# AQUATIC FACILITY RENEWAL – SITE SELECTION

#### **DECISION SUPPORT MATRIX – SWOT ANALYSIS**

	Site A – Henrietta Street	Site B – South Street	Site C – Georgiana Street
STRENGTHS	<ul> <li>Vacant site – low demolition costs</li> <li>Can keep existing pool operational while construction occurs</li> <li>Space to fit new facility</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Can keep existing pool operational while construction occurs. No loss of service</li> <li>Preferred site based on geotechnical results and site classification</li> <li>Co locate and integrate with existing recreation facilities</li> <li>WHS improvements for staff working in isolation</li> <li>Located close to School. Reduces travel time and safety concerns with walking to swimming lessons</li> <li>Available space will fit new facility</li> </ul>	Community sentiment for history of site

	Site A – Henrietta Street	Site B – South Street	Site C – Georgiana Street
WEAKNESSES	<ul> <li>Little value in co-location. No integration with existing facilities</li> <li>Not preferred site based on geotechnical results</li> <li>Access to power and water. No connection on site</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Demolition costs of existing infrastructure</li> <li>Need to relocate existing uses</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Would require closing the pool for up to two swimming seasons</li> <li>No integration with other recreational facilities</li> <li>Would require demolition, including removal of entire pool shell</li> <li>Geotechnical results revealed highly reactive clay site classification. Least desirable of all sites, compared to other options.</li> </ul>

# **AQUATIC FACILITY RENEWAL – SITE SELECTION**

### **DECISION SUPPORT MATRIX – SWOT ANALYSIS**

	Site A – Henrietta Street	Site B – South Street	Site C – Georgiana Street
OPPORTUNITIES	Attractive entry statement to town	<ul> <li>Has room for relocation of basketball courts to the south of the site.</li> <li>Upgrade to basketball courts, current courts require renewal</li> <li>Is located close to school, reduced travel for swimming lessons, safer for students walking along roads</li> <li>Allows for disposal of obsolete infrastructure</li> <li>No need to 'double up' on some facilities such as gym, café and playground.</li> <li>Increased site activation and patronage for café</li> <li>Opportunities for developing a water use efficiency project in conjunction with school., which would provide alternative sources of water for ovals.</li> <li>Frees up existing site for consideration for other community use. Potential for variety of multi-generational spaces and uses. Opportunity to recognise history as a pool site.</li> <li>Demolition of existing site – might not need to remove shell and demolition could occur over time.</li> <li>Redevelopment of site could incorporate removal of Asbestos material found at old bowling green site, reducing risk.</li> </ul>	

## **AQUATIC FACILITY RENEWAL – SITE SELECTION**

### **DECISION SUPPORT MATRIX – SWOT ANALYSIS**

	Site A – Henrietta Street	Site B – South Street	Site C – Georgiana Street
THREATS	<ul> <li>Access to power and water. No connections on site</li> <li>Change adverse elements in community</li> </ul>	Change adverse elements in community     Relocation of Early Years Hub/ Play Group will need to be considered	<ul> <li>Loss of facility for at least one season, maybe two</li> <li>Potential for lasting damage to swimming club if pool was closed for a season</li> <li>Community travel to Northam for swimmng, don't return</li> <li>Economic loss if people travel to Northam, likely to combine trip with shopping etc. Spend leaves town</li> <li>Loss of school swimming lessons as travel is not possible (cost and time)</li> <li>Negative impact on Emergency Service Cadet program – Loss of Bronze Medallion, water safety program</li> <li>Impact on Vac Swim as loss of a season reduces enrolments</li> <li>Lack of accessibility increases poor swimming outcomes for children</li> </ul>