

Appendix A

Cullen Central Park Master Plan

Consultant's Evaluation of Scenarios for Tableland Areas

		A Town Owned / Operated Facility	B Educational / Institutional Use	C Private Sector Owned/Operated
1. Net Financial Implication*	0 High Net Financial Implication	2.0	3.0	3.4
	5 Low Net Financial Implication			
Underlying Considerations				
Capital Cost Recovery	0 Low Capital Cost Recovery	0	2	4
	5 High Capital Cost Recovery			
Additional Capital Investment Required	0 High Cost	4	4	3
	5 Minimal Additional Cost Required			
Revenue Generation Potential	0 Highly Dependent on Municipal Support and Grants	1	4	5
	5 Self Sufficient			
Offset Municipal Expenditures Elsewhere	0 New Expenditure for Town	4	1	0
	5 Reduces Town Expenditures at Other Locations			
Ongoing Operating Costs	0 Requires Additional Expertise and Resources	1	4	5
	5 Staff and Resources Immediately Available to Implement			
2. Economic Opportunities and Benefits	0 Low Economic Benefit	2.3	3.7	4.0
	5 High Economic Benefit			
Underlying Considerations				
Market Potential	0 Very Limited Attendance	3	3	3
	5 Widespread Market Support			
Economic Benefits to Town and Region	0 Low Spin Off Spending / Minimal Draw from outside Town	2	4	4
	5 Generates Spending and Visitors throughout Whitby			
Opportunities for Private Sector Participation	0 Very Limited Potential	2	4	5
	5 Strong Potential			
3. Compatibility with Natural Features	0 Low Compatibility	3.0	4.0	2.5
	5 High Compatibility			
Underlying Considerations				
Contrasts with or impacts Natural Resources	0 High impacts/contrasts	3	4	2
	5 Low impacts/contrasts			
Support for Environmental Principles	0 Demonstrates Low support for Environmental Principles	3	4	3
	5 Demonstrates High support for Environmental Principles			
4. Compatibility with Heritage Features	0 Low Compatibility	3.0	2.5	2.0
	5 High Compatibility			
Underlying Considerations				
Contrast or Impacts to Heritage Resources	0 High impacts/contrasts	3	2	2
	5 Low impacts/contrasts			
Support for Heritage Principles	0 Not in Keeping with Heritage Principles	3	3	2
	5 Sympathetic to Heritage Principles			
5. Compatibility with Surrounding Uses	0 Low Compatibility	4.3	3.7	3.3
	5 High Compatibility			
Underlying Considerations				
Neighbourhood Compatability	0 High Impacts on Surrounding Neighbourhood, e.g. noise, traffic	4	3	3
	5 Low Impacts on Surrounding Neighbourhood, e.g. noise, traffic			
Impacts on Valleyland Passive Recreation Uses	0 Impacts negatively on Valleyland passive/recreational use	4	4	4
	5 Low or no impacts on Valleyland passive/recreational uses			
Compatibility with Central Park Concept (broader greenspace context)	0 Eliminates Physical or Gateway Access to Central Park	5	4	3
	5 Maintains Physical or Gateway Access to Central Park			
6. Opportunities for Access to Recreation/Social Interactions and Benefits	0 Low Potential	4.5	3.0	2.5
	5 High Potential			
Underlying Considerations				
Informal Social/ Recreation Uses	0 Limited Opportunity for Informal Public Use	4	3	3
	5 Community Can Use at Minimal or No Cost			
Town Programming for Community Benefit	0 Limited Opportunities for Integration of Town Programs	5	3	2
	5 High Potential for Integration of Town Programs			
TOTAL UNWEIGHTED RANKING		19.2 2	19.8 1	17.7 3

*The bolded scores for each criteria are calculated by adding the scores for the Underlying Considerations and dividing by the number of Underlying Considerations