

Criteria	Weighting	Option											
		Option 1 - Stacked		Option 2 - Stacked +		Option 3 - Clustered		Option 4 - Hybrid Split		Option 5 - Community & Arts		Option 6 - Community & Bowls	
		Stacked	Rationale	Stacked +	Rationale	Clustered	Rationale	Clustered	Rationale	Clustered	Rationale	Clustered	Rationale
<b>1. Community Needs</b>													
4	1a. Existing User Group Expectations	3											
	1b. Town of Vic Park Needs	5											
	1c. Existing User Group Needs	5											
	1d. Future User Group Needs	3											
<b>2. Precinct Impact</b>													
4.33333	2a. Identity and Brand	4											
	2b. Vision and Principles	5											
	2c. Activation	4											
<b>3. Functionality</b>													
4.5	3a. User Experience	4											
	3b. Flexibility and Spatial Efficiency	5											
	3c. Fit for Purpose	4											
	3d. Passive Environmental Performance	5											
	3e. Parking & Access	4											
<b>4. Feasibility</b>													
4.2	4a. Land use Efficiency	4											
	4b. Upfront Costs	5											
	4c. Running Costs	5											
	4d. Technical Complexity	3											
	4e. Potential Revenue Generation	4											
<b>Total</b>			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unweighted Position			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Community Needs			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Precinct Impact			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Functionality			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Feasibility			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Rationale (Refer Tab 2)  
0 Low  
3 Medium  
5 High

Criteria (Refer Tab 3)  
Options (Refer Tab 4)

Criteria	Option		
	1	2	3
	Stacked	Stacked +	Clustered
<b>1. Community Needs</b>			
1a. Existing User Group Expectations	0		
1b. Town of Vic Park Needs			
1c. Existing User Group Needs			
1d. Future User Group Needs			
<b>2. Precinct Impact</b>			
2a. Identity and Brand			
2b. Vision and Principles			
2c. Activation			
<b>3. Functionality</b>			
3a. User Experience			
3b. Flexibility and Spatial Efficiency			
3c. Fit for Purpose			
3d. Passive Environmental Performance			

3e. Parking & Access			
4. Feasibility			
4a. Land use Efficiency			
4b. Upfront Costs			
4c. Running Costs			
4d. Technical Complexity			
4e. Potential Revenue Generation			

Criteria	Description	Ranking	Assumptions
<b>1. Community Needs</b>			
<b>1a. Existing User Group Expectations</b>	Option generally meets the expectations outlined by existing Key User Groups	0 = Does not meet at all 5 = Meets in full	Qualitative assessment based on Facility Design Brief Existing Key User Group Needs Analysis
<b>1b. Town of Vic Park Needs</b>	Option meets the service delivery needs of the Town of Victoria Park, as identified in the Urbis Community Facility Needs Analysis (2019)	0 = Does not satisfy needs 5 = satisfies specified needs	Qualitative assessment based on Facility Design Brief Requirements Schedule
<b>1c. Existing User Group Needs</b>	Option satisfies the needs of other existing Key User Groups, as identified by Urbis Community Facility Needs Analysis (2019)	0 = Does not meet at all 5 = Meets in full	Qualitative assessment based on Facility Design Brief Requirements Schedule
<b>1d. Future User Group Needs</b>	Option is future proofed to meet the needs of other existing and future user groups, including not for profits	0 = Does not satisfy needs 5 = Significant contribution	Qualitative assessment based on Facility Design Brief (2.6) Other Users
<b>2. Precinct Impact</b>			
<b>2a. Identity and Brand</b>	Option will have a positive impact on the identity of the Precinct and the Town of Vic Park brand	0 = No/Negative impact 5 = Positive impact	Qualitative assessment of the scale, prominence and functionality of the option
<b>2b. Vision and Principles</b>	Option is aligned to the endorsed Macmillan Precinct Vision , Principles and Concept Plan	0 = Low alignment 5 = High alignment	Qualitative assessment based on the alignment of the option with the Vision and Principles, including public spaces and connections impacted by the Facility design
<b>2c. Activation</b>	Option will attract people to the Precinct and activate the public realm, both along the Facility ground floor edge and along new connections proposed within the Precinct	0 = Minimal activation 5 = Significant activation	Qualitative assessment based on the location of building entries relevant to important public spaces + ground floor function and form to promote activity along the building edge
<b>3. Functionality</b>			
<b>3a. User Experience</b>	Option can provide a diverse and high quality user experience within the Facility	0 = poor experience 5 = excellent experience	Qualitative assessment that considers building access, circulation, wayfinding, spatial qualities, synergies between different functions, natural light and ventilation, and external views
<b>3b. Flexibility and Spatial Efficiency</b>	Spaces within the Facility are flexible by design, supporting multiple use and building efficiency	0 = poor performance 5 = excellent performance	Qualitative assessment based on Facility Design Brief

<b>3c. Fit for Purpose</b>	Spaces are designed for optimal performance of intended functions, particularly those delivering Town services	0 = poor performance 5 = excellent performance	Qualitative assessment based on Facility Design Brief
<b>3d. Passive Environmental Performance</b>	Extent to which the option has the potential to satisfy the Facility's Baseline and Aspirational Sustainability targets	0 = poor performance 5 = excellent performance	Qualitative assessment based on Facility Design Brief targets
<b>3e. Parking &amp; Access</b>	Car and bike parking provision is in accordance with the Design Brief and attractive to users	0 = poor performance 5 = excellent performance	Qualitative assessment based on Facility Design Brief parking requirements. Also, the accessibility and security of car and bike parking
<b>4. Feasibility</b>			
<b>4a. Land use Efficiency</b>	The option incorporates a high level of land-use efficiency, which frees up opportunities for additional uses elsewhere within the Precinct, which could provide revenue generation	0 = Low efficiency 5 = High efficiency	Quantitative assessment based on Facility land-take requirements within the Precinct, including provision of bowls
<b>4b. Upfront Costs</b>	The extent of upfront development costs compared with other options	0 = Low cost 5 = High cost	Quantitative assessment based on the cost estimates to deliver the Facility, including the bowls within or outside the Precinct
<b>4c. Running Costs</b>	The extent to which running costs may vary across the options based on the physical design and layout (excludes capital replacement costs)	0 = Low cost 5 = High cost	Qualitative assessment based on fundamental physical design elements likely to impact running costs. This includes all likely running costs, such as building costs, management / staff resources and maintenance
<b>4d. Technical Complexity</b>	Anticipated complexity of solution based on the identification of key option-specific constraints, including staging and maintaining the delivery of core Town service	0 = High complexity 5 = Low complexity	Identification of technical constraints and complexities and qualitative assessment of their significance in terms of the delivery of core Town Services and achieving the Precinct Vision and Principles
<b>4e. Potential Revenue Generation</b>	The potential for floorspace within the Facility to provide a source of revenue to the Town to offset costs	0 = Low revenue 5 = High revenue	Quantitative and qualitative assessment based on the total area of 'commercial' floor space, rental potential and the suitability of its locations