

Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan

Issue: Whether to provide feedback via a Round 2 survey or other means following publication of comments on the first round of community consultation.

Background:

This survey focuses on the key recommendations related to the need for parks and the number of specific types of facilities per thousands of residents, such as pools, arenas and tennis courts.

In Round 1 of public consultation, input from 2,200 people provided opinions on opportunities and challenges for the City of Ottawa's Parks, Outdoor and Indoor Recreation Facilities.

The feedback fell into one of three categories:

1. directly related to parks and recreation facilities and within the scope of this Plan (e.g. intensification, the number of parks and facilities)
2. directly related to parks and recreation facilities but beyond the scope of this Plan (e.g. maintenance and operations at parks and recreation facilities, programming and program costs)
3. related to parks and recreation facilities but, beyond the mandate of RCFS (e.g. road design to get parks, OC Transpo routes and schedules)

The responses 2 and 3 above show the plan is siloed failing to account for complementary facilities, such as NCC lands, that are part of the lived experience of residents but not managed by Parks and Recreation.

The main focus in Round 2 is the need for parkland to meet population growth for the next 10 years, to 2031. In this survey, and the plan in general, there is minimal attention to non-sports recreation — the oxygen is consumed by facilities for sports.

For most types of recreational facilities per capita Ottawa as a whole compares favourably with other major Canadian communities, in most cases above average.

The analysis is performed on a transect basis, a decision made by City staff. Hunt Club is in the Outer Urban Transect. An average availability of a recreational facility across the transect does not necessarily represent the availability for a particular community. In particular the Outer Urban transect is second only to the Inner Urban in population but has a greater geographic spread meaning for the same number of facilities per capita they are less accessible as the distance to them is greater on average.

In addition to completing the online survey (closing June 17) there is the option to register for one of the following virtual bilingual consultation sessions:

Monday, June 7, 2021 from 1:30 to 3:30 pm;
Monday, June 7, 2021 from 7:00 to 9:00 pm;
Tuesday, June 8, 2021 from 7:00 to 9:00 pm; (focus on organized sports)
Wednesday, June 9, 2021 from 9:00 to 11:00 am

The questions for the survey and consultation sessions are:

Do you feel the recommendations are sufficient to meet population needs?

Is there missing data or information you would like the project team to consider?

This survey will ask your level of agreement for each park and facility type per thousands of residents (example: 1 playground for every 1,400 residents). Each question will have the current number of each type by thousands of residents, and the recommended level in 2031. Here is an example of how the survey questions are structured:

“Currently, there are 145 Splash Pads, 1 per 7,300 residents. The recommendation is to set this level at 1 per 7,500 residents. This means 54 new Splash Pads will be needed by 2031. (see page 90-95 for details)”

If you think that this is the right number, then you would answer “Agree with the recommendation”.

If you think that there should be more, then you would answer “there should be more than the recommendation”.

If you think that there should be fewer, then you would answer “there should be fewer than the recommendation”.

There is also an option to answer, “No opinion”.

You will have an opportunity in the survey to provide more detail about your answers as well as give feedback about existing parkland and facilities

More detail is available at <https://engage.ottawa.ca/parks-and-facilities-recreation-master-plan/>

Local Consultation

The following issues were raised from Environment Committee members and advisors:

Accessibility: Will the planned upgrades to recreational facilities, or the new facilities that will be installed, adequately meet accessibility standards?

Seniors: What consideration is being given to the needs of the elderly in the planning of new recreational facilities? Will there be some that are designed specifically having in mind the needs and physical limitations of elderly persons?

Maintenance and upkeep: Will the City maintain all newly installed recreational facilities?

Parkland: Question reducing the current citywide provision level for municipal active parkland from 2.31 hectares per 1,000 residents to 2.0 hectares per 1,000 residents.

Options

1, No Association Response

It's unlikely an intervention would have any significant impact. The Association could post information about the option to respond individually to the survey on Association social media.

2, Broad Response

Respond by letter pointing out the deficiencies of the analysis noted above and that in a climate emergency situation increasing the availability of parks and recreation facilities should be a second priority for expenditures ensuring existing facilities are highly energy efficient.

Recommendation

Option 1.

There is probably not a response that reflects a community consensus.

John D Reid