

Project: Dublin CC Accessibility Audits

Job No: 23399



Use Type: Public Park

Auditor: G Speirs

Date of Audit: 21/03/2007

Capita Ref: 064

Name: California Hills Park

Address: South Central

Section 1: Approach Routes & Street Furniture

REF	QUESTION	Y/N	LOCATION	RECOMMENDATION	QTY	PHOTO REF	PRIORITY	COSTS
1.1	Is the park easy to find?	No		Refer to item 1.7.				€0
1.2	Is the park within convenient walking distance of: Public Highway, Public Transport, Car Parking?	Yes						
1.3	Is the surrounding approach routes level?	Yes						
1.4	Are the approach routes minimum 1.8m wide?	Yes						
1.5	Are approach route surfaces even and slip resistant?	Yes						
1.6	Do approaches to crossovers have the necessary contrasting tactile surfaces and dropped kerbs?	No		There is limited physical assistance on route to the park. Recommend that crossover points be incorporated with tactile blister paving to either side. This need only be incorporated on the main approach routes. A budgetary cost is included. This may be the responsibility of the roads department.		1	2	€1,000
1.7	Is the approach route to the park entrances clearly signed?	No		The park is not well signed on approach. Recommend that signage be provided on all major approach routes. A budgetary cost is included.		1	1	€200

1.8	Is the approach route to the park suitably lit (if park operates after dark)?	Yes
1.9	Is the approach route to the park entrances free of hazards such as bollards, litter bins etc?	Yes
1.10	Is there a designated drop-off point close to a park entrance to allow disabled visitors arriving at the park in vehicles to be safely dropped-off? Is it well signed/marked out?	N/A

Section 3: Park Entrances

REF	QUESTION	Y/N	LOCATION	RECOMMENDATION	QTY	PHOTO REF	PRIORITY	COSTS
3.1	Is the park entrance(s) easy to find, well signed and clearly distinguishable from the façade?	No		Refer to item 3.2.				€0
3.2	Is there suitable signage to the main entrance(s) of the park indicating what facilities are available to assist visitors with a disability (i.e. accessible routes, parking, toilets etc)?	No		The park is not well signed at entrance areas. Recommend that signage be provided at all entrances to indicate its name and purpose etc (if applicable). A budgetary cost is included.			1	€200
3.3	Is there level access to park entrances?	No		There are small areas of uneven surfaces at main entrance which, although providing access, may restrict wheelchair users or persons with reduced mobility. Resurface the small isolated areas.		1	1	€2,000
3.4	Are park entrances wide enough for all users (minimum 800mm)?	Yes						

3.5 If operated by the public, are park gate handles/controls easy to use and at a suitable height for use by visitors standing or seated? N/A

Section 4: Horizontal Circulation Routes

REF	QUESTION	Y/N	LOCATION	RECOMMENDATION	QTY	PHOTO REF	PRIORITY	COSTS
4.1	Are circulation routes within the park at least 1800mm wide (or have regular 1800mm wide passing zones)?	Yes						
4.2	Are surfaces even and slip resistant?	Yes						
4.3	Is park signage suitably positioned, sized and with necessary colour/tonal contrast between letters and background? Is there alternative pictorial signage indicating key park features/warnings etc?	N/A						
4.4	Is adequate seating with armrests provided in larger parks?	No		There is insufficient seating within the park. Recommend that seating be provided with arm rests and back support. A budgetary cost is given for approximately 10 No. benches / seating.	10 No.	1,2,3	2	€2,000
4.5	Does the park allow general movement to all areas; accessible paths, accessible gates, segregation of pedestrians from vehicles?	No		There is part of park that would not be deemed wheelchair accessible due to its natural topography - photo 2. No alterations are required as this does not provide access to any specific facility.				€0
4.6	Are circulation routes kept free of debris, foliage, overgrown plants/shrubs etc?	Yes						

