **4.5 Option 5: Anzac Park North**

The Anzac Park North site is the same general location proposed in the *Application for Project Change October 2010*, and *Further Information to the Application for Project Change November 2010* reports. It involves creating a car park to accommodate approximately 200 cars within the northern part of the park, close to the existing pedestrian and cycle overpass. The car park would be accessed from Dean Street, with the existing one way internal access road widened between the Dean Street entrance and car park entry to allow two way access for construction workforce vehicles only. Pool fencing would be provided along the two way section of road on the internal park site to reduce the risk of children running onto the road.

Council is also proposing that an additional toilet facility would be constructed adjacent to the existing play equipment and picnic area to further improve community safety within the park. A toilet facility in this location would help to avoid adults and children crossing the proposed two way section of the internal access road between Dean Street and the car park in order to get to and from the existing toilets adjacent to Dean Street on the outside of the internal access road.

The facilities in the existing barbecue area will also be re-provided elsewhere in a more useable location within the park to maintain this public amenity.

An indicative car park layout is shown in **Figure 4-7**.



## 5. Evaluation Criteria

Criteria were developed within the categories of Community, Suitability, Environmental and Economic. At the request of local residents the evaluation criteria were provided to both Friends of Anzac Park and Mount Coot-tha Residents Group prior to the Workforce Parking Consultation Group for their feedback. The criteria presented at the Workforce Parking Consultation Group, and used in this report, reflect changes suggested by those groups.

Evaluation criteria were again discussed at the Workforce Parking Consultation Group. The group agreed that the criteria adequately covered the issues that should be considered but, as a group, agreed economic factors were not as important to them as community, suitability and environment. This feedback is reflected in criteria weighting (Section 5.5).

As part of the evaluation, each option was scored from 1 to 10 against each criterion, with 1 being a very unfavourable score and 10 being a very favourable score. The scores for each category were then aggregated for the purposes of evaluation. This section explains the evaluation criteria and how scores and weighting were allocated.

### 5.1 Community

Six community criteria were identified for the purpose of the multi-criteria assessment: noise impacts, land use impacts, business impacts, cultural heritage, visual amenity impacts and community values. Each of these criteria is defined in Table 5-1 below. Definitions for the scoring of each criterion are also provided in Table 5-1 grouped into favourable scores, neutral scores and unfavourable scores.

■ Table 5-1 Community Criteria Definitions

Criteria	Definition	Favourable Scores (10-7)	Neutral Scores (6-4)	Unfavourable Scores (3-1)
Noise impacts	Noise impacts on surrounding community based on proximity of sensitive receptors (e.g. houses or schools) and predicted compliance with acoustic quality objectives and noise limits.	Noise impacts are predicted to be below the objective or limit under the Coordinator General's condition at nearest residential dwelling	Noise impacts are predicted to be below the objective or limit under the Coordinator General's condition at nearest residential dwelling with mitigation	Likely non-compliance with Coordinator General's conditions at nearest residential dwelling even with mitigation
Land use impacts	Impact on existing land use including impacts on local events	No interruption to existing or surrounding land uses	Potential for minor disruption to use of land, however surrounding land uses unaffected	Significant disruption to use of land and surrounding land uses
Business impacts	Impact on local businesses or tourism	Positive effect on local business / tourism	No effect on local business / tourism	Negative effect on local business / tourism
Cultural Heritage	Impact to heritage values of the site or area based on the level of existing heritage registration and	Site is not located within an area on a heritage register of either State or	Site is located within an area on a heritage register of either State or	Site is located within an area on a heritage register of either State or



Criteria	Definition	Favourable Scores (10-7)	Neutral Scores (6-4)	Unfavourable Scores (3-1)
	identified conflict with heritage values of the site or area	local significance	local significance with low to moderate impact on those values.	local significance with high to very high impact on those values.
Visual amenity impacts	Impact to visual amenity of the site or area based on visibility from sensitive vantage points or residential areas including light spill and headlight glare.	No change to existing view or largely hidden from views	Passing visibility from public roads	Highly visible from nearby residential areas
Community Values	Community attitude towards the proposal.	High level of community support	Neither high support or opposition	High level of community opposition

## 5.2 Suitability

Four suitability criteria were developed to assess the options in terms of the technical suitability as a car park site taking project needs and safety into account. Each of these criteria is defined in **Table 5-2** below. Definitions for the scoring of each criterion are also provided in **Table 5-2** grouped into favourable scores, neutral scores and unfavourable scores.

■ **Table 5-2 Suitability Criteria Definitions**

Criteria	Definition	Favourable Scores (10-7)	Neutral Scores (6-4)	Unfavourable Scores (3-1)
Capacity	Approximate number of parking spaces provided	Provides at least 2/3 of capacity requirements (200 spaces plus)	Provides at least half of the car park capacity requirements (150-199 spaces)	Provides less than half of the car park capacity requirements (less than 150 spaces)
Car park construction safety	Safety during car park construction and ease of car park construction	Existing car park, no unmanageable safety issues	Simple construction and management	Difficult construction with identified public safety issues requiring management
Car park operation safety	Road (including cycle and pedestrian) and site safety during car park operation	Existing road and/or site safety is improved	No change to existing road and/or site safety	May compromise road and/or site safety and management is required
Convenient access to worksite	Relative ease for construction workers to access the worksite	Direct access to worksite (less than 400m)	Walking distance to worksite (400-800m)	Requires use of shuttle bus

### 5.3 Environmental

The potential environmental impacts of the car park options were evaluated through six criteria covering flora impacts, fauna impacts, surface water effects, traffic impacts, contaminated land and air quality. These criteria are defined in **Table 5-3** below. Definitions for the scoring of each criterion are also provided in **Table 5-3** grouped into favourable scores, neutral scores and unfavourable scores.

■ **Table 5-3 Environmental Criteria Definitions**

Criteria	Definition	Favourable Scores (10-7)	Neutral Scores (6-4)	Unfavourable Scores (3-1)
Flora impacts	Impact on vegetation measured through loss of trees and/ or identified vegetation communities	No clearing of vegetation is required	No clearing of protected vegetation	Clearing of protected remnant vegetation
Fauna impacts	Impact on fauna habitat or threatened / protected fauna	No known loss of habitat or threatened fauna species	low level reduction of common urban habitat, low level increase of edge effects within remnant regional ecosystems	Loss of known habitat of protected / threatened fauna or increase of edge effects within remnant regional ecosystems
Surface Water Effects	Within overland flow path and / or risk of soil erosion	Standard soil erosion and control measures would be required, flood effects are unlikely	Minor additional soil erosion and control measures above standard measures would be required	Significant mitigation measures would be required to address risks – within overland flow or flood storage area
Traffic Impacts	Traffic impacts on local roads (traffic safety / performance) and pedestrian and cycle safety	No conflict with existing traffic flow or local access. No significant traffic safety items.	Minor traffic / pedestrian / cycle management or safety measures required	Significant management required to avoid impacts to traffic flow or local access. Safety items unresolved or requiring significant modification.
Land Contamination	Constructed on a land parcel listed on the Environmental Management Register (EMR) or is a known contaminated site	Property title not on the EMR	Property title on the EMR, however proposed car park location unlikely to be affected	Property title on EMR with proposed car park area within a known affected area
Air quality	Impacts to local air quality, proximity of surrounding community (sensitive receptors) to vehicle emissions	No adjacent sensitive receptors	Sensitive receptors unlikely to be affected	Sensitive receptors immediately adjacent during running of engines

## 5.4 Economic

The four economic criteria were designed to evaluate the relative cost of the car park options, considering land cost and availability, construction cost, operational cost and rehabilitation cost. Each of these criteria is defined in **Table 5-4** below. Definitions for the scoring of each criterion are also provided in **Table 5-4** grouped into favourable scores, neutral scores and unfavourable scores.

■ **Table 5-4 Economic Criteria Definitions**

Criteria	Definition	Favourable Scores (10-7)	Neutral Scores (6-4)	Unfavourable Scores (3-1)
Land Cost / availability	Relative cost associated with land access including land acquisition or leasing	Low – Council owned land or Reserve with Council as trustee	Medium – State owned land	High – private freehold land
Construction cost	Estimate of relative construction costs	Low (0-\$2mil)	Medium (\$3-5mil)	High (\$6mil+)
Operational cost	relative costs estimate associated with car park operation and management	Low (0-\$2mil)	Medium (\$3-5mil)	High (\$6mil+)
Rehabilitation cost	estimate of relative rehabilitation costs to restore site to previous condition following construction of car park	Low (0-\$2mil)	Medium (\$3-5mil)	High (\$6mil+)

## 5.5 Criteria weighting

For the purpose of the multi-criteria analysis, each of the criteria categories was weighted so the total of the scores would equal 100. The weighting was informed through the workforce parking consultation group which placed the community and technical criteria as the most important, environmental criteria as important but not as important and the economic criteria as the least important. On this basis a 35% weighting was provided to each of the community and technical criteria, a 25% weighting was provided to the environmental criteria and a 5% weighting was provided to the economic criteria.



## 6. Stage 1 and 2 Consultation Activities and Outcomes

The community consultation process for the Legacy Way workforce parking was carried out in three stages:

- Stage 1 – Workforce Parking Consultation Group (February 2011)
- Stage 2 – Community Consultation Sessions (March 2011)
- Stage 3 – Key Stakeholder Consultation (Ongoing)

This Section discusses the Stage 1 and 2 consultation activities and outcomes. Stage 3 consultation is discussed in **Section 7.3**.

Initially a letter was distributed to 14,000 residents in the Toowong, Auchenflower, Taringa and Bardon suburbs outlining Council's approach to the workforce parking consultation. A copy of the wording from the letter is included in **Appendix B**.

The letter explained:

- The Coordinator-General's refusal of Anzac Park
- The formation of the Workforce Parking Consultation Group
- The intention to hold Community Consultations Sessions.

The information was also displayed on the Northern Link EIS website ([www.northernlinkeis.com.au](http://www.northernlinkeis.com.au))

### 6.1 Stage 1: Workforce Parking Consultation Group

The workforce parking consultation group was formed to invite resident groups, local business owners, local stakeholders and interest groups to meet with Council to discuss shortlisted options prior to wider consultation with the community.

Members were invited to join based on proximity, level of impact or level of interest to the five options proposed for workforce parking. The group members consisted of:

- Two representatives from the Mt Coot-tha Residents Group
- Four representatives from Friends of Anzac Park
- A representative from the Summit Restaurant
- A representative from Friends of Toowong Cemetery
- A representative from Bicycle Queensland
- A representative from the Brisbane Botanic Gardens
- A representative from Stuartholme School
- A representative from In-Training was not able to attend workshop but was included in all email correspondence

Members of the Legacy Way management team and technical advisers on construction safety, operational safety, environment, traffic, land tenure, access, cultural heritage and noise were also in attendance at the workshop.

### 6.1.1 Format of workshop

The workshop was held on Thursday 24 February at the Botanic Gardens Auditorium, 9am – 12.30pm

The workshop was formal, chaired by an independent facilitator, designed to encourage sharing of information about the process, options and criteria assessment. It created opportunities for the group members to have access to and ask questions of technical specialists of the Legacy Way team.

The workshop was attended by 11 members of the Workforce Parking Group.

A power point presentation was given by the Legacy Way project team explaining:

- Process of change report
- Coordinator-General's decision to refuse Anzac Park as the location for workforce parking
- Council's process for considering and short listing new options
- First pass criteria to reduce initial options
- Criteria assessment which will score each option
- Five shortlisted options.

Attendees were given a copy of the presentation and blank sheets to enable their own scoring on the options which Council intended to collect and use to guide future decisions about the shortlisted options. Attendees were also encouraged to ask questions of the technical specialists.

### 6.1.2 Actions requested during the workshop

The following actions were requested by the consultation group which Council followed up:

Action	Council follow up
Further investigate the use of the parcel land owned by Stuartholme, as a potential site for workforce parking (formerly the site of Freers Chip Factory)	Organised meeting with Stuartholme School with subsequent emails and phone conversations. Stuartholme are currently reviewing the proposal with their Board,
Further investigate the use of Purtell Park, Bardon as a potential site for workforce parking	Council confirmed Purtell Park consists of two parcels of land which are unavailable to Council in the required timeframe due to current leases



Action	Council follow up
Investigate commercial carparking options in Mount Ommaney	Investigated commercial parking options with Wilson Parking and the Mt Ommaney Shopping Centre. No commercial facilities exist in Mount Ommaney and the shopping centre does not have the capacity to cater for the workforce parking requirements.

Assessment sheets allowing a score of positive, negative or neutral against each criteria were handed out at the Workforce Parking Consultation Group. Only two members of the group, one member of Friends of Anzac Park and Friends of Toowong Cemetery, chose to complete these assessment sheets, with others providing their feedback more informally. It was therefore not possible to provide a comprehensive assessment of options based on the feedback of the group. However information and feedback provided by the community during the Workforce Parking Consultation Group workshop and throughout the consultation period was used by the project team undertaking the evaluation.

### 6.1.3 Outcomes

The group was unable to agree on a short list of options to be taken out for further consultation. There were high emotions over the inclusion of two options in Anzac Park which were shortlisted.

Council received two completed criteria scoresheets from the attendees. Few questions were directed to the technical specialists.

Council were asked by members of the group not to release the options to the wider community until further feedback could be given by the group. Members of the group then released the options publicly via the internet and to the media. Council decided, in fairness to the wider community, to proceed with Stage 2 of the consultation, Community Consultation Sessions, while continuing to seek feedback from the Workforce Parking Consultation Group. This decision was communicated to the Workforce Parking Group who provided feedback on the decision.

## 6.2 Stage 2: Community Consultation Sessions

The purpose of this stage was to take the five shortlisted options for workforce parking to the wider community, provide information about each option, provide opportunities to speak with Council representatives and invite feedback over a two week period.

A total of 15 sessions were held in various locations in the Toowong and local communities which included two evening sessions and a weekend session.

### **6.2.1 Notification**

The community were notified of the Community Consultation Sessions in a number of ways:

- Notification to the Workforce Parking Consultation Group
- Letter to 14,000 homes in Toowong, Auchenflower, Taringa and Bardon
- Half page advertisement in Westside News on Wednesday 9 March and Wednesday 16 March 2011
- Placed on Northern Link EIS website ([northernlinkeis.com.au](http://northernlinkeis.com.au))
- Placed on front page of BCC corporate website
- Your City Your Say email to all residents in those postcodes
- Community Liaison Group (CLG)
- Signage at five locations
- Media coverage in Westside News
- Posters with session times displayed at Toowong Ward Office, Toowong and Indooroopilly libraries.

A copy of the letter, advertisement, signage and information from the website are included in **Appendix B**.

### **6.2.2 Locations**

The locations of the Community Consultation Sessions were set based primarily on getting direct feedback from the key users of the areas affected by the options. This meant early morning and afternoon sessions in Anzac Park North, the dog-off leash area in Anzac Park, the Park and Ride facility and Hoop Pine Picnic Area.

To facilitate accessibility a night time and weekend session were important. These were held at well-known local facilities with adequate space and parking.

A location in Bardon was also selected for a consultation session after feedback from Friends of Anzac Park, and Mount Coot-tha Residents Group about the wider use of the area from people in surrounding suburbs.

### **6.2.3 Timing**

Council had been given much feedback throughout the original Application for Project Change comment period about the use of these areas. This, along with local knowledge among the team, informed the sessions time of 6.30am to 9.30am on week day morning and 4-6pm on the weekend afternoons. The evening sessions ran 6.30-8.30pm and the Saturday 12-3pm



Friends of Anzac Park representatives requested an extension to the length of the Community Consultation Sessions. Council had proposed one week, however extended this to two weeks.

Collateral at sessions

- Double-sided, colour facts sheets on each of the five options detailing design, usage and assessment criteria
- Replied paid feedback forms which asked for a preferred option for workforce parking and also allowed feedback on each of the criteria
- Large maps outlining the design, access and other information about each option.

The five factsheets and feedback form were made available on the Northern Link EIS website ([www.northernlinkeis.com.au](http://www.northernlinkeis.com.au)). Copies of the factsheets and feedback form are included in **Appendix B**.

#### **6.2.4 Format**

Council's information sessions took an informal format. Each session had a small marquee clearly marked Legacy Way Workforce Parking Consultation and was attended by two Council officers at the morning and afternoon sessions. At the two evening and one weekend session technical specialists in safety, cultural heritage, environment, traffic, construction and noise were on hand to answer specific queries. Examples of the displays are shown in **Figure 6-1**.

Attendees were encouraged to take in information about the five options, and to ask questions for clarification. The team took any feedback that was given at the session, and also encouraged attendees to either fill out there, or take away, a reply paid feedback form. A summary of the attendance and key outcomes of each session is provided in **Table 6-1**.



Workforce consultation stand at Dog Off-leash area, Anzac Park



Workforce consultation stand at Qld Academy



Workforce consultation information display at Qld Academy

- **Figure 6-1 Workforce consultation sessions**



Table 6-1 Community Consultation Session Summary

Time	Location	Attendees	Comments made	Observations
<b>Tuesday 8 March</b>				
6.30-9.30am	Hoop Pine Picnic Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Approx 10 including: two representatives from Workforce Parking Consultation Group (WFPG/Friends of Anzac Park (FOAP) member of Men of Trees community group</li> <li>▪ Toowong residents</li> <li>▪ Bardon resident</li> <li>▪ Cyclists</li> <li>▪ Walker</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Extra vehicles will make it more difficult for walkers who already walk on the road as there is no footpaths</li> <li>▪ Union discussions regarding walking distances</li> <li>▪ Concern that this location will cause rat running through the already clogged Bardon streets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quiet session</li> <li>▪ Many cyclists on roads from 5.45am. Most cyclists cleared by 8am</li> </ul>
4-6pm	Anzac Park North	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Approx 40 including: Two representatives from WFPG/FOAP</li> <li>▪ CLG member</li> <li>▪ Toowong local residents</li> <li>▪ Park users</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Safety concerns for children in the park due to increase activity on the ring road</li> <li>▪ Anzac Park North will cause loss of ring road to walkers</li> <li>▪ Union discussions regarding walking distances</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Very busy session. Speaking with large groups of people for full two hour session</li> <li>▪ High emotion over inclusion of Anzac Park. Emotion managed through information about other options</li> <li>▪ General support for Park and Ride option.</li> </ul>
<b>Wednesday 9 March</b>				
6.30-9.30am	Dog off-leash area, Anzac Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Approx 50 including</li> <li>▪ One representative from WFPG</li> <li>▪ Park users</li> <li>▪ Bible College residents</li> <li>▪ Local residents</li> <li>▪ Heritage representative</li> <li>▪ CoG representative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Changes to Broseley Road and access from Wool Street very concerning</li> <li>▪ Concern about where the dog off-leash area would be relocated to within Anzac park</li> <li>▪ Disruption to local residents from noise, lighting and additional traffic</li> <li>▪ Heritage concern regarding location of dog off-leash area in relation to potentially buried urns and ashes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Very busy session</li> <li>▪ Speaking with large groups of people at a time for full three hour session</li> <li>▪ Resident expressed their separation and differing opinion from the resident group (FOAP)</li> </ul>