



NOTES

1. NEW SPORTS LIGHTING POLES TO BE SET BACK A MINIMUM 5000mm FROM THE PRINCIPAL PLAYING AREA.
2. NOTE, THERE ARE EXISTING UNDERGROUND POWER CONDUITS IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THE PROPOSED SITE WORKS. THE EXACT ROUTE OF EXISTING CONDUITS IS UNKNOWN. TO AVOID CLASHES AND RISK OF DAMAGE, IDENTIFY EXISTING UNDERGROUND SERVICES PRIOR TO TRENCHING BY MEANS OF CABLE SCANNING.
3. EXISTING CONSUMER MAINS TO BE DISCONNECTED AND REMOVED.
4. PROVIDE 1P25mm UNDERGROUND CONDUIT FROM THE SITE MAIN SWITCHBOARD TO THE NEW EARTH PIT.
5. EXISTING LIGHT POLE AND FLOODLIGHT TO BE REMOVED.

LEGEND

- SPORTS LIGHTS - POLE MOUNTED, QUANTITY AS INDICATED. REFER TO TYPICAL DETAIL)
- POWER PIT - ACO CABLE MATE- TYPE 66 POLYMER CONCRETE WITH STEEL POWERLOK LID.
- EARTH PIT - TYPE ACO CABLE MATE TYPE 33
- COMMUNICATIONS PIT - ACO CABLE MATE- TYPE 45 POLYMER CONCRETE WITH STEEL POWERLOK LID.
- SITE MAIN SWITCHBOARD
- BORE PUMP ENCLOSURE/CONTROL CABINET
- UNDERGROUND POWER CONDUIT
- UNDERGROUND COMMUNICATIONS CONDUIT
- INDICATIVE LOCATION OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND CONDUIT
- INDICATES 1 x 100 DIA POWER CONDUIT
- INDICATES 2 x 100 DIA POWER CONDUIT
- INDICATES 1 x 80 DIA POWER CONDUIT
- INDICATES 1 x 100 DIA SPARE POWER CONDUIT
- INDICATES 1 x 50 DIA COMMUNICATIONS CONDUIT
- INDICATES 2 x 50 DIA COMMUNICATIONS CONDUIT
- EXISTING DEVICE TO REMAIN
- SUPPLY AUTHORITY POWER POINT OF ATTACHMENT (PILLAR)
- AUTO MCB
- ISOLATOR ON LOAD SWITCHING
- NORMALLY OPEN CONTACTOR (4-POLE)
- FUTURE NORMALLY OPEN CONTACTOR (4-POLE) (PROVIDE SPACE PROVISION ONLY)
- COMBINED RCD / MCB
A = TRIP RATING, B = No. OF PHASES
- FUTURE COMBINED RCD / MCB
A = TRIP RATING, B = No. OF PHASES (PROVIDE SPACE PROVISION ONLY)
- SINGLE PHASE & NEUTRAL
- THREE PHASE & NEUTRAL
- RELAYS WHERE 'n' DENOTES RELAY IDENTIFICATION
- FUTURE RELAYS WHERE 'n' DENOTES RELAY IDENTIFICATION (PROVIDE SPACE PROVISION ONLY)
- POWER ANALYSER
- WESTERN POWER kWh METER COMPLETE WITH FUSES.
- SURGE DIVERTER
- HRC FUSE
A= CARTRIDGE SIZE, B= HOLDER RATING
- CURRENT TRANSFORMER
A = No. OF PHASES
- EARTH
- TIME DELAY RELAY (RTA)
WHERE 'n' DENOTES IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
- FUTURE TIME DELAY RELAY (RTA)
WHERE 'n' DENOTES IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (PROVIDE SPACE PROVISION ONLY)
- (E) EXISTING EQUIPMENT TO REMAIN
- (R) EXISTING EQUIPMENT TO BE REMOVED

EXISTING BORE PUMP
NOTE 5
WESTERN POWER POINT OF ATTACHMENT
EXISTING BORE PUMP ENCLOSURE/CONTROL CABINET
NEW SITE MAIN SWITCHBOARD

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION	CHECK
A	07.08.14	PRELIMINARY ISSUE - DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	PJ

BEST Consultants
BUILDING ENGINEERING SERVICES + TECHNOLOGY
616 NEWCASTLE ST, WEST PERTH, 6005
T: +61 8 9277 0200
E: info@bestconsultants.com.au
www.bestconsultants.com.au

CHICHESTER PARK FLOODLIGHTING
ELECTRICAL SERVICES
LEGEND & SITE SERVICES LAYOUT

DRAWN	D. RULAND	DESIGNED	P. JEFFS	DRAWING No.	E.01 A
CHECKED	-	DATE	AUG 2014	SCALE	APPROX 1:500 @ (A1)
APPROVED	-	SCALE	APPROX 1:500 @ (A1)	BEST PROJECT No	14.15.028

THIS IS A CAD DRAWING
DO NOT AMEND MANUALLY
PLOT BY: S.SHEPHERD
PLOT DATE: Aug-07-14

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

PRELIMINARY ISSUE
REFER TO REVISION COLUMN

ATTACHMENT 2



- NOTES**
1. NEW SPORTS LIGHTING POLES TO BE SET BACK A MINIMUM 5000mm FROM THE PRINCIPAL PLAYING AREA BOUNDARY.
 2. NOTE, THERE ARE EXISTING UNDERGROUND POWER CONDUITS IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THE PROPOSED SITE WORKS. THE EXACT ROUTE OF EXISTING CONDUITS IS UNKNOWN. TO AVOID LASHES AND RISK OF DAMAGE, IDENTIFY EXISTING UNDERGROUND SERVICES PRIOR TO TRENCHING BY MEANS OF CABLE SCANNING.
 3. NEW SITE MAIN SWITCHBOARD TO REPLACE EXISTING. REMOVE EXISTING SWITCHBOARD AND CLIENT POLE UPON COMPLETION OF THE WORKS.
 4. PROVIDE 1P25mm UNDERGROUND CONDUIT FROM THE NEW SITE MAIN SWITCHBOARD TO THE NEW EARTH PIT.
 5. EXISTING LIGHT POLE AND FLOODLIGHTS TO BE REMOVED.

- LEGEND**
- SPORTS FLOODLIGHTS - POLE MOUNTED, QUANTITY AS INDICATED. (REFER TO TYPICAL DETAIL)
 - POWER PIT - ACO CABLE MATE- TYPE 66 POLYMER CONCRETE WITH STEEL POWERLOK LID.
 - EARTH PIT - TYPE ACO CABLE MATE TYPE 33
 - COMMUNICATIONS PIT - ACO CABLE MATE - TYPE 45 POLYMER CONCRETE WITH STEEL POWERLOK LID.
 - SMSB - SITE MAIN SWITCHBOARD
 - MSB1 - MAIN SWITCHBOARD
 - BORE PUMP ENCLOSURE/CONTROL CABINET
 - UNDERGROUND POWER CONDUIT
 - UNDERGROUND COMMUNICATIONS CONDUIT
 - INDICATIVE LOCATION OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND CONDUIT
 - 1P100 INDICATES 1 x 100 DIA POWER CONDUIT
 - 2P100 INDICATES 2 x 100 DIA POWER CONDUIT
 - 1P80 INDICATES 1 x 80 DIA POWER CONDUIT
 - 1S100 INDICATES 1 x 100 DIA SPARE POWER CONDUIT
 - 1C50 INDICATES 1 x 50 DIA COMMUNICATIONS CONDUIT
 - 2C50 INDICATES 2 x 50 DIA COMMUNICATIONS CONDUIT
 - (E) EXISTING DEVICE TO REMAIN
 - SUPPLY AUTHORITY POWER POINT OF ATTACHMENT (PILLAR)
 - AUTO MCB
 - ISOLATOR ON LOAD SWITCHING
 - NORMALLY OPEN CONTACTOR (4-POLE)
 - FUTURE NORMALLY OPEN CONTACTOR (4-POLE) (PROVIDE SPACE PROVISION ONLY)
 - COMBINED RCD / MCB
A = TRIP RATING, B = No. OF PHASES
 - FUTURE COMBINED RCD / MCB
A = TRIP RATING, B = No. OF PHASES (PROVIDE SPACE PROVISION ONLY)
 - SINGLE PHASE & NEUTRAL
 - THREE PHASE & NEUTRAL
 - RELAYS WHERE 'n' DENOTES RELAY IDENTIFICATION
 - FUTURE RELAYS WHERE 'n' DENOTES RELAY IDENTIFICATION (PROVIDE SPACE PROVISION ONLY)
 - POWER ANALYSER
 - WESTERN POWER kWh METER COMPLETE WITH FUSES.
 - SURGE DIVERTER
 - HRC FUSE
A= CARTRIDGE SIZE, B= HOLDER RATING
 - CURRENT TRANSFORMER
A = No. OF PHASES
 - EARTH
 - TIME DELAY RELAY (RTA)
WHERE 'n' DENOTES IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
 - FUTURE TIME DELAY RELAY (RTA)
WHERE 'n' DENOTES IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (PROVIDE SPACE PROVISION ONLY)
 - (E) EXISTING EQUIPMENT TO REMAIN
 - (R) EXISTING EQUIPMENT TO BE REMOVED

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION	CHECK
A	07.08.14	PRELIMINARY ISSUE - DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	PJ

BEST Consultants
 BUILDING ENGINEERING SERVICES + TECHNOLOGY
 676 NEWCASTLE ST. WEST PERTH, 6005
 T: +61 8 9227 0300
 E: info@bestconsultants.com.au
 www.bestconsultants.com.au

**OCEAN REEF PARK FLOODLIGHTING
 ELECTRICAL SERVICES
 LEGEND & SITE SERVICES LAYOUT**

DRAWN	D.RULAND	DESIGNED	P.JEFFS	DRAWING No.	E.01 A
CHECKED		DATE	AUG 2014		
APPROVED		SCALE	APPROX 1:500 @ (A1)	BEST PROJECT N° 14.15.027	

THIS IS A CAD DRAWING
DO NOT AMEND MANUALLY

PLOT BY: S.SHEPHERD
PLOT DATE: Aug-01-14

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

PRELIMINARY ISSUE
REFER TO REVISION COLUMN



ANALYSIS OF 'CHICHESTER PARK, WOODVALE — SPORTS FLOODLIGHTING PROJECT' SURVEY

The following provides an analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data gathered from the *Chichester Park, Woodvale — Sports Floodlighting Project* Survey conducted with residents between 27 June and 18 July 2014.

BACKGROUND

The City consulted directly with the following stakeholders:

- Local residents within 200 metres of Chichester Park; and
- Representatives from current park user groups.

This was undertaken by way of a hard-copy survey form sent to residents' addresses (together with a cover letter and information brochure). The consultation was also advertised to the general public on the City's websites and social media and through signage located at Chichester Park. Members of the public were able to complete a survey form via the City's website, or were able to contact the City for a hard-copy.

RESPONSE RATES

Hard-copy surveys were sent to 348 local residents/and owners within a 200 metre radius of Chichester Park and five were sent to current park user groups.

The City collected a combined total of 81 responses. Of the 81 responses received, 78 were assessed as valid responses¹. These are summarised in Table 1 and Table 2 below.

Table 1: Survey responses by collection method

Type of survey completed	Responses	
	N	%
Hard-copy survey	66	84.6%
Online survey	12	15.4%
Total (valid) responses	78	100.0%

Table 2. Responses by location of respondent

Location of respondent (vicinity to proposed park)	Responses	
	N	%
Respondent resides within 200m	76	97.4%
Respondent does not reside within 200m	2	2.6%
Total (valid) responses	78	100.0%

¹ N.b. a "valid" response is one which includes the respondent's full contact details, they have responded within the advertised consultation period and for which multiple survey forms have not been submitted by the same household.


IDENTIFIED USER GROUPS

Of the 78 valid responses received, 13 respondents stated that they were affiliated with an organisation/group that utilised Chichester Park for a variety of activities. Most notably, 83.3% of the responses received were from residents who don't affiliate themselves with one of the user groups. These data are summarised in Table 3 and Chart 1 below.

Table 3. Responses by respondent affiliation to identified user groups

Identified user groups	Responses	
	N	%
Member of Kingsley Senior Soccer Club	2	2.6%
Member of Woodvale Football Club	10	12.8%
Member of WA Christian Football Association	0	0%
Member of Kingsley Woodvale Junior Cricket Club	0	0%
Member of Kingsley Woodvale Senior Cricket Club	1	1.3%
Status not identified/None of these groups	65	83.3%
Total (valid) responses	78	100%

Chart 1. Responses by respondent affiliation to identified user groups




DEMOGRAPHICS

A total of 78 respondents provided a response to this question. Over one third of the responses were completed by people aged 55-74 and a further third by people aged 25-54. People aged 35-44 and 45-54 represent significant segments of the local population, so it is expected that a large response from these age groups would be received. These data are summarised in Table 4 and Chart 2 below.

Table 4. Responses by age

Age groups	Responses	
	N	%
Under 18 years of age	0	0%
18-24 years of age	0	0%
25-34 years of age	9	11.5%
35-44 years of age	12	15.4%
45-54 years of age	14	18%
55-64 years of age	16	20.5%
65-74 years of age	13	16.7%
75-84 years of age	11	14.1%
85+ years of age	3	3.8%
Total (valid) responses	78	100.0%

Chart 2. Survey responses by age




QUESTION 1 – “HOW DO YOU CURRENTLY USE CHICHESTER PARK?”

A total of 78 respondents provided a response to this question. Of the responses, 80% stated that they were used Chichester Park for informal recreation. These data are summarised in Table 5 and Chart 3 below. (N.b. the number of responses can be greater than 78 as respondents were permitted to select more than one response.)

Table 5. Types of responses to the question: “How do you currently use Chichester Park?”

Type of park usage	Responses	
	N	%
Organised sport or recreation	8	10%
Informal recreation	64	80%
Other	3	3.8%
I do not currently use Chichester Park, but I am interested in the project	5	6.2%
Total (valid) responses	80	100%

Chart 3. Survey responses by type of use



QUESTION 2 – “THE CITY IS PROPOSING TO INSTALL A SET OF NINE SPORTS FLOODLIGHTS AROUND THE PLAYING FIELD OF CHICHESTER PARK TO A LIGHTING LEVEL OF 50 LUX OR 100 LUX. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR THIS PROPOSAL BY TICKING THE MOST APPROPRIATE BOX BELOW.”

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of support for the installation of nine floodlights around the playing field of Chichester Park on a 5–point scale (“strongly support” to “strongly oppose”) for both 50 lux (training level) and 100 lux (match level).

Results have been analysed to determine the level of support for respondents within the 200m of Chichester Park, and respondents that do not reside within 200m. Overall 88.9% of respondents either supported or strongly supported the installation of lights to 50 lux and 84.8% supported or strongly supported 100 lux. The results have been summarised in Table 6 & 7 and Chart 4 & 5 below.

Table 6. Level of support for the installation of sports floodlighting – 50 lux

Type of respondent	Strongly Support		Support		Unsure		Oppose		Strongly Oppose	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Respondent resides within 200m	22	40.7%	24	44.4%	3	5.6%	1	1.9%	2	3.7%
Respondent does not reside within 200m	1	1.9%	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total (valid) responses	23	42.6%	25	46.3%	3	5.6%	1	1.9%	2	3.7%

Chart 4. Level of support for the installation of sports floodlighting – 50 lux





Table 7. Level of support for the installation of sports floodlighting –100 lux

Type of respondent	Strongly Support		Support		Unsure		Oppose		Strongly Oppose	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Respondent resides within 200m	34	51.5%	20	30.3%	3	4.5%	4	6.1%	3	4.5%
Respondent does not reside within 200m	1	1.5%	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total (valid) responses	35	53.0%	21	31.8%	3	4.5%	4	6.1%	3	4.5%

Chart 5. Level of support for the installation of sports floodlighting – 100 lux



QUESTION 3 — “IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO ELBORATE ON YOUR LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR THE INSTALLATION OF SPORTS FLOODLIGHTING AROUND THE PLAYING FIELD OF CHICHESTER PARK, PLEASE TELL US WHY.”

Respondents were asked to provide comments to explain their support or opposition. Of the seven respondents that opposed the installation, seven provided reasons for their opposition. The results have been summarised in Table 8 below. The main reasons for opposition included: respondents’ belief that the lights will have a greater impact on the amount of parking; and concerns regarding the higher level of light. Several responses that were supportive of the floodlights also provided comments. These have been summarised in Table 9 below.

Table 8. Summary of reasons for opposition to proposed sports floodlighting in Chichester Park²

Reasons	Responses	
	N	%
Believe it will attract more noise to the area (in general)	2	10%
Believe it will have an greater impact on parking (in general)/ Are already concerned about the parking	7	35%
Believe it will impact on the level of amenity on the park	1	5%
Believe the increased level of light will impact on their amenity	4	20%
Believe lighting is too close to residential properties	3	15%
Believe night games will increase traffic and impact on the local residents negatively	3	15%
Total comments made	20	100%

Table 9. Summary of reasons of support for proposed sports floodlighting in Chichester Park³

Reasons	Responses	
	N	%
Believe it will positively impact on physical activity	17	48.6%
Believe it will have a positive impact on the level of security of the park	10	28.6%
Would like access to the lights for informal recreation	5	14.2%
Request that the lights be turned off at 9pm not 10pm	3	8.6%
Total comments made	35	100%

² N.b. some respondents provided more than one reason. Percentage is determined by the total number of comments made.

³ N.b. some respondents provided more than one reason. Percentage is determined by the total number of comments made.

QUESTION 4 — “DO YOU HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT THE SPORTS FLOODLIGHTING AT CHICHESTER PARK?”

Respondents were asked if they had any further comments on the proposed installation of sports floodlighting at Chichester Park. A total of six respondents provided comments. The results have been summarised in Table 10 below.

Table 10. Summary of further comments provided by respondents⁴

Level of support	Responses	
	N	%
Compliment the City on the current park amenity	4	66.7%
Would like to see more park facilities (ie sheter and BBQ)	2	33.3%
<i>Total comments made</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>100%</i>

ANALYSIS OF 'OCEAN REEF PARK, OCEAN REEF — RELOCATION OF CRICKET INFRASTRUCTURE AND SPORTS FLOODLIGHTING PROJECT' SURVEY

The following provides an analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data gathered from the *Ocean Reef Park, Ocean Reef — Relocation of Cricket Nets and Sports Floodlighting Project* Survey conducted with residents between 27 June and 18 July 2014.

BACKGROUND

The City consulted directly with the following stakeholders:

- Local residents within 200 metres of Ocean Reef Park;
- Representatives from current park user groups; and
- Representative(s) from local residents/ratepayers association(s).

This was undertaken by way of a hard-copy survey form sent to residents' addresses (together with a cover letter and information brochure). The consultation was also advertised to the general public via advertisements in the community newspaper, on the City's website and social media as well as through signage located at Ocean Reef Park. Members of the public were able to complete a survey form via the City's website, or were able to contact the City for a hard-copy.

RESPONSE RATES

Hard-copy surveys were sent to 258 local residents/and owners within a 200 metre radius of Ocean Reef Park, three were sent to current park user groups, one was sent to the Heathridge Residents Association and one sent to the Oceanside Gardens Residents Association.

The City collected a combined total of 56 responses. Of the 56 responses received, 55 were assessed as valid responses¹. These are summarised in Table 1 and Table 2 below.

Table 1: Survey responses by collection method

Type of survey completed	Responses	
	N	%
Hard-copy survey	52	94.5%
Online survey	3	5.5%
Total (valid) responses	55	100.0%

Table 2. Responses by location of respondent

Location of respondent (vicinity to proposed park)	Responses	
	N	%
Respondent resides within 200m	46	83.6%
Respondent does not reside within 200m	9	16.4%
Total (valid) responses	55	100.0%

¹ N.b. a "valid" response is one which includes the respondent's full contact details, they have responded within the advertised consultation period and for which multiple survey forms have not been submitted by the same household.


IDENTIFIED USER GROUPS

Of the 55 valid responses received, eight respondents stated that they were affiliated with an organisation/group that utilised Ocean Reef Park for a variety of activities. Most notably, 78.1% of the responses received were from local residents who don't affiliate themselves with one of the regular user groups. This data is summarised in Table 3 and Chart 1 below.

Table 3. Responses by respondent affiliation to identified user groups²

Identified user groups	Responses	
	N	%
Member of Ocean Ridge Junior Football Club	6	10.9%
Member of Ocean Ridge Junior Cricket Club	1	1.9%
Member of Ocean Ridge Cricket Club	1	1.9%
Member of Heathridge Residents Association	2	3.6%
Member of Oceanside Gardens Residents Association	2	3.6%
Status not identified	43	78.1%
Total (valid) responses	55	100%

Chart 1. Responses by respondent affiliation to identified user groups²



² Some respondents are affiliated with more than one identified user group.


DEMOGRAPHICS

A total of 53 respondents provided a response to this question. Of these, over one third were completed by people aged 45-54 and a further third by people aged 65-74. People aged 45–54 represent significant segments of the local population, so it is expected that a large response from this age group would be received. This data is summarised in Table 4 and Chart 2 below.

Table 4. Responses by age

Age groups	Responses	
	N	%
Under 18 years of age	0	0%
18–24 years of age	0	0%
25–34 years of age	1	1.9%
35–44 years of age	9	17%
45–54 years of age	20	37.7%
55–64 years of age	8	15%
65–74 years of age	11	20.8%
75–84 years of age	3	5.7%
85+ years of age	1	1.9%
Total (valid) responses	53	100.0%

Chart 2. Survey responses by age




QUESTION 1 – “HOW DO YOU CURRENTLY USE OCEAN REEF PARK?”

A total of 55 respondents provided a response to this question. Of the responses collected, the majority use Ocean Reef Park for informal recreation and organised sport or recreation. This data is summarised in Table 5 and Chart 3 below. (N.b. the number of total responses can be greater than the total number of respondents as respondents were permitted to select more than one response.)

Table 5. Types of responses to the question: “How do you currently use Ocean Reef Park?”

Type of park usage	Responses	
	N	%
Organised sport or recreation	8	13.1%
Informal recreation	42	68.9%
Other	5	8.2%
I do not currently use Ocean Reef Park, but I am interested in the project	6	9.8%
Total (valid) responses	61	100%

Chart 3. Survey responses by type of use



QUESTION 2 – “THE CITY IS PROPOSING TO RELOCATE THE EXISTING CRICKET INFRASTRUCTURE FROM THE WESTERN SIDE OF OCEAN REEF PARK TO THE SOUTH-EAST CORNER. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR THIS PROPOSAL BY TICKING THE MOST APPROPRIATE BOX BELOW”.


Respondents were asked to indicate their level of support for the relocation of the cricket infrastructure at Ocean Reef Park on a 5 point scale (strongly support to strongly oppose). A total of 55 respondents replied to this question with 76.3% stating that they support the relocation.

Results have been analysed to determine the level of support by respondents within 200m of Ocean Reef Park and respondents that do not reside within 200m. The results have been summarised in Table 6 and Chart 4 below.

Table 6. Level of support for the relocation of cricket infrastructure

Type of respondent	Strongly Support		Support		Unsure		Oppose		Strongly Oppose	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Respondent within 200m	15	27.3%	21	38.2%	6	10.9%	1	1.8%	3	5.5%
Respondent does not reside within 200m	4	7.2%	2	3.6%	2	3.6%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%
Total (valid) responses	19	34.5%	23	41.8%	8	14.5%	2	3.6%	3	5.5%

Chart 4. Level of support for the relocation of cricket infrastructure



QUESTION 3 — “THE CITY IS PROPOSING TO INSTALL A SET OF FOUR SPORTS FLOODLIGHTS AROUND THE PLAYING FIELD OF OCEAN REEF PARK TO A LIGHTING LEVEL OF 50 LUX OR 100 LUX. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR THIS PROPOSAL BY TICKING THE MOST APPROPRIATE BOX BELOW.”

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of support for installation of four floodlights around the playing field at Ocean Reef Park on a 5 point scale (strongly support to strongly oppose) for both 50 lux (training level) and 100 lux (match level).

Results have been analysed to determine the level of support by respondents within 200m of Ocean Reef Park and respondents that do not reside within 200m. Note: 20 respondents did not answer this question as they supplied a rating for 100 lux only. The results have been summarised in Tables 7 and 8 and Charts 5 and 6 below.

Table 7. Level of support for the installation of sports floodlighting – 50 lux

Type of respondent	Strongly Support		Support		Unsure		Oppose		Strongly Oppose	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Respondent within 200m	8	22.8%	12	34.3%	5	14.3%	2	5.7%	2	5.7%
Respondent does not reside within 200m	0	0%	5	14.3%	1	2.8%	0	0%	0	0.0%
Total (valid) responses	8	22.9%	17	48.6%	6	17.1%	2	5.7%	2	5.7%

Chart 5. Level of support for the installation of sports floodlighting – 50 lux





Table 8. Level of support for the installation of sports floodlighting – 100 lux

Type of respondent	Strongly Support		Support		Unsure		Oppose		Strongly Oppose	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Respondent within 200m	19	40.4%	12	25.5%	3	6.4%	2	4.3%	3	6.4%
Respondent does not reside within 200m	3	6.4%	4	8.5%	1	2.1%	0	0%	0	0.0%
Total (valid) responses	22	46.8%	16	34%	4	8.5%	2	4.3%	3	6.4%

Chart 6. Level of support for the installation of sports floodlighting – 100 lux



QUESTION 4 — “IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO ELBORATE ON YOUR LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR THE INSTALLATION OF SPORTS FLOODLIGHTING AROUND THE PLAYING FIELD OR THE RELOCATION OF CRICKET INFRASTRUCTURE AT OCEAN REEF PARK, PLEASE TELL US WHY.”

Respondents were asked to provide comments to explain their support or opposition to the proposed works. Of the five respondents that opposed the project, five provided comments. The results have been summarised in Table 9 below. The main reasons for opposition included: respondents believe that the works will have a greater impact on the amount of parking and concerns regarding a higher level of lighting. A number of respondents who supported the floodlighting project also answered this question stating their concern about the parking issues. Several respondents that were supportive of the floodlights also provided comments. These have been summarised in Table 10 below.

Table 9. Summary of reasons for opposition to proposed sports floodlighting and relocation of cricket infrastructure at Ocean Reef Park³

Reasons	Responses	
	N	%
Believe it will have a greater impact on parking (in general)	4	33.3%
Don't see the need to relocate cricket infrastructure/concerned about safety in proposed location	5	41.7%
Believe lights will be too bright (in general)	2	16.7%
Believe the height of the poles is not appropriate in a residential area	1	8.3%
Total comments made	12	100%

Table 10. Summary of reasons of support for proposed sports floodlighting and relocation of cricket infrastructure at Ocean Reef Park⁴

Reasons	Responses	
	N	%
Believe it will increase physical activity	3	23.1%
Believe it will increase security at the park	3	23.1%
Believe it is a good project and support the additional park lighting	5	38.5%
Believe the ability to utilise the park at night will benefit the community	2	15.3%
Total comments made	13	100%

³ N.b. some respondents provided more than one reason. Percentage is determined by the total number of comments made.

⁴ N.b. some respondents provided more than one reason. Percentage is determined by the total number of comments made.

QUESTION 5 — “DO YOU HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT OCEAN REEF PARK”.

Respondents were asked if they had any further comments on the proposed installation of sports floodlighting or the relocation of the cricket infrastructure at Ocean Reef Park. A total of 23 respondents provided comments. The results have been summarised in Table 11 below.

Table 11. Summary of further comments provided by respondents

Level of support	Responses	
	N	%
Believe the proposed works will have a greater impact on parking	11	47.8%
Request for additional bins to be provided around the park	4	17.4%
Would like to see an upgrade to the playground equipment	3	13%
Would like to see more informal recreation facilities (park benches, pathways, tennis hit up wall)	4	17.4%
Believe the lights will increase physical activity	1	4.4%
Total comments made	23	100%