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1. Introduction

The City of London has embarked on an update to its Parks and Recreation Master Plan, which – once complete – will guide decisions about parks, recreation and sport services and facilities. This section highlights the purpose of this “What We’ve Heard So Far” Report within the context of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan process.

Purpose of this “What We’ve Heard So Far” Report

The purpose of this report is to summarize what we’ve heard from the public and stakeholders through Phase 1 of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update. Sharing summaries of what we’ve heard is important as it creates a common understanding of opportunities and issues in the community and sets the stage for further discussions. Additional public input will be sought once the Draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan is available in early 2019.

This report identifies all the ways in which information was collected from residents and stakeholders, as well as an overall summary of the key findings (Section 5). Very little interpretation or fact checking of statements made by the public or stakeholders is contained in this report and therefore does not represent final themes or directions for the Update. Further research on existing strategies and plans, best practices and trends, and current and future demographics will take place before the draft Plan and its recommendations are developed.

We acknowledge and appreciate those that have provided input to date. We encourage residents and stakeholders to stay engaged by visiting http://getinvolved.london.ca/playyourway for updates on the Plan and future opportunities for review and discussion.

1.1 About the Parks and Recreation Master Plan

The City of London offers high quality parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities that engage residents and visitors of all ages and abilities. Parks, recreation and sport plays a significant role in community building through the facilitation of active and passive activities, opportunities for structured and spontaneous play, strengthening of neighbourhood connections, and more.

Planning ahead is critical. As London grows and changes, the interests of residents also change. With 2009 being the last review of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan (an interim update was prepared in 2017), London needs an updated plan to set a course for the future.
Once complete, the 2019 Parks and Recreation Master Plan will provide an overall vision, direction and guidance for making decisions about parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities. The Master Plan will have a timeframe of ten years (2019 to 2028), although it will be informed by a longer-term outlook for major projects (to 2039).

1.2 Master Plan Scope

At a high-level, the Master Plan will guide the City’s planning and future budgeting. It will also be relevant for the day-to-day operations of several City of London Service Areas, including: Parks and Recreation; Neighbourhood, Children and Fire Services; Planning Services; and Finance and Corporate Services.

The services and entities that will be directly guided by the Plan include:

a) Recreation Programming, such as aquatic, sport, wellness, arts/crafts, dance/music, and general interest programs provided by the City and other providers.

b) Recreation and Sport Facilities, such as community centres, pools, sports fields, playgrounds and more.

c) Parks & Civic Spaces, such as major parks, neighbourhood parks, gardens and civic squares.

d) Investment in the Community, such as neighbourhood opportunities, public engagement, sport tourism and more.

The scope of parks, recreation and sport is quite broad and many aspects of the Plan touch on topics that are related to other master plans and strategic documents. Aligning the Master Plan with related initiatives is critical to implementing Council’s Strategic Plan, maximizing resources and achieving common outcomes. For example, the following amenities are not included in the scope of the Master Plan as they are addressed in other strategic documents:

a) Parkland Dedication, which is guided by the London Plan and Parkland Dedication Bylaw.

b) Cycling and Bike Lanes, which are addressed in the Cycling Master Plan and London Plan.

c) Sensitive features of the Natural Heritage System – including trails within Environmentally Significant Areas – which are addressed through the London Plan policies and technical recommendations within Conservation Master Plans.

d) Arts, Culture and Heritage, which is guided by the City’s Cultural Prosperity Plan, Music, Entertainment and Culture District Study and related reports.
1.3 Master Plan Methodology

The Master Plan is based on several inputs and is being developed through a phased process (Figure 1). This “What We’ve Heard So Far” Report falls within the first phase and consists of the community engagement strategy, various touchpoints and opportunities to be involved in the development of the Plan, and outcomes of several consultation initiatives.

Figure 1: Master Plan Methodology

Phase One
Research & Consultation
Background Review
Visioning Workshop
Community Engagement
Socio-Demographic Profile
Trends and Best Practices
Inventory and Mapping

Phase Two
Development of Recommendations & Strategies
Systems Assessment
Recreation Service Levels
Parkland Service Levels
Implementation Plan
Financial Plan
Draft Strategic Master Plan

Phase Three
Testing the Master Plan & Project Finalization
Community Engagement
Final Strategic Master Plan
Council Presentation

1.4 Overview of Community Engagement to Date

City of London Staff and the Consulting Team developed a comprehensive community engagement strategy detailing the various engagement tactics employed throughout the consultation period. These touchpoints are intended to help the City better understand how Londoners use municipal parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities.

The consultation program to date has incorporated both online and in-person opportunities to discuss the plan and provide feedback. If any interested participants were unable to provide feedback in person, they were welcomed to provide written submissions. Similarly, if online access was a barrier to participation, in-person and written submissions were also received.
There were multiple opportunities to learn more, provide feedback and engage in discussions about the Master Plan. These opportunities were designed to generate comments about London’s parks, recreation, and sports and were available throughout Spring and Summer 2018. Online engagement tools were open to the public for a pre-determined window of time and in-person sessions were by invitation and facilitated either by City of London staff or members of the Consulting Team.

Below is a list of the tactics that are discussed in greater detail throughout the Report.

Community & Online
- Community Survey
- Online Input (website, email, discussion guide, etc.)
- Child’s Voice Drawing Submissions
- Other City Initiatives

Stakeholder Consultation
- Stakeholder Input Sessions
- Targeted Focus Groups
- Agency & Partner Interviews

Internal Consultation
- Staff Workshops
- Mayor & Council Interviews
- Advisory Committees

The City employed a strategic and targeted marketing and distribution campaign to disseminate information about the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Survey engagement tactics included:
- The Play Your Way Newsletter.
- City of London social media accounts (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, etc.).
- Banners attached to Spectrum program registration emails.
- Details appended to all City of London Spectrum email receipts during the consultation period.
- Postcards and posters at City of London parks, recreation, sport, parks and special event locations throughout London. Master Plan materials were also shared with stakeholder groups and partner agencies to distribute through their networks.

Examples of print and online media materials that were distributed throughout the City as part of the community engagement process can be found in Appendix A.
Consultation Summary

- Online Surveys Completed: 2,159
- Stakeholder Input Session Participants: 50+
- Child’s Voice Drawings: 117
- Key Partner Interviews: 12
- Email Submissions: ongoing
- Meetings with Staff, Officials & Committees: ongoing
- Targeted Focus Group Participants: 85
2. Community & Online Consultation

This section contains details on methodologies employed and results obtained from various community consultation initiatives used to help inform the Master Plan.

2.1 Community Survey

To support the development of this Master Plan, the City of London hosted an online community survey (also available in hard copy at municipal recreation facilities, through customer service and by request). The survey was available from May to July 2018. A total of 2,159 unique responses were received; being a voluntary, self-directed survey, response rates vary by question.

The purpose of the community survey was to elicit information on the parks, recreation and sport needs of London residents. The City wants to ensure that the right parks, recreation and sport activities and programs are in place to improve quality of life for all Londoners, and the survey provided the public with an opportunity to have their say.

The survey was estimated to take about 10 to 15 minutes of time to complete depending on the number of questions answered and level of detail provided. The questions were designed to gather information regarding resident and stakeholder participation rates in both organized and unorganized activities, barriers to activity, facility use, recommended improvements, support for investment, and opinion/agreement with statements regarding municipal support for parks, recreation and sport. Finally, the survey also helped to paint a picture of parks, recreation and sport users in the City by collecting neighbourhood and City-wide demographics. Tabulated survey response data has been provided in Appendix B.

Cross-Tabulation Analysis

To help better understand the respondent population and how needs are distributed throughout London, an analysis of relevant cross-tabulations (i.e., correlations) was undertaken on the following variables:

- Area of Residency
- Household Composition
- Length of Residency
- Barriers to Participation
- Frequency of Visiting Indoor Recreation Facilities
- Frequency of Visiting Parks
- Frequency of Visiting Trails and Pathways.

Where applicable, some of the cross-tabulation results have been highlighted throughout the survey summary below. These will help represent key findings from the
survey feedback. Detailed results of the cross-tabulation analysis have been provided in Appendix C.

**Sample Demographics**

**Neighbourhood Distribution & Representation**

The survey collected responses from across all geographic areas of the City, with each Forward Sortation Area (first three digits of the postal code) represented by 14 or more individuals. The neighbourhoods with the highest response rate (all 10% of the sample or higher) included: N5X (12% from Uplands / Stoneybrook / Stoney Creek / Fanshawe), N6G (12% from Medway / Masonville / Sunningdale), N6K (12% from Westmount / Byron / Riverbend / Woodhull), and N6H (West London / Oakridge / Hyde Park / Fox Hollow). The table below details the proportion of respondents per each of the five plan areas: Northwest, Northeast, Central, Southwest, and Southeast. It also compares geographic household representation from the survey with actual residential figures from Canada Post data and indicates equitable distribution of survey respondents across the city.

**Figure 2 Neighbourhood Distribution of Survey Responses (n=2159)**

For the most part, respondents from Northeast, Northwest and Southwest London have similar interests and opinions regarding parks, recreation and sport in the City.
Household Composition

On the whole, survey respondents skewed younger, with strong representation from households with children and teens. Figure 3 illustrates the distribution of respondent households by age group and compares to the same information from Statistics Canada’s community profile for London. The most significant gaps are between children under 10 years of age (over-represented in the survey), and seniors aged 75 years or older (under-represented in the survey).

Figure 3 Household Composition of survey respondents compared to 2016 Census (n=1793)
Residency

Almost two-thirds (62%) of survey respondents are long-time residents of London, having lived here for 20 years or more. Another one-in-five (19%) have resided in London for 10 to less than 20 years, while 9% have lived here 5 to less than 10 years, 8% less than 5 years, and the remaining 2% indicated that they didn’t know their length of residency.

Some activities and sports with a more international appeal are more strongly supported by newer London residents.

Participation

To gauge participation in parks, recreation, and sport, the survey asked respondents to identify the activities and programs which they or someone in their household had participated in within the last twelve months. Note that respondents were able to select more than one response so percentages do not add to 100%.

Figure 5 illustrates all parks, recreation, and sport activities listed on the survey and the percentage of respondents who had participated within the past year. Overall, the most popular activities were forms of active transportation, with walking, hiking and cycling taking over the top three. The less popular activities were specialized or emerging activities including squash/racquetball, cricket, and BMX biking.

Indoor Recreation Activities

The indoor recreation activities with the highest rates of participation were unstructured and/or self-scheduled. Fitness, yoga, or weight training was the most popular (48%), followed by swimming (47%), and attending special events or community gatherings (40%).

Fourth overall, and the most commonly listed structured/organized indoor activity was ice sports including skating, hockey, ringette, or sledge (34%). Other commonly listed registered or structured indoor recreation activities were: court sports such as volleyball, basketball or badminton (19%); cultural programs such as drama, dance or music (18%); arts programs such as crafts or creative arts (17%); holiday or summer camps (17%); indoor turf sports (12%); general interest programs such as cooking, computers and photography (12%); and organized programs and activities for seniors (11%).

The most common response to the open-ended “Other” category was curling, which accounted for 16% of all respondents. This is well above actual participation rates,
suggesting that curling enthusiasts are over-represented within the survey. Other indoor recreation activities were participated in by 10% or fewer survey respondents and are detailed in Appendix B.

Figure 5 Participation in parks, recreation and sport activities and programs (n=2159)
Outdoor Recreation Activities

When addressing participation in outdoor recreation, various forms of active travel ranked among the highest on the list. The most popular outdoor recreation activity overall was walking for leisure; selected by almost three-quarters (72%) of survey respondents. More than half (54%) of survey respondents had gone hiking in a natural area in the last 12 months while one-in-two respondents (50%) had participated in some form of cycling. Running or jogging was another popular activity, participated in by 32% of survey respondents.

Outdoor aquatic pursuits were also highly represented. Swimming outdoors was the most popular aquatic activity with 42% participating in the last 12 months. Another 34% indicated that their household had played at a spray pad or wading pool and 19% participated in water sports such as canoeing or kayaking.

Similar to participation in indoor recreation activities, the most popular outdoor recreation pursuits are often unstructured or unscheduled individual activities. For example, after walking and hiking, the third most commonly listed activity was playing at a playground (43%) and the most popular winter activity was outdoor ice skating (27%).

Traditional team field sports were also fairly popular among survey respondents. Just above one-quarter (27%) participated in sports such as soccer, lacrosse, football, rugby, ultimate frisbee, and field hockey. More than one-in-five (21%) survey respondents indicated that they had participated in baseball or softball within the last year.

London residents appear to have adopted many newly-emerging or individual sports and activities. One example of this is golf, which was participated in by one-third (33%) of survey respondents. Outdoor racquet sports were also listed by many survey respondents with 13% who played tennis in the last year and 7% said the same for pickleball. Wheeled action sports were also identified as outdoor recreation pursuits; including 14% who had participated in skateboarding, scootering or rollerblading and another 2% who participated in BMX biking.

Following the trend of increased pet-ownership, dog-walking was commonly reported as an outdoor recreation activity both on and off-leash (35% and 16%, respectively).
Facilities & Locations

The survey asked respondents to indicate which types of locations had been used to participate in parks, recreation or sport activities within the last twelve months. The most popular location by far was City of London parks, visited by almost four-in-five survey respondents (79%). The second most popular location was indoor City of London facilities such as community centres, arenas, or indoor pools (64%). London Public Library locations rounded out the top three most popular locations, with 54% of survey respondents having visited in the last year. Other facilities used by less than half of survey respondents included a variety of outdoor public facilities, not-for-profit, private, educational, or worship-based locations. These results indicate a heavy reliance on City facilities, but also recognizes the significant use of non-municipal recreation facilities.

**Figure 6 Locations for participation in parks, recreation and sport (n=2159)**
The survey specifically asked for information about the frequency of use at parks and facilities operated by the City of London. Figure 7 below illustrates the listed facilities and quantifies frequency of use into three categories: frequent, infrequent, and never. The most popular and frequently used facilities were outdoor facilities: smaller, neighbourhood-serving parks (66%); and trails and pathways (63%). Facilities used with the lowest level of frequency were specialized indoor recreation facilities including: community centres (33%); arenas (32%), and indoor pools (22%).

**Figure 7 Frequency of use - City of London operated parks and facilities (n = 1706 to 1907)**
Barriers to Participation

Almost two-thirds (62%) of survey respondents indicated that they are able to participate in parks, recreation and sport activities as often as they would like. Just over one-third (34%) said they are not able to participate as often as they would like, and the remaining 4% didn’t know.

The survey data indicates that convenience is a key factor in participation.

The following are notable differences between respondents that did and did not identify barriers to participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents experiencing barriers…</th>
<th>Respondents not experiencing barriers…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- participate more often in special events or community gatherings, meetings, festivals, or movie nights (48% v. 40%) and use a spray pad or wading pool more often (41% v. 32%)</td>
<td>- participate more often in golf (38% v. 28%), are more like to have visited a City of London golf course within the past 12 months (28% v. 19%) and support improvements to golf courses (71% v. 58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are more likely to indicate that different hours of operation (26% v. 15%) and program locations close to their home (42% v. 35%) would encourage them to use indoor recreation facilities more often</td>
<td>- are more likely to have lived in London for twenty years or more (65 v. 56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are more likely to indicate that access to pathways and trails that are closer to their home (31% v. 23%) would encourage them to use parks, civic spaces, natural areas and trails more often</td>
<td>- are more likely to have persons ages 55 to 64 years living in their household (28% v. 17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- are more likely to agree that the City’s parks are conveniently located (93% v. 81%), that recreation and sport facilities are conveniently located (88% v. 64%) and that City programs are affordable to their household (89% v. 71%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indoor Recreation

When asked how the City can help Londoner’s use municipal community centres, arenas or indoor pools more often, the top responses involved accessibility. The number one response related to economic accessibility and was affordable pricing; selected by two-in-five (40%) survey respondents. The second most common response related to geographic accessibility and was program locations close to your home; selected by 35% of survey respondents. The third and fourth most common responses related to information accessibility and included: variety of programs or events (29%) and information on what is available (25%).

Respondents tend to use parks and facilities that are nearby and support locations that are accessible by public transit, walking or biking.

Figure 9 Methods to increase use of indoor recreation facilities (n=2014)
Outdoor Recreation

To encourage Londoner’s to use municipal parks, civic spaces, natural areas, and trails more often, respondents suggested upgrades to existing parks (33%); followed by updates to existing trails, such as improved surfacing or signage (31%); and passive amenities within existing parks such as pathways, seating, shade and open space (28%). Other suggestions to increase use of outdoor recreation spaces included: information on what is available (25%); access to pathways and trails that are closer to home (24%); and parks that are closer to home (22%). These findings suggest that residents are interested in using local parks and outdoor facilities, but wish to see upgrades to existing spaces, or an increased supply within their neighbourhood – and more information about both.

Figure 10 Methods to increase use of outdoor recreation facilities (n=2014)
New Activities

Three-in-ten survey respondents indicated that there are parks, recreation and sport programs or activities not currently available in London that they would like to see offered. When asked to list examples of activities not currently available the most common requests included: curling (facilities and programming), multi-generational drop-in opportunities, cricket (facilities), pickleball (facilities and programming), and outdoor fitness opportunities.

Figure 11 Five most requested activities to be added/increased (open-ended)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>curling</th>
<th>pickleball</th>
<th>outdoorfitness</th>
<th>multi-generational drop-in programs</th>
<th>cycling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Importance & Satisfaction

The following series of questions deal with resident levels of satisfaction and importance placed on parks, recreation, and sport opportunities within the municipality. The first question dealt with opportunities available for various age groups. Survey respondents were highly satisfied with children’s programming overall (85% preschool, 88% school-age), and were equally satisfied with programming and activities for young adults and families (81% each). Satisfaction levels began to decline slightly with opportunities for adults ages 55 to 64 years (79%), and declined further to 75% for older adult programming for those aged 65 to 74 years. The lowest levels of satisfaction were indicated for opportunities for teens and seniors (71% each).
**Figure 12 Levels of satisfaction with age-group opportunities (n= 1548 to 1650)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool (0-4 years old)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (5-12 years old)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teens (13-18 years old)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (19-54 years old)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (55-64 years old)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65-74 years old)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors (75+ years old)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: don’t know responses excluded

Figure 13 lists seven different parks, recreation, and sport facility types available to Londoners. The survey asked participants to indicate their levels of importance and satisfaction for each of seven facility types. According to survey respondents, the three most important facilities were trails and pathways (94%), passive parks (93%), and indoor recreation facilities (91%). Levels of satisfaction with the most important facilities was also quite high, with trails and pathways receiving (89%), passive parks receiving (90%), and indoor recreation receiving (86%). These results indicate that the City is meeting user expectations, particularly for those facilities deemed most important to survey respondents.

Contrastingly, the facility type with the lowest level of importance according to survey respondents was opportunities for high-level athlete training and competition with 50%; this category was also the one of only two to receive a higher level of
satisfaction than importance with 62% satisfaction (active parks also had higher levels of satisfaction than importance with 87% and 85%, respectively). This indicates that while facilities for high-level athlete training and competition are not important to all, those who use the facilities are satisfied with the current supply. Similarly, active parks are used by a large portion of the population and most are satisfied with the facilities.

Overall the spread between importance and satisfaction among most categories of parks, recreation, and sport is very small, indicating few gaps in service levels. One noteworthy gap was found between importance (82%) and satisfaction (72%) for casual, unstructured recreation and sport. This result indicates that there is unmet demand for casual, unstructured recreation and sport provided by the City of London.

Figure 13 Levels of importance and satisfaction with municipal parks, recreation and sport facilities (n = 1789 to 1876)

Note: don’t know responses excluded

“Neighbourhood parks are so important for children and for community building. Some of the older parks are rather decrepit...it would be nice to see smaller neighbourhood parks updated.”

- survey respondent
Additional Investment

Survey respondents were also asked to indicate their level of support for improvements in the number/quality of a variety of facilities. In the survey this question was subdivided into: indoor recreation facilities; sport/organized recreation facilities; and parks and passive outdoor recreation. This survey design was intended to simplify the question scope and decrease the burden of responding to a lengthy list. However, the results have been combined within this analysis to illustrate where the three sub-divisions of facility types rank when compared against one another.

All facility types received majority support, indicating that they are important to residents across the City. The top five facilities with support for additional investment are all associated with passive outdoor recreation and received more than 95% support. These included: park washrooms (98%); nature trails (96%); parkland (96%); woodlots and natural areas (95%); and seating areas (95%).

Conversely, the bottom five facilities which received support from less than 80% of survey respondents were all specialized or niche sports and activities. Based on previous questioning about participation rates, these were also activities that were participated in by relatively fewer survey respondents. These included: pickleball courts (73%); skateboard parks (73%); off-leash dog parks (72%); indoor tennis facilities (71%); BMX bike parks (70%); golf courses (67%); and cricket pitches (62%).

Among indoor recreation facilities, the top three facilities which received support for additional investment were: seniors’ community centres/seniors’ satellites (95%); indoor pools (92%); and tied at 88% each were arenas and gymnasiums.

The top three facilities which received support for additional investment among sport/organized recreation options were: multi-use fields and outdoor pools (tied at 90%), soccer fields (87%), and baseball or softball diamonds (86%).

Finally, among parks and passive outdoor recreation facilities, the top three facilities which received support for additional investment were: park washrooms (98%); parkland and nature trails (tied at 96%); and seating areas, woodlots and natural areas (tied at 95%).

Similar to the importance and satisfaction questions, these responses indicate strong demand for unstructured, drop-in and passive recreation opportunities by the large majority of respondents. Investment in facilities that serve a broad range of uses for residents of all ages and abilities were well supported by survey respondents.

Additionally, there is demand for specialized facilities from those groups that participate most. Despite lower representation for some facility types, it is possible that investment would result in increased use by those populations.
Figure 14 Support for investment in parks, recreation and sport facilities (n = 1690 to 1816)

- Park washrooms: 98%
- Nature trails: 96%
- Parkland: 96%
- Woodlots and natural areas: 95%
- Seating areas: 95%
- Playgrounds: 94%
- Seniors' centres/satellites: 94%
- Paved multi-use pathways: 93%
- Park pavilions and picnic areas: 93%
- Indoor pools: 92%
- Multi-use fields: 90%
- Outdoor pools: 90%
- Spray pads: 90%
- Community gardens: 89%
- Public access to the river: 89%
- Community gardens: 89%
- Ice skating rinks: 88%
- Arenas: 88%
- Gymnasiums: 88%
- Soccer fields: 87%
- Baseball or softball diamonds: 86%
- Indoor sports facilities: 85%
- Storybook Gardens: 85%
- Basketball courts: 84%
- Outdoor track and field facilities: 84%
- Outdoor fitness equipment: 82%
- Tennis courts: 80%
- Indoor track and field facilities: 80%
- Pickleball courts: 73%
- Skateboard parks: 73%
- Off-leash dog parks: 72%
- Indoor tennis facilities: 71%
- BMX bike parks: 70%
- Golf courses: 67%
- Cricket pitches: 61%

Note: don’t know responses excluded
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Support

Respondents were asked to indicate their feelings on the current level of support that the City provides for a series of items. Across all listed items, respondents generally stated that there is not enough support provided. The most significant of which was “maintaining and upgrading older parks, recreation and sport facilities” indicating that almost two-thirds (62%) of respondents are seeking increased support for older facilities. Half of survey respondents (50%) indicated a need for more support in “providing parks and recreation opportunities on or adjacent to the Thames River”.

People that do not participate in parks, recreation and sport activities as often as they would like tend to be less satisfied with services and amenities provided by the City and want to see greater support.

Southeast Londoners are less satisfied with the availability of activities and proximity of recreation facilities, and are more concerned about affordability.

Figure 15 Perception of municipal support for parks, recreation and sport (n=1759 to 1780)

- Maintaining and upgrading older parks, recreation and sport facilities: 62%
- Providing parks and recreation opportunities on or adjacent to the Thames River: 50%
- Providing parks, recreation and sport opportunities in your neighbourhood: 47%
- Supporting sport tourism, such as building facilities that attract athletes and competitions: 44%
- Providing parks, recreation and sport opportunities that are welcoming, inclusive and accessible for all residents across London: 37%
Opinions

Survey respondents were provided with a series of statements about parks, recreation and sport facilities, programs and services within the City of London.

Using a five-point scale, respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with those statements. All (100%) of survey respondents agreed with statements pertaining to the importance of parks, recreation and sport in quality of life and their role in building healthy communities. The remaining three statements also received high levels of support, all with 80% agreement or higher. The two with the lowest level of agreement indicated that recreation and sport programs could be more affordable (82% agreement) and that residents would like recreation and sport facilities to be constructed in locations more convenient for their households (80% agreement).

Note: don’t know responses excluded
Recruitment

The final survey question asked respondents how they learned about the survey. The most common method was through a community or sport organization (33%), followed by other non-listed forms (19%), and city social media or friends/family (tied at 14%).

Figure 17 Survey recruitment methods (n=1778)

2.2 Online Input

The City of London Project Team has been accepting, reviewing, and compiling feedback provided through the various online submission platforms. This includes: messages sent to the project email address; engagement with social media posts; discussions through Get Involved London; and interaction with the Play Your Way webpage.

Input from the online forums is not published within this report but will be used to inform the development of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.
2.3 Child’s Voice

A Child’s Voice illustration project was used to engage children in the Master Plan development process. Blank pages were provided inviting children to “Show us how you like to play!” and included space for the first name and age of the contributor. Submissions were collected from May through July 2018 at various special events (e.g., Balconies Beautiful, neighbourhood movie nights, etc.), at City of London Community Centres and at municipal day camps (July only).

Figure 18 Example submission received through Child’s Voice consultation initiative (Ala, age 11)
Drawing Submissions

A total of 117 drawing submissions were received over the course of the consultation period. The average age of the illustrators was 8 years old (from those drawings with an age included). Submissions were reviewed by City of London staff and tallied based on type of play and associated facilities. Some of the drawing submissions could not be categorized or were difficult to discern content; as a result, analysis below has been provided by count \((n=x)\) from the total categorized drawings \((N=103)\), rather than using percentages. A sample of representative drawings has been included in Appendix F.

Types of Play

Almost three-quarters \((n=72)\) of submissions represented unstructured play (i.e., at a spray pad, on a playground, at home), while 19 submissions included representation of structured activities (e.g., organized sports). Analysis also found a fairly even divide between drawings representing collective/group play opportunities \((n=39)\) and individual play opportunities \((n=32)\).

The most commonly recognized sports represented in the Child’s Voice submissions were basketball \((n=14)\), soccer \((n=8)\), and hockey \((n=5)\).

Environment

Outdoor play and opportunities to connect with nature were featured in almost half of the submissions \((n=46)\). Indoor-specific activities were less represented, potentially as a result of the time of year and location of consultation. Of the few included, drawings representing indoor recreation illustrated arenas, swimming pools, and court sports.

Equipment & Facilities

Some of the submissions included illustrations or noted use of public infrastructure, such as municipal parks and recreation facilities. The most commonly featured outdoor recreation facilities were: playground equipment \((n=16)\), sports fields \((n=10)\), and spray pads \((n=5)\). The most commonly featured indoor recreation facilities were hard surface courts \((n=10)\), arenas \((n=5)\) and recreation centres \((n=4)\). A few images represented activities that could be participated in both indoors and out; these included court sports such as basketball and tennis \((n=13)\) and swimming \((n=5)\).

2.4 Other City Initiatives

The City of London has undertaken multiple other consultation and engagement initiatives outside of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan over the past few years. Many of these other initiatives have provided data and resident feedback which may help augment the Master Plan. The City has collected and analyzed data from these consultation initiatives over the past few years; the summaries below capture two of the most recent examples.
2017 Citizen Satisfaction Survey Report

The City of London undertakes an annual citizen satisfaction survey to measure the quality of life in London and satisfaction with various City services. The following are selected results from the 2017 survey that fall within the scope of the Master Plan.

- 92% of respondents were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with parks and other greenspaces.
- 88% of respondents were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with recreation facilities.
- 83% of respondents were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with recreation, sports, and leisure programs.
- 81% of respondents were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with urban forestry.

Note that the 2018 survey report is anticipated to be released within the Master Plan development timeframe and new results will be considered when available.

Neighbourhood Decision Making

The City of London has initiated an annual community engagement process titled Neighbourhood Decision Making (NDM). Through this process, residents are encouraged to submit their ideas for projects to enhance and strengthen their neighbourhood. A city-wide vote determines which projects go forward.

NDM submissions and results illustrate community interest in parks, recreation and sport and provide valuable insight into the type of improvements desired by the community. Within this context, all idea submissions from the 2017 and 2018 NDM initiatives were reviewed and categorized. The following list summarizes key themes that emerged and the percentage of total idea submissions associated with each:

- Parks & Trails (42%);
- Healthy Living (13%);
- Roads & Sidewalks (13%);
- Events & Community (12%);
- Environmental (8%);
- Arts, Culture & Identity (7%); and
- Other (5%).

Analysis of the Neighbourhood Decision Making process clearly identifies a strong desire from residents for more opportunities to build community in their neighbourhoods. Winning projects were generally identified as parks and recreation infrastructure improvements, particularly for unstructured free play, which was also identified as a gap in the survey analysis.

Suggestions varied significantly throughout the City. For example, there were more submissions for Healthy Living and Arts, Culture and Identity projects in Central London,
while residents in Northeast London focused more on ideas involving Parks and Trails. Another noteworthy trend in idea submissions was a strong demand for additional park amenities to support comfort and accessibility. Some examples of these submissions include: playground enhancements, shade, seating, connectivity (e.g., trails, pathways, etc.), and animation and programming of outdoor spaces. These results suggest that neighbourhood parks and playgrounds are highly valued by residents and could be improved to address a broader range of community needs.
3. Stakeholder Consultation

This section summarizes the consultation tactics employed to engage external organizations, partners and agencies, many of which work closely with the City of London or rely on municipal parks, facilities and services.

3.1 Stakeholder Input Sessions

The City of London hosted three Stakeholder Input Sessions as part of its Parks and Recreation Master Plan. The purpose of the sessions was to engage key stakeholders and create awareness of the Master Plan, and to seek feedback on challenges and priorities related to parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities. The sessions took place on May 28, May 30 and June 4, 2018 and featured the same content and information.

Each session began with an overview presentation outlining the Master Plan process and additional opportunities for organizations, their members and others to get involved and share feedback. Following the presentation, participants took part in facilitated discussions guided by a series of five focus questions related to: positive impacts, trends and changes, challenges and priorities, support, and working together. Approximately 50 people participated in the Stakeholder Input Sessions, with over 30 organizations represented.

A high-level summary that synthesizes key themes that emerged from feedback received at all three Stakeholder Input Sessions is provided below. Appendix D contains a detailed summary that organizes the more detailed feedback received according to the five themes of the focus questions.

This high-level summary, along with the more detailed summary included in the Appendix, is not intended to provide a verbatim transcript of the sessions but instead synthesizes the perspectives and advice shared by participants during the facilitated discussions.

Further investigation and confirmation of demographics, growth patterns, trends and best practices will follow to determine the best course of action and development of recommendations for the Master Plan.

Positive Impacts

Participants at all three sessions discussed the importance of parks, recreation and sport for their organization and the City of London as a whole. They said that London is home to many quality parks, recreation and sport facilities and identified several ways parks, recreation programs, sport services, and facilities create a positive impact for residents of London and their organizations. Common themes that emerged at the three sessions include: opportunities to participate in sports and generally get active; the
development of strong neighbourhoods and a sense of community; enhanced physical and mental health; opportunities to access and connect with the natural environment; and access to quality and affordable programs and facilities for people, regardless of level of income or ability. Participants also said the City’s Spectrum programming is both important and fantastic.

**Trends & Changes**

Common trends and changes identified at the three sessions that impact the use of parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities include: an overall increase in active lifestyles and participation in programs and use of facilities; changing demographics with increased demand for facilities and programs that serve older adults, youth, families and an expanding immigrant population; the time people are using programs and facilities is changing and expanding, both in terms of overall time spent participating and the time of day; increased need and demand for accessible and affordable programs and facilities; and more interest in opportunities for passive or non-programed recreation.

**Challenges & Priorities**

Participants at all three sessions identified a need for additional facilities and programs to better serve their members and a growing population as a priority. Other common challenges and priorities that emerged included: the provision of accessible facilities and programs; increasing costs to provide programs, which acts as a barrier to participation; the ongoing maintenance of existing facilities; additional opportunities to raise funds to sustain and grow their organizations; and increased/improved public transportation to the City’s many parks, recreation and sport facilities.

**Support**

A number of common ideas of how parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities can continue to support the needs of the participating organizations were discussed at the sessions, including: providing additional financial support to both organizations and individual users, including subsidies for those who cannot afford to pay full prices; building additional facilities and providing more programming to meet current and future needs; and improving the accessibility of existing facilities and ensuring future facilities are fully accessible. Participants also advocated for support in simplifying access to facilities and programs for organizations and their members, including simplifying the process to book facilities, register for programs, and apply for subsidy.

**Working Together**

Participants identified a number of specific ways that organizations, the City and others can work together to meet future needs. Common themes that emerged at the three sessions include: continued engagement and consultation with organizations and their direct users to understand existing and changing needs; continuing to seek and develop beneficial partnerships with other levels of government, developers, and private
organizations that provide recreation and sports programming; and continuing to work with and encourage volunteers in the delivery of parks and recreation programming.

3.2 Targeted Focus Groups

The City of London hosted six Targeted Focus Groups with organizations that provide service and support to groups that face barriers to participation as part of its Parks and Recreation Master Plan. The purpose of the Focus Groups was: to raise awareness about the Master Plan process; to engage and learn about organizations’ challenges and priorities; and to discuss their ideas and opportunities to be considered within the Master Plan. The sessions took place between June and July 2018.

Each Focus Group began with an overview presentation outlining the process for updating the Master Plan, as well as additional ways organizations and the clients they serve can get involved and share feedback. Following the presentation participants took part in a facilitated discussion guided by a series of focus questions. The focus questions asked organizations to provide feedback on the roles their organizations play; the trends impacting use of services and facilities; any suggested improvements or gaps to address; and how best to continue working together in the future in the provision of parks, recreation, sports services and facilities. Approximately 85 people participated in the Focus Groups, with over 25 organizations represented.

High-level summaries of the key feedback received at each Focus Group are provided below. Detailed Focus Group summaries and a list of all participating organizations can be found in Appendix E.

Organizations Serving Newcomers and Immigrants

Representatives of organizations serving newcomers and immigrants said their primary roles in parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities included raising awareness, renting City facilities for their programming, and providing subsidies or discounted memberships to get clients more involved. Participants said they have observed more youth interest in sports/fitness and workplace/leadership training opportunities, and a higher level of importance placed on the socialization aspect of sports and recreation overall.

Participants identified affordability, technology, language, safety, and coordination and geographic distribution of programming as some of the gaps they would like to see addressed. To address these gaps, participants suggested subsidizing memberships and transportation; allowing parents to share Play Your Way subsidy allocations with their kids; coordinating multi-age activities in one facility so parents and kids can attend programming concurrently; distributing specialized services and programs throughout the city; providing multi-lingual staff and facilitators; developing a diversity and inclusion strategy; improving the booking/reservations process and providing the ability to submit Play Your Way applications online.
Participants said they welcome opportunities to work with the City now and in the future. They said they were pleased with the Neighbourhood Service Days model and would like to see this expanded to more libraries and family centres. Organizations said that with enough notice, they could help coordinate these events and ensure translators are invited to make the initiatives more effective. It was also suggested that Parks & Recreation staff attend existing programs to raise awareness and explain to clients what other opportunities and subsidies are available.

**Organizations Serving Persons with Disabilities**

Representatives identified a significant increase in the desire for integration, noting that parents and individuals with disabilities want to have the same experiences as everyone else. They said they appreciate efforts made by City staff to serve individuals with disabilities, especially in the Camps on TRACK program. To help increase integration, participants suggested more programs and staff for individuals with higher needs as they are often excluded from programs with a lack of support.

Participants said it is very important to know which facilities are accessible and what specific accessible equipment is available. They suggested creating a public inventory of facilities’ accessible features and equipment, performing regular accessibility audits, and hiring individuals with different types of disabilities to perform comprehensive audits.

Participants expressed appreciation for the City reaching out to their organizations through this focus group to better understand the priorities and challenges of the groups and individuals they serve. They also noted the importance of ongoing consultation with people with a variety of disabilities to fully understand the range of needs.

**Organizations Serving Low Income and/or Homeless Populations**

Participants identified parks as an important resource/place for people experiencing homelessness and said they should be a welcoming space for everyone. They also shared that parks and recreation facilities present a great opportunity to create a sense of belonging through creative and culturally appropriate installations and programs, especially for those who are marginalized.

Participants noted that many people experiencing homelessness and mental health issues have been banned from facilities due to disruptive or unsafe behaviour. They suggested providing staff with additional training to help de-escalate situations where individuals may otherwise be removed and banned. Participants also discussed creating a program to help individuals regain access to facilities if/when appropriate.

Representatives emphasized the importance of connecting with Indigenous people to understand and help promote the healing power of parks. They said it is important to continue working with organizations that serve people experiencing homelessness to identify potential policy issues that may impact people who are homeless.
Organizations Serving Indigenous Communities

The Journey Together Planning Table members shared their insights on how engagement and consultation can be conducted within Indigenous communities in a way that encourages respect, relationship-building, and capacity. Participants identified the need for greater opportunities for Indigenous people to share their input and that input must be dealt with meaningfully. It is best to build relationships with Indigenous people outside of planning periods so that we can plan together. It was suggested that the City engage with local First Nations of the Traditional territory upon the land which it is built (e.g., clear cutting for development that includes parks, protection of natural spaces, etc.).

Participants spoke about the importance of acknowledgement and visibility in parks, public spaces, and community centres. It was suggested to make acknowledgement of the land and traditional territories more visible in the community to educate the public on the relationship to the traditional territory. Participants suggested hiring Indigenous staff and providing cultural training for Indigenous history and cultural competence so families know that they are understood. This is especially important for staff that deal with the public (e.g., casual staff, camp staff, program staff, customer service).

It was identified that there is a gap in Indigenous programming available through Spectrum. It was suggested that the City create program opportunities in partnership with Indigenous organizations.

Participants suggested providing information about Indigenous peoples within recreation facilities and acknowledging the territory and the origins of traditional games. For example, it was suggested that a mural recognizing the origin of lacrosse be created at areas where the sport is played.

Participants spoke about experiences of racism that have occurred, especially in relation to sport. It was suggested that the City’s RZone (Respect and Responsibility Zone) policy be strengthened to specifically make a statement about zero tolerance for racism in sport and provide specific examples of unacceptable racist behaviour and how it should be dealt with.

Lastly, participants identified the importance of reviewing ALL of the Truth and Reconciliation Calls to Action as many are related to the work that is guided by the Master Plan.

London Child and Youth Network

Members of the Child and Youth Network (CYN) include a variety of organizations and agencies in London that serve children, youth, and families and work directly with these populations in our community.

Participants discussed the roles that their organizations play in the coordination and usage of parks and facilities such as providing space for Spectrum programming, using parks and spray pads for summer camps, programming, and events. Participants
identified that organizations are playing a larger role in connecting their clients to services and helping them navigate the system, including finding programming and applying for subsidy. Organizations are specifically looking for more partnership opportunities with the community.

Factors and trends impacting usage include: demand for enhanced accessibility of parks, pools, centres, and play spaces; presence of needles in parks; risky play; demand for free and drop in programs; accessible transportation; and improved access to transportation. In addition, some City spaces do not meet the health, safety and accessibility requirements of agencies which limits their use.

Participants identified barriers in: communication channels; dealing with different City departments/policies; transportation systems that are not interconnected; and restricted access to washrooms on the evenings and weekends. Other gaps that were identified include: more garbage cans/recycling bags for animal waste; larger and more accessible climbing equipment; more Class A facilities for competitive sports; and more consultation with families, especially for children with complex needs.

Participants also identified many opportunities for addressing challenges, such as: utilizing resource centres to gauge what residents need; adding more sheltered spaces in parks and needle boxes; consulting with specialized service providers about accessible needs; and better communication strategies that make it easier to find information.

Age Friendly London Network

Members of the Age Friendly London Network (Outdoor Spaces & Buildings Group) spoke about the popularity of older adult programming at the City’s seniors’ community centres. Participants praised the general affordability of membership and diversity of programs at the seniors’ centres. They also pointed out the importance of seniors’ centres and programs to provide opportunities for social interactions, especially in the winter when older adults have a more difficult time getting out. Participants identified a general increase in older adults being active and participating in a wide range of indoor and outdoor activities. Older adults’ usage of outdoor pathways, walkways, and bike paths is also increasing.

Regarding affordability, participants discussed the trend among municipalities of moving away from subsidies based on age to subsidies based on income/ability to pay. Participants pointed out that many seniors are uncomfortable with applying for a subsidy and there is a great deal of stigma attached to doing so. Participants mentioned that Aquafit classes are very expensive and the increase in the price tends to be more for older adults than the general adult rates.

Participants also discussed how new multi-purpose community centres should be optimized for use by older adults during the day and children/youth and families for evening and weekend programming. Members also mentioned that having both centres or “hubs” and neighbourhood-based programs are important parts of seniors’
communities that help them age in place. It is important to build a sense of community, ownership, and belonging in these spaces. They would like to see neighbourhood-based programs like the Seniors’ Satellites expanded to be available for longer hours and more days a week. Intergenerational programs are great, but it is also important to have seniors-only spaces.

Suggestions for how services and programs could be improved include offering more free meeting space to seniors’ groups, especially in facilities that are centrally located and easy to get to. Participants would like to see better strategies for dealing with the geese population and with excrement on pathways/sidewalks. Participants said that the priority should be getting more people participating over bringing in more money.

If the City wants seniors to remain active, it was suggested that they improve promotion of available subsidy opportunities. Despite being engaged in recreation programs and activities, many participants were unaware of existing subsidy programs. The group recognized that parks and recreation are important, so promotion and information sharing was emphasized.

3.3 Agency & Partner Interviews

In June and July 2018, interviews were conducted with the following organizations to inform the development of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. These agencies were selected due to their connection to the City of London; many also provide parks, recreation and sport services and/or facilities to residents across the City and beyond.

1. Boys and Girls Club of London
2. Fanshawe College
3. London Development Institute
4. London District Catholic School Board
5. London Public Library
6. Middlesex-London Health Unit
7. Thames Valley District School Board
8. Tourism London
9. Upper Thames River Conservation Authority
10. Western Fair District
11. Western University (interview not completed)
12. YMCA of Western Ontario

The City has respectful, meaningful and productive relationships with community agencies and stakeholders throughout London. Many partners are heavy users of City of London parks and facilities, while the community also accesses some partner facilities and services. Continued coordination and communication are essential to successful partnerships and groups were pleased to participate in the Master Plan process.

Input from the interviews is not published within this report but will be used to inform the development of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.
4. Internal Consultation

This section summarizes the various tactics employed to engage Municipal Staff, Advisory Committees, the Mayor and City Council. Details on consultation methods, session dates and attendance numbers have been documented, but detailed summaries of responses are not included. Input from many of the internal consultations is not published within this report but will be used to inform the development of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

4.1 Staff Workshops

Municipal staff employed by departments related to operation and programming of parks, recreation, and sport in the City of London were invited to attend one of two workshop sessions. The sessions were both held on May 24, 2018; the first in the morning at Stronach Recreation Centre and the second in the afternoon at Central Library. The purpose of these sessions was to learn about the daily operations and functions of each department from those who engage directly with the users.

Nearly 50 staff participated the two sessions. Attendees represented the following departments: Parks and Recreation; Neighbourhood, Children and Fire Services; Parks Operations; Aquatics; Storybook Gardens; Environmental & Parks Planning; Planning Services; Urban Design; Facilities; Homeless Prevention; and Finance.

As part of the Master Plan’s development, staff have been assigned to Master Plan Committees and are engaged in meetings with consultants to share their knowledge and expertise. There are three such committees: Engagement Committee (13 staff members); Technical Working Committee (7 staff members); and Steering Committee (4 staff members). The project is being led by a Project Management Team of four (4) managers involved in parks, recreation, sport and planning.

Input from the sessions is not published within this report but will be used to inform the development of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

4.2 Mayor & Council Interviews

Members of the 2015-2018 City of London Council were invited to attend interviews with the Consulting Team to discuss the Master Plan and learn more about the challenges and opportunities within their wards. Input from the interviews is not published within this report but will be used to inform the development of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. London’s 2019-2022 Council will be engaged later in the Master Plan’s development process.
4.3 Advisory Committees

Staff from the Project Management Team met with several Advisory Committees in June and July 2018 to solicit their input for the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Committees consulted during the initial project phases included:

- Accessibility Advisory Committee;
- Advisory Committee on the Environment;
- Animal Welfare Advisory Committee;
- Community Safety & Crime Prevention Advisory Committee;
- Cycling Advisory Committee;
- Diversity Inclusion and Anti-Oppression Advisory Committee;
- Environmental & Ecological Protection Advisory Committee;
- London Youth Advisory Council;
- Trees & Forests Advisory Committee; and
- Urban Design Peer Review Panel.

Below are summaries from those that provided comment. There will be future opportunities for advisory committees to provide feedback on the draft Master Plan.

Accessibility Advisory Committee

The Accessibility Advisory Committee offered the following comments at its meeting on June 11, 2018 and Built Environment Subcommittee on July 23, 2018:

- Provide more accessible programming through partnerships with other community agencies.
- Be consistent and persistent when providing programming. It may take time to build the clientele and will require advertising throughout the community.
- Ensure that all parks and recreation facilities are included in Facility Accessibility Design Standards (FADS) document. Include FADS in the list of Council-approved initiatives.
- Make sure that accessibility standards are being met at all parks, recreation facilities and trails. Some additional considerations may include:
  - Establishing a guideline requiring a minimum level of accessibility at playgrounds (e.g., at least 30-50% of amenities like swings be accessible).
  - Providing electric scooter charging stations and adjustable change tables in all facilities.
Improving accessibility at dog parks by using easier to open gate latches and providing a paved area just inside the gate with shade. Small dog parks should also be open to service dogs.

Making community events more accessible. For example, offering closed captioning at Labatt Park ball games.

Providing sensory rooms for the neurodiverse population and providing training for staff about how to better address the needs of individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), including programing specifically for individuals with ASD. (from a delegation at the June 28, 2018 meeting)

Community Safety & Crime Prevention Advisory Committee

The Community Safety & Crime Prevention Advisory Committee offered the following comments at its meeting on June 28, 2018:

- financial programs to assist with insurance requirements, equipment, and to provide benches with arms
- communication with partners including Police, Fire and City Council
- more needle boxes, strategies to check for needles and address used needles in sand boxes
- Community Safety and Crime Prevention Safety week, jointly with 2019 Emergency Preparedness Week
- additional signage for bike helmets

Environmental & Ecological Protection Advisory Committee

The Environmental & Ecological Protection Advisory Committee submitted written comments on the 2009 Parks & Recreation Strategic Master Plan at its meeting on July 19, 2018. Although the comments are in reference to specific passages and recommendations from the 2009 Master Plan, key points that may be relevant to the development of the 2019 Master Plan are summarized below:

- The Parks and Recreation Master Plan should exclude ESAs and other features of the Natural Heritage System with no recreational value.
- The goal of addressing the gaps in the Thames Valley Parkway (TVP) has been used to threaten the integrity of the Natural Heritage System. Future development of the TVP must be outside the significant parts of the Natural Heritage System such as ESAs, Significant Woodlands and Wetlands. The role of AODA and the impact of its regulations on trail development in ESAs should be clarified.
- The Committee requested further clarification on its role in implementing recommendation A24 from the 2017 Interim Update: "Improve awareness and
understanding about the importance of the City’s Natural Heritage System, the city’s urban forest and their broader role within Carolinian Canada.

Trees & Forests Advisory Committee

The Trees & Forests Advisory Committee offered the following comments and actions at its meeting on July 25, 2018:

- the Civic Administration BE ADVISED of the following comments from the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee with respect to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan:
  - it should be ensured that trees continue to populate the City of London as it is “The Forest City” and more trees should be planted in shared recreation spaces;
  - it is recommended that a shade policy be created as a task item and implemented under the Parks and Recreation Master Plan;
  - selective tree species should be planted in parks and recreation areas to assist with safer shaded areas;
  - older trees should be kept and maintained as much as possible and all trees should be properly maintained (watering, trimming, etc.);
  - residents of the City of London should be engaged with respect to what is being done to protect and encourage trees and forests in their area;
  - tree-related communities (i.e., ReForest London) should be allowed to use parks and recreation facilities to hold events;
  - the Parks and Recreation Master Plan should explicitly recognize the importance of park spaces play in the local environment and that park spaces should be designed in such a way as to enhance the environmental benefits they offer; and,
  - it is recommended that a Naturalization Policy be included as a task item under the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

Urban Design Review Panel

The Urban Design Review Panel offered the following comments at its meeting on June 20, 2018:

- The Panel appreciates the update by City staff and asked for an opportunity to provide comment as the master plan is developed.
- The Panel asked if there would be principles for park design included in the Master Plan and/or a recommendation that design guidelines are established.
- The Panel also asked if locational criteria for new parks and recreational facilities would be a component of the Master Plan.
London Youth Advisory Council

A session was held with the London Youth Advisory Council on July 26, 2018 to gather their input on the City’s Parks & Recreation Master Plan.

The Council’s primary areas of interest involve youth access to public spaces and programs. Activities that are popular with teens include unstructured and drop-in pursuits (e.g., basketball, yoga, trails, skateboarding, etc.), but overall there was a sense that there are insufficient opportunities for teens.

In terms of gaps or requests, participants expressed demand for a greater variety of affordable programs, including those focused on the arts, dance and STEM/academics, as well as skills training for newcomers (beyond ESL). Extended study hours and more study rooms in libraries were also requested, as was a mentorship program (e.g., “helpers” in public spaces that can answer questions).

Some participants suggested that there is very little for young adults (ages 19 to 25 years) to do. Additional arenas and free skate times might help to expand skating opportunities as there are fewer activities available in the winter season. Skateboarding is also popular and more skate parks were requested (particularly in Southeast and East London), as well as pathways for longboards.

Barriers to participation include safety, transportation, and affordability. For example, some post-secondary students don’t feel safe off campus; smoking and other social issues can also be deterrents, as can loitering and littering. It was identified that many youths cannot use skating rinks because they do not own skates (and they are not available for rent) and that many schools remove their basketball hoops during the summer, limiting their use. Ensuring an equitable distribution of facilities across the City would also help to make recreation more accessible for all.

Suggestions included the provision of neighbourhood-based community spaces (not just churches) that are welcoming (e.g., open, bright, clean, informal) and allow youth to meet, socialize and participate in programs. The South London Community Centre is a good example of a successful facility. Improving the condition, cleanliness and variety of features within smaller parks was also suggested as an opportunity to enhance participation. Respondents felt that the City could benefit from better marketing of available programs, including promotion through schools, online (web and social media), malls, libraries, radio, etc.
5. Summary of Key Findings

This section summarizes the first phase of public and stakeholder input for consideration in the development of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

The communication and engagement initiatives outlined in this report provided valuable insights into the current state of London’s parks, recreation and sport system. The following findings represent a high-level summary of the input received to date and will serve as a point of departure for further analysis.

It is important to note that the following findings represent areas of public interest requiring further review in conjunction with other building blocks, such as demographics, trends, financial capabilities, etc. They are not to be considered key themes or directions of the Master Plan and are not listed in priority order.

The City offers a wide variety of high quality and responsive parks, facilities and services.

1. Londoners expressed high levels of satisfaction with parks, recreation and sport services, programs and facilities. According to the community survey: indoor recreation facilities, active parks, passive parks, trails and pathways all received satisfaction levels of 86% or higher.

2. The City and community partners provide access to high quality and affordable programs, parks and facilities. Most partners and community organizations have excellent relationships with the City and want to do more.

3. Residents indicated that there are many opportunities to participate in sports and active pursuits. This is vital for physical activity and physical literacy for people of all ages, abilities and income levels.

4. Residents indicated that there are countless opportunities to access and connect with the natural environment (which promotes mental, physical, social and cultural health for individuals and communities).

5. Organizations indicated that the City is progressive, responsive to community requests, and open to trying new things. One example is the City’s efforts to develop strong neighbourhoods and enhance a sense of community.

Access, equity and inclusion are key considerations for service delivery.

6. Additional free and low cost activities and facility rentals were requested. Affordability challenges are the greatest for under-represented and marginalized groups, such as homeless and low-income populations, newcomers to Canada, Indigenous populations, persons with disabilities and seniors.

7. The City’s Play Your Way Subsidy is well used and needed. However, some groups found that it was difficult to navigate the system and felt that some people are falling through the cracks.
8. Participants felt that it is vital that the City continue to offer accessible and inclusive spaces, amenities and services. A wide variety of requests were received in this regard, both general and specific, including the establishment of a public inventory of accessible spaces and services.

9. Program locations that meet accessibility design standards, provide accessible equipment, and are accessible by public transit and active transportation were identified as key considerations.

We can achieve more by working together.

10. Greater communication and awareness was requested by many. A multi-faceted strategy is required as different groups rely on different forms of communication.

11. Many community organizations expressed interest in working with the City to fill gaps in programs and services. Regular and consistent communication with a wide range of service providers is critical.

London’s population and urban form are changing and parks, facilities and services must keep pace.

12. London’s population is aging and becoming more ethnically diverse. This is leading to new demands, including more community events, unstructured activities and sports (pickleball, cricket, etc.).

13. With growing diversity (ethnicity, income, abilities, etc.) comes the need for strategies to promote inclusion, safety and welcoming environments. Examples include training, messaging, communication, etc.

14. There is growing recognition of the need to acknowledge the traditional territories of Indigenous populations and build strong relationships to accommodate their unique needs within the parks and recreation system.

15. Continued education was requested around park use/rules, City initiatives, benefits of physical activity, etc. Public involvement helps to elevate sense of community and pride.

Parks and open spaces provide tremendous benefits and should be a focus of future investment.

16. Comfort amenities in parks – such as shade, seating and washrooms – were a common request. These amenities help to support greater use by people of all ages and respond to the trend in unstructured park use. A significant number of Neighbourhood Decision Making idea submissions focused on these park support amenities.

17. The variety of park types and designs is changing. For example, suggestions were received to reimagine Neighbourhood Parks with age-friendly and accessible amenities and a variety and higher standard of play equipment (including challenging play).

18. There are growing concerns over safety within the City’s parks and trails system. Common requests included the separation of pedestrians and cyclists along the
Thames Valley Parkway, addressing the issue of needles, litter and vandalism within parks, and responding to concerns over urban wildlife.

19. Many participants suggested that a greater emphasis be placed on healthy food and urban agriculture, such as the expansion of community gardens and promotion of naturally growing foods.

20. More can be done to promote the environmental and social benefits of preserving, managing and enjoying natural areas, but the Parks and Recreation Master Plan is not the place to include overarching policy relating to the Natural Heritage System. Clarity in terminology and alignment with existing policy will be important.

Population growth and evolving interests are impacting demand for recreation and community services and facilities.

21. Strong support was expressed for multi-use parks and facilities. Some interest was found for future community centre development, potentially in Northwest London. Additional large gymnasiums that can accommodate a variety of sports (including pickleball) were requested.

22. Aging infrastructure is a growing concern in London. Specifically, there is uncertainty over the future of older arenas (e.g., Silverwood Arena, Farquharson Arena, etc.), though demand was expressed for accommodating other community-building and sport opportunities within repurposed facilities.

23. Several groups articulated a desire for new or improved sports fields, such as additional ball diamonds (with consideration to geographic distribution), cricket fields, multi-use turf fields, and fieldhouse amenities at sports parks.

24. Many requests were received for more spray pads throughout the City. Some concern was expressed over the phasing out of wading pools.

25. While there is growing interest for new park amenities, many – such as BMX/skateboard parks, off-leash parks, outdoor sport courts, lighting, etc. – are met with community opposition due site selection challenges.

Interest in sport is growing and additional support was requested.

26. Several organizations expressed interest in new and improved facilities to meet year-round sport training and competition needs. One example was an expansion to the Canada Games Aquatic Centre.

27. There were suggestions for the City to support athlete development to a greater degree than it has in the past. Examples include working with community partners to provide indoor and outdoor track and field venues, as well as a curling facility.

28. To better support sport tourism, it was suggested that the City work with organizations to design new parks and facilities that are “competition-ready”.
Appendix A  Print & Online Materials

Figure 19 Master Plan landing page

Parks and Recreation Master Plan

Your input is important! Be part of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan process.

The City of London offers high quality parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities that engage residents of all ages and abilities. We are undertaking a study to ensure that our services continue to respond to the community, now and into the future.

The Parks and Recreation Master Plan provides an overview of the City's parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities over the next ten years and beyond.

Through the update process, we want to know more about how you use London's parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities. This is your chance to influence how we deliver recreation programs, design parks and build facilities.

Help us plan for the next 10 years and tell us what recreation, parks, and sport services mean to you! Complete the community survey!

Figure 20 Survey recruitment postcard

As London grows and changes, the recreation needs of residents also change. We want to ensure that the right parks, recreation and sport services, programs and facilities are in place to improve quality of life for all Londoners.

Tell us how you like to Play Your Way: Complete the community survey: getinvolved.london.ca

Help us plan for the next 10 years and tell us what parks, recreation and sport services, programs and facilities mean to you!
City of London
Parks and Recreation Master Plan – “What We’ve Heard So Far” Report
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City of London Parks & Recreation Master Plan

Get Involved!
Your input will be used to inform the recommendations of the draft Master Plan.

Things to Think About
1. How do parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities in the City of London make a difference in your life?
2. Over the past two years, has your usage of parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities changed? What would increase your participation?
3. What can be done to make parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities more vibrant? Let us know your specific ideas for your neighbourhood or the City.
4. We want to ensure that our parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities continue to be affordable to residents. Let us know what opportunities or strategies should be considered.

Please email your answers to these questions to: playyourway@london.ca

Online Community Survey
getinvolved.london.ca/playyourway

Pop-Up Consultations
Spring & Summer 2018

Play Your Way Consultation
Fall & Winter 2016

City of London Parks & Recreation Master Plan

Discussion Guide
Spring/Summer 2018

Parks & Recreation Master Plan

The City of London offers high quality parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities that engage residents and visitors of all ages and abilities. We are undertaking a study to ensure that our services continue to respond to the community now and into the future.

Through the Parks & Recreation Master Plan, we want to know more about how you use London’s parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities.

This is your chance to influence how we deliver recreation programs and sport services, design parks and build facilities.

We value your input!

Use the Discussion Guide to start a conversation about the Parks & Recreation Master Plan. The Guide explains what has been accomplished through previous Master Plans, what we are currently working on, and how to get involved.

Use the “Things to Think About” Questions on the back page of this Discussion Guide to start a conversation with family, friends, or groups that you want or volunteer with. Please send your answers to these questions to playyourway@london.ca

To learn more about all the many ways that you can share your feedback, see the back page of this Discussion Guide or visit getinvolved.london.ca/playyourway.
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City of London Parks & Recreation Master Plan

What we value about Parks, Recreation Programs, Sport Services and Facilities in London

Participation: The City’s goals is to provide entry level recreation programs. Participation improves health and quality of life.

Diversity and Inclusion: The City is committed to providing a full range of opportunities that reflect the heritage and culture of London and their interests and values.

Accessibility: The City is committed to providing services and facilities for persons with all ages and abilities.

Quality: The City is committed to providing parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities that meet the needs of all Londoners.

What the City of London provides

Recreation Programming: The City of London proffers affordable and accessible opportunities for new activities that we hope will interest and engage you.

Facilities: This includes recreation programming, parks, libraries, golf courses, community centres, as well as special parks and attractions.

Parks, Civic Spaces, Trails & Natural Areas: We offer parks to fill the interests of all residents including recreational playgrounds, sports parks, community gardens, and the Thames River Corridor.

Investment in the Community: The City is committed to making investments in our communities, and delivering support for residents. An example of this is the new Neighbourhood Decision Making Initiative.

Parks, Sport & Recreation are good for all!

Healthy Neighbourhoods: Parks make our communities vibrant and keep individuals connected and engaged.

Healthy Lifestyles: Increased access to parks and recreation services improves individual, social and economic well-being.

Sustainable Environments: Effective management, restoration and stewardship maintain the sustainability of our parks and natural areas.

Look, it works!

Below is a list of accomplishments we have been able to implement through direction provided in previous Master Plans.

Key accomplishments from past Master Plans

- Collaboration to improve and develop sport fields
- Development of Shrewsbury Creek Community Centre, VIVCA Library
- Increased programming in neighbourhoods (e.g., Seniors’ Saturdays)
- Capital investment and repairs to facilities at the end of their life cycle
- Parkland acquisition, design and management costs in the London Plan
- Southwest Community Centre, VIVCA Library (opening September 2018)
- Accessibility improvements and playground equipment replacement in parks throughout London

What we’re working on

This City is committed to improving access to parks and supporting residents through participation in parks and recreation activities. Some upcoming projects include:

- Facility and park-specific upgrades
- Green River Environmental Assessment
- East Community Centre
- East Lions Park improvement

Why now?

We need an Updated Plan to set a course for the future.

As London grows and changes, the interests of residents also change.

We value diversity and inclusion. This plan aims to improve the quality of life for all Londoners through the provision of parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities that are welcoming and accessible for all.

We want to address barriers to access and align parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities with the overall interests and needs of Londoners.
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Tell us how you like to Play Your Way!

The City of London offers high quality parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities that engage residents of all ages and abilities. We are undertaking a study to ensure that our services continue to respond to the community now and into the future.

The Parks and Recreation Master Plan provides an evaluation and direction for future decisions. The Master Plan is a living document that is based on public input, participation in surveys, utilization levels, best practices, demographic changes and growth forecasts. It will guide the City’s development in parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities over the next twenty and beyond.

Through this update process, we want to hear more about how you want London to grow, what your top priorities are, what you think the City should be doing, what parks and facilities are needed and why.

Help us plan for the next 10 years and tell us what parks, Recreation and Sport Services programs and facilities mean to you.

Figure 24 Play Your Way Website

Parks and Recreation Master Plan Discussion Guide

Do you want to talk about the Parks and Recreation Master Plan with friends? Find a group that you work or volunteer with and let them know that the discussion guide is a starting point for conversations about the Master Plan. The Discussion Guide contains helpful information about the Master Plan and is intended to be used to start a conversation and learn about the many ways that you can...
Appendix B Community Survey Results

See following pages.
### Q1

Please select the first three (3) digits of your Postal Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Canada Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N5V (Airport/ Huron Heights/ Argyle/ Cruinlin)</td>
<td>N5V 12,273 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5W (East LONDON/ Hamilton Road)</td>
<td>N5W 10,861 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5X (Upland's/Stoneybrook/ Stone Creek/ Fanshawe)</td>
<td>N5X 12,333 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5Y (Carling/Huron Heights)</td>
<td>N5Y 15,015 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5Z (Glen Cairn/Pond Mills)</td>
<td>N5Z 10,178 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6A (North LONDON/ Central LONDON)</td>
<td>N6A 7,162 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6B (Central LONDON/ Woodfield)</td>
<td>N6B 6,205 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6C (South LONDON/ Wortley/ Highland)</td>
<td>N6C 12,624 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6E/ (White Oaks/ Westminster/ Longwoods/ Brockley)</td>
<td>N6E 9,737 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6G (Medway/ Masonville/ Sunningdale)</td>
<td>N6G 16,523 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6H (West London/ Oakridge/ Hyde Park/ Fox Hollow)</td>
<td>N6H 18,915 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6J (Southcrest/ Highland)</td>
<td>N6J 12,482 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6K (Westmount/ Byron/ Woodfield)</td>
<td>N6K 13,570 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6L (Longwoods/ Brockley/ Tempo/ Bostwick)</td>
<td>N6L 979 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6M (Jackson/ Summerside/ Bradley/ Highbury/ Old Victoria)</td>
<td>N6M 2,139 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6P (Lambeth/ Talbot/ Sharon Creek/ Tempo)</td>
<td>N6P 3,293 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know: 2159

Total: 2159

### Q2

In the past 12 months have you or anyone in your household participated in any of the following INDOOR ACTIVITIES? These activities could take place anywhere, not just in City facilities. Select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% (all)</th>
<th>% (sample)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skating, hockey, ringette, sledge</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness, yoga or weight training</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball, volleyball or badminton</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor hockey, ball hockey, roller hockey</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller skating, roller derby</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash or raquetball</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama, dance or music programs</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor turf sports</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial arts</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and crafts or creative arts program</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General interest programs - cooking, computers, photography</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors' organized activities or programs</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday or Summer Camps (may be indoor or outdoor)</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending special events or community gatherings, meetings, festivals, movie nights (indoor or outdoor)</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top responses to 'Other' | # |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curling</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics (track and field activities)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling (Velodrome)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know: 2159

Total: 2159

answered question: 2159

skipped question: 0
Q3. In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your household, participated in any of the following OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES? These activities could take place anywhere, not just in City parks. Select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>% (all)</th>
<th>% (sample)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing at a spray pad or wading pool</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing at a playground</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball or baseball</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other field sports - Soccer, lacrosse, football, ultimate frisbee, field hockey</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice skating</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Volleyball</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking for leisure</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog walking (on-leash)</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog walking (off-leash)</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking in a natural area</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running or jogging</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMX biking</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding, scootering or rollerblading</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watersports such as canoeing or kayaking</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td>12381</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
<td>2156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>skipped question</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4. In the past 12 months, which of the following types of locations have you or a member of your household used to participate in a parks, recreation or sport activity? Select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>% (all)</th>
<th>% (sample)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of London community centre, arena or indoor pool</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London park</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London civic spaces (R.H. Cooper Square, Rotary Square, Golden Jubilee Square)</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London golf course (Thames, Fanshawe or River Road)</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family centre</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Public Library</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation area</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Valley Parkway or other paved pathways</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural area trail</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-for-profit Facility (e.g., YMCA, Boys &amp; Girls Club, BMO Centre)</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private facility or club (e.g., fitness centres, sport training, condo facility)</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places of worship (e.g., Church, Temple, Mosque, etc.)</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School, college or university facility</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td>11308</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
<td>2159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>skipped question</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. On average, how frequently do you and members of your household visit the following parks or facilities operated by the City of London? For seasonal parks or facilities, identify your usage during the time they are available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park/Facility</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once a Year</th>
<th>A few times a year</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Twice a month</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Skipped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community centres</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>125%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arenas</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>204%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>493%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor pools</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>442%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails and pathways</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>375%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller parks that serve your neighbourhood</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>288%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger parks that serve the whole City</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>577%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active parks (sports fields, spray pads or courts)</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>387%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive parks (natural areas, trails)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>504%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6 Are you or members of your household able to participate in parks, recreation and sport activities as often as you would like?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 2015 (100%)
skipped question: 144

Q7 How can we help you or members of your household use the City’s community centres, arenas or indoor pools more often? Select up to four (4) responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% (all)</th>
<th>% (sample)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different hours of operation</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of programs or events</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-in/scheduled activities</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for all household members at the same time</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accesses by public transit, walking or biking</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean spaces</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child minding services</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable pricing</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to financial assistance</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program locations close to your home</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates to existing facilities</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity spaces within existing facilities such as pools, gymnasiums, or</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support spaces within existing facilities such as washrooms, change rooms, and seating areas</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on what is available</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one interested in using facilities</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top responses to “Other”:
- Provision of or partnership with London Curling Club
- Dedicated Pickleball Facilities (distribution and multi-court)
- Athletics Facilities (i.e., indoor track)
- Expanded programming (e.g., toddler, seniors, STEM, etc.)
- Additional indoor aquatics facilities
- Flat Pad for Roller Sports (e.g., derby, skating, etc.)
- Additional indoor ice (i.e., arenas in the north end)
- Accessibility and inclusion programs and services

Total responses: 5803
answered question: 2014
skipped question: 145

Q8 How can we help you or members of your household use the City’s parks, civic spaces, natural areas and trails more often? (select up to four (4) responses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% (all)</th>
<th>% (sample)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variety of programs or events</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities at times that suit your needs</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for all household members at the same time</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accesses by public transit, walking or biking</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks that are closer to your home</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrades to existing parks</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to pathways and trails that are closer to your home</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrades to existing trails, such as improved surfacing or signage</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean spaces</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active amenities within existing parks, such as sports fields, playgrounds, and courts</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive amenities within existing areas such as pathways, seating, shade and open space</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on what is available</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one interested in using parks and natural areas</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top responses to “Other”:
- Trails (e.g., connectivity, maintenance, signage, etc.)
- Washrooms (e.g., availability, unlocking, maintenance)
- Outdoor pickleball facilities (preferably 4 to 8+ courts)
- Amenities (e.g., lighting, garbage, recycling, sharps, etc.)
- Improved maintenance (seasonal and refuse)
- Additional cycling infrastructure and signage
- Bylaw enforcement (i.e., dogs, substances, urban camping)

Total responses: 5561
answered question: 2014
skipped question: 145

Q9 Are there any parks, recreation or sport programs or activities that you or members of your household would like to see offered in London that are NOT currently available?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 2015
skipped question: 144
Q10 If Yes, what programs or activities would you like to see offered?
open-ended responses have been summarized by activity/theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Theme</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curling</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball (indoor, outdoor)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Fitness</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs (drop-in, family, STEM, etc.)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling (on-road, off-road, BMX, mountain biking)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics programs (e.g. track and field)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller-sports (i.e., derby, skating, etc.)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking (hiking, running, jogging, etc.)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket (indoor, outdoor)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds (natural, rinks, play, ninja, obstacle)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool (indoor, outdoor, wading)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoga, Tai Chi, Meditation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Access (Kayak, Canoe, Paddle Board, etc.)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Programs</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen and Older Child Programs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness (dance, weight lifting, etc.)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (ten or fewer requests)</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11 How satisfied are you with the parks, recreation or sport opportunities in London for each of the following age groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool (0-4 years old)</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (5-12 years old)</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teens (13-18 years old)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (19-54 years old)</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (55-64 years old)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65-74 years old)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors (75+ years old)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12 How important are each of the following items to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Answered Question</th>
<th>Skipped Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor recreation facilities (community centres, arenas, indoor pools)</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active parks (sports fields, spray pads or courts)</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive parks (natural areas and trails)</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails and pathways</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs that teach introductory recreation and sport skills</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for casual, unstructured recreation and sport activities</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for high level athlete training and competition</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13 What is your level of satisfaction with the following items in London?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Not at all Satisfied</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Answered Question</th>
<th>Skipped Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor recreation facilities (community centres, arenas, indoor pools)</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active parks (sports fields, spray pads or courts)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive parks (natural areas and trails)</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails and pathways</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs that teach introductory recreation and sport skills</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for casual, unstructured recreation and sport activities</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for high level athlete training and competition</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14 How strongly would you support or oppose improvements to the number and/or quality of the following facility types?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Somewhat support</th>
<th>Somewhat oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Skipped</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Support %</th>
<th>Oppose %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arenas</td>
<td>722 (41%)</td>
<td>652 (37%)</td>
<td>134 (8%)</td>
<td>56 (3%)</td>
<td>201 (11%)</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor pools</td>
<td>775 (44%)</td>
<td>673 (38%)</td>
<td>96 (5%)</td>
<td>31 (2%)</td>
<td>189 (11%)</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasiums</td>
<td>449 (26%)</td>
<td>605 (46%)</td>
<td>129 (7%)</td>
<td>45 (3%)</td>
<td>308 (18%)</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior community centres/Seniors satellites</td>
<td>785 (43%)</td>
<td>698 (37%)</td>
<td>58 (3%)</td>
<td>41 (2%)</td>
<td>204 (15%)</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for indoor sports such as soccer</td>
<td>551 (32%)</td>
<td>702 (40%)</td>
<td>163 (9%)</td>
<td>53 (3%)</td>
<td>280 (16%)</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor tennis facilities</td>
<td>312 (18%)</td>
<td>649 (37%)</td>
<td>273 (16%)</td>
<td>123 (7%)</td>
<td>381 (22%)</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor track and field facilities</td>
<td>441 (26%)</td>
<td>686 (39%)</td>
<td>212 (12%)</td>
<td>73 (4%)</td>
<td>333 (19%)</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indoor Facilities (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top responses to 'Other'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curling</td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Sports</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics (Track &amp; Field)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling (Velodrome)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centres (Multi-purpose)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q15 How strongly would you support or oppose improvements to the number and/or quality of the following sport/organized facility types?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Somewhat support</th>
<th>Somewhat oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Skipped</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Support %</th>
<th>Oppose %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storybook Gardens</td>
<td>665 (37%)</td>
<td>673 (38%)</td>
<td>169 (10%)</td>
<td>69 (4%)</td>
<td>201 (11%)</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer fields</td>
<td>601 (34%)</td>
<td>720 (41%)</td>
<td>131 (7%)</td>
<td>61 (3%)</td>
<td>249 (14%)</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball or softball diamonds</td>
<td>496 (28%)</td>
<td>771 (44%)</td>
<td>150 (9%)</td>
<td>55 (3%)</td>
<td>284 (16%)</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket pitches</td>
<td>168 (10%)</td>
<td>524 (30%)</td>
<td>288 (17%)</td>
<td>161 (9%)</td>
<td>597 (34%)</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use fields (football, rugby, lacrosse, field hockey)</td>
<td>506 (29%)</td>
<td>810 (46%)</td>
<td>107 (6%)</td>
<td>37 (2%)</td>
<td>297 (17%)</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor pools</td>
<td>714 (40%)</td>
<td>709 (40%)</td>
<td>117 (7%)</td>
<td>39 (2%)</td>
<td>186 (11%)</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach volleyball courts</td>
<td>266 (15%)</td>
<td>741 (43%)</td>
<td>248 (14%)</td>
<td>105 (6%)</td>
<td>382 (22%)</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor track and field facilities</td>
<td>437 (25%)</td>
<td>752 (43%)</td>
<td>170 (10%)</td>
<td>59 (3%)</td>
<td>332 (19%)</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses</td>
<td>414 (24%)</td>
<td>562 (32%)</td>
<td>257 (15%)</td>
<td>231 (13%)</td>
<td>289 (16%)</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sport Facilities (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top responses to 'Other'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curling</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc Golf</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling (Velodrome)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Sports</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Sports (e.g., bike / skate park, pump track, etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bocce</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q16 How strongly would you support or oppose improvements to the number and/or quality of the following parks and passive outdoor facility types?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Somewhat support</th>
<th>Somewhat oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Skipped Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkland</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>508%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>145%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlots and natural areas</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>481%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public access to the river for fishing or padding</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>583%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>117%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>164%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park pavilions and picnic areas</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>465%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>126%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park washrooms</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>491%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating areas (benches, picnic tables)</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>645%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature trails</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>473%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved multi-use pathways</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>512%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>560%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor fitness equipment or exercise areas</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>651%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>188%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>225%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray pads</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>619%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>193%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>724%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>196%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>307%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball courts</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>510%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>188%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>585%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>784%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>291%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice skating rinks</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>696%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>165%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMX bike parks</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>655%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>261%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>137%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>378%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboard parks</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>705%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>235%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>137%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>308%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>634%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>125%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>143%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off leash dog parks</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>544%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>209%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>184%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>278%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Parks and Passive Facilities (please specify)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golfing</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Parks</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc Golf</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalization of Open Space</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities (e.g., lighting, garbage, recycling, etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of existing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17 How do you feel about the current level of support that the City provides to the following items?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Level</th>
<th>Too much support</th>
<th>The right amount of support</th>
<th>Not enough support</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Skipped Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing parks, recreation and sport opportunities in your neighborhood</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing parks, recreation and sport opportunities that are welcoming, inclusive and accessible for all residents across London</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting sport tourism, such as building facilities that attract athletes and competitions</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing parks and recreation opportunities on or adjacent to the Thames River</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining and upgrading older parks, recreation and sport facilities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Don't know removed)

Q18 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don't know Not applicable to me</th>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Skipped Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks, recreation and sport services are important to my quality of life</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, recreation and sport play an important role in building healthy communities</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City’s parks are conveniently located for me and the members of my household</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City’s recreation and sport facilities are conveniently located for me and the members of my household</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and sport programs provided by the City are affordable for me</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Don't know removed)

Q19 Do you have ideas to share or additional comments that you think are important for the Parks and Recreation Master Plan? (maximum 100 words).

Open-ended - comments kept on file
Q20  Please identify the total number of persons within your household within each of the age categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th># Households</th>
<th># Persons</th>
<th>2016 Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 10 years</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 years</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-34 years</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54 years</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ years</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total persons</td>
<td>5480</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 1793
skipped question: 366

Q21 How long have you lived in London?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to less than 10 years</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to less than 20 years</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years or more</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 1767
skipped question: 392

Q22 How did you learn about the survey?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Website</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City staff or Council member</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City social media</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster, advertisement or handout</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community or Sport Organization</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends or Family</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top responses to “Other” |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Organizations</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails (including newsletter blasts)</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media Pages</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centres / City of London Facilities</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature London</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 1778
skipped question: 381
Appendix C  Community Survey Cross-tabulation Analysis

From May to July 2018, the City of London hosted an online community survey to support the development of its Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Being a voluntary, self-directed survey, response rates vary by question.

An analysis of relevant cross-tabs (i.e., correlations) was undertaken based on the following variables:

- **Area of Residency**: surveys completed by respondents in the five plan areas (Northeast, Northwest, Central, Southwest, Southeast).
- **Household Composition**: surveys completed by respondents with children (ages 0 to 19 years) at home versus those without children at home.
- **Length of Residency**: surveys completed by respondents that have lived in London for up to 10 years versus those that have lived in London for 20 years or more (note: analysis excludes those living in London for 10 to 19 years).
- **Barriers to Participation**: surveys completed by respondents indicating that members of their household are able to participate in parks, recreation and sport activities as often as they would like versus those that are unable to participate as often as they would like.
- **Frequency of Visiting Indoor Recreation Facilities**: surveys completed by respondents indicating that they visit community centres, indoor pools and arenas once a month or more versus those that visit all of these facility types a few times a year or less.
- **Frequency of Visiting Parks**: surveys completed by respondents indicating that they visit smaller parks, larger parks, active parks and passive parks once a month or more versus those that visit all of these park types a few times a year or less.
- **Frequency of Visiting Trails and Pathways**: surveys completed by respondents indicating that they visit trails and pathways once a month or more versus those that visit trails and pathways a few times a year or less.

Although the survey was self-selected, the analysis assumes a significant sample with a 95% confidence level (correct 19 times out of 20). The margin of error varies by subset according to the number of responses. Based on these parameters, the following significant findings are noted.
Area of Residency (Q1)

- Respondents living in Northeast London were more likely than respondents living in other areas to:
  - use a not-for-profit facility (e.g., YMCA) within the past 12 months (40% v. 29%)
  - be satisfied with opportunities for casual, unstructured recreation and sport activities (80% v. 70%)
- Respondents living in Northwest London were more likely than respondents living in other areas to:
  - be satisfied with opportunities for teens (80% v. 69%)
- Respondents living in Northwest London were less likely than respondents living in other areas to:
  - support improvements to off-leash dog parks (64% v. 75%)
- Respondents living in Central London were more likely than respondents living in other areas to:
  - participate in fitness, yoga or weight training (60% v. 49%), attending indoor or outdoor special events or community gatherings, meetings, festivals, movie nights (54% v. 41%), and hiking in a natural area (66% v. 55%)
  - use City of London civic spaces (20% v. 10%) and the Thames Valley Parkway or other paved pathways (60% v. 48%) within the past 12 months
  - use larger parks that serve the whole City on a frequent basis (55% v. 41%)
  - indicate that access by public transit, walking or biking would encourage them to use parks, civic spaces, natural areas and trails more often (25% v. 13%)
  - be satisfied with opportunities for preschool children (96% v. 84%), older adults ages 65 to 74 years (83% v. 74%) and families (91% v. 80%)
  - support improvements to off-leash dog parks (81% v. 71%)
- Respondents living in Central London were less likely than respondents living in other areas to:
  - have children age 10 years and under living in their household (30% v. 20%)
  - play at a spray pad or wading pool (25% v. 37%) and play at a playground (33% v. 48%)
  - use active parks on a frequent basis (36% v. 50%)
  - indicate that there are programs or activities that they would like to see offered in London that are not currently available (23% v. 32%)
  - indicate that active parks are important to their household (76% v. 87%)
  - support improvements to golf courses (54% v. 69%)
  - have learned about the survey through a community or social organization (31% v. 42%)
Respondents living in Southeast London were more likely than respondents living in other areas to:

- be unable to participate in parks, recreation and sport activities as often as they would like (43% v. 33%)
- indicate that affordable pricing would encourage them to use indoor recreation facilities more often
- support improvements to BMX bike parks (85% v. 68%) and skateboard parks (83% v. 72%)
- indicate that all items addressed in Question 17 (opportunities in their neighbourhood; opportunities that are welcoming, inclusive and accessible; sport tourism; recreation opportunities on or adjacent to the Thames River; and maintaining and upgrading older parks and facilities) do not receive enough support from the City (varying percentages)
- have learned about the survey through the City’s social media (27% v. 16%)

Respondents living in Southeast London were less likely than respondents living in other areas to:

- participate in indoor skating, hockey, ringette, sledge (25% v. 38%), outdoor ice skating (17% v. 30%), fitness, yoga or weight training (40% v. 52%), golf (21% v. 35%), and running or jogging (22% v. 35%)
- use City of London community centres, arenas or indoor pools (57% v. 68%) or private facility or clubs (31% v. 43%) within the past 12 months
- be satisfied with opportunities for teens (52% v. 75%), adults ages 19 to 54 years (73% v. 82%), families (70% v. 82%), and for high level athlete training and competition (54% v. 63%)
- agree that the City’s recreation and sport facilities are conveniently located for them (69% v. 81%)
- agree that recreation and sport programs provided by the City are affordable to their household (69% v. 84%)
- have learned about the survey through a community or social organization (29% v. 41%)

Respondents living in Southwest London were less likely than respondents living in other areas to:

- use the Thames Valley Parkway or other paved pathways (43% v. 53%) and natural area trails (44% v. 53%) within the past 12 months

Key Observations:

1. For the most part, respondents from Northeast, Northwest and Southwest London have similar interests and opinions regarding parks, recreation and sport in the City.
2. Respondents from Southeast London tend to exhibit lower participation rates, are less satisfied with the availability of activities and proximity of recreation facilities, and are more concerned about affordability. Respondents from this area have a desire to participate more, with affordability being a key factor. Respondents stated a stronger desire for the provision of BMX and skateboard parks.
3. Respondents from Central London tend to have fewer children and do not participate in or prioritize support for children’s activities and facilities. On the whole, they are
generally satisfied (this area has the lowest percentage of respondents that requested additional programs or activities). Respondents tend to use parks and facilities that are nearby and support locations that are accessible by public transit, walking or biking.

Household Composition (Q20)

- **Respondents with children** at home were more likely than respondents without children at home to:
  - have participated in swimming, ice sports, gymnasiuim sports, dance/drama/music, indoor turf sports, martial arts, gymnastics, arts and crafts, camps, spray pad/wading pool use, playground use, baseball, field sports, outdoor tennis, running/jogging, skateboarding and watersports (varying percentages) within the past 12 months
  - have used a City community centre/arena/pool, park family centre, public library, conservation area, non-profit facility, private facility and school facility (varying percentages) within the past 12 months
  - be frequent users of City arenas (42% v. 20%), indoor pools (30% v. 14%), smaller parks within their neighbourhood (74% v. 56%) and active parks (64% v. 30%)
  - indicate that activities for all household members at the same time (31% v. 5%) and childminding (12% v. 1%) would encourage them to use indoor recreation facilities more often
  - indicate that activities for all household members at the same time (19% v. 4%), parks that are closer to their home (27% v. 20%), upgrades to existing parks (40% v. 31%) and active amenities within existing parks (22% v. 14%) would encourage them to use parks, civic spaces, natural areas and trails more often
  - indicate that indoor recreation facilities (95% v. 88%), active parks (95% v. 74%), programs that teach introductory skills (81% v. 72%) and opportunities for high level athlete training and competition (56% v. 43%) are important to their household
  - be more supportive of improvements to indoor track and field facilities (83% v. 76%)

- **Respondents without children** at home were more likely than respondents with children at home to:
  - live in Central London (19% v. 12%)
  - have lived in London for twenty years or more (71% v. 53%)
  - have participated in pickleball and seniors activities (varying percentages) within the past 12 months
  - indicate that access by public transit, walking or biking (18% v. 11%) and information on what is available (31% v. 21%) would encourage them to use indoor recreation facilities more often
  - indicate that updates to existing trails (39% v. 28%) and information on what is available (30% v. 23%) would encourage them to use parks, civic spaces, natural areas and trails more often
o be more supportive of improvements to golf courses (72% v. 61%), pickleball courts, (81% v. 65%), community gardens (93% v. 86%) and off-leash dog parks (78% v. 67%)

Key Observations:

4. As one would expect, households with children tend to be more frequent users of recreation facilities and parks that are oriented toward sports and active pursuits. These households tend to be more supportive of additional investment in active and youth-oriented amenities. Conversely, households without children are more supportive of passive and seniors-oriented amenities. In areas of the City with higher percentages of certain age groups, the City may wish to consider amenities that appeal most to these markets.

5. Households without children have less information on opportunities to participate.

Length of Residency (Q21)

- Respondents that have lived in London for up to 10 years were more likely than respondents that have lived in London for 20 years or more to:
  o have children age 10 years and under living in their household (35% v. 21%)
  o have participated in running or jogging in the past 12 months (40% v. 29%)
  o suggest that having parks that are closer to home would encourage them to use parks, civic spaces, natural areas and trails more often (30% v. 21%)
  o support additional investment in indoor tennis facilities (78% v. 69%), cricket pitches (68% v. 58%), beach volleyball courts (84% v. 71%) and off-leash dog parks (83% v. 70%)

- Respondents that have lived in London for 20 years or more were more likely than respondents that have lived in London for up to 10 years to:
  o have persons ages 55 to 64 years living in their household (31% v. 18%)
  o have persons ages 65 to 74 years living in their household (27% v. 11%)
  o have participated in golf in the past 12 months (40% v. 21%) and support additional investment in golf courses (70% v. 60%)
  o be able to participate in parks, recreation and sport activities as often as they would like (65% v. 56%)

Key Observations:

(Note: There is a correlation between newer residents to London and households with young children, thus many of the previous observations apply.)

6. Some activities and sports with a more international appeal (such as cricket, beach volleyball, etc.) are more strongly supported by newer London residents, which may reflect the growing diversity in the City.
7. Long-time residents of London are stronger users and supporters of municipal golf courses than newer residents. This may offer insight into potential marketing approaches.

**Barriers to Participation (Q6)**

- Respondents that indicated that members of their household are able to participate in parks, recreation and sport activities as often as they would like (i.e., no barriers) were more likely than respondents that that are unable to participate as often as they would like to:
  - have lived in London for twenty years or more (56% v. 65%)
  - have persons ages 55 to 64 years living in their household (28% v. 17%)
  - have participated in golf within the past 12 months (38% v. 28%), have visited a City of London golf course within the past 12 months (28% v. 19%) and support improvements to golf courses (71% v. 58%)
  - be satisfied with opportunities for residents of all age groups (varying percentages)
  - be satisfied with all types of facilities and parks in London (varying percentages)
  - agree that the City’s parks are conveniently located (93% v. 81%), that recreation and sport facilities are conveniently located (88% v. 64%) and that City programs are affordable to their household (89% v. 71%)
  - have learned about the survey through a community or sport organization (44% v. 35%)

- Respondents that indicated that members of their household are unable to participate in parks, recreation and sport activities as often as they would like (i.e., barriers) were more likely than respondents that that are able to participate as often as they would like to:
  - have persons under the age of 10 years living in their household (34% v. 26%)
  - have participated in special events or community gatherings, meetings, festivals, or movie nights (48% v. 40%) and playing at a spray pad or wading pool (41% v. 32%)
  - indicate that different hours of operation (26% v. 15%) and program locations close to their home (42% v. 35%) would encourage them to use indoor recreation facilities more often
  - indicate that access to pathways and trails that are closer to their home (31% v. 23%) would encourage them to use parks, civic spaces, natural areas and trails more often
  - indicate that there are programs or activities that they would like to see offered in London that are not currently available (36% v. 27%)
  - indicate that all items addressed in Question 17 (opportunities in their neighbourhood; opportunities that are welcoming, inclusive and accessible; sport tourism; recreation opportunities on or adjacent to the Thames River; and maintaining and upgrading older parks and facilities) do not receive enough support from the City (varying percentages)
Key Observations:

8. The survey data indicates that convenience is a key factor in participation. Amenities that are close to home would encourage people that face barriers to participation to use City parks, facilities and trails more often.
9. People that do not participate in parks, recreation and sport activities as often as they would like tend to be less satisfied with services and amenities provided by the City and want to see greater support. Many of them have younger children and are seeking additional program opportunities.

Frequency of Visiting Indoor Recreation Facilities (Q5)

- Respondents that visit community centres, indoor pools and arenas once a month or more were more likely than respondents that visit all of these facility types a few times a year or less to:
  - have children age 10 years and under (59% v. 21%) and age 10 to 19 years (39% v. 25%)
  - be frequent users of trails and pathways (78% v. 55%), smaller parks (87% v. 55%), larger parks (50% v. 37%), active parks (74% v. 28%) and passive parks (53% v. 40%)
  - suggest different hours of operation (29% v. 14%), activities for all household members at the same time (26% v. 13%), and affordable pricing (52% v. 38%) as ways to encourage them to use indoor recreation facilities more often
  - be satisfied with parks, recreation and sport opportunities for seniors (82% v. 68%)
  - support improvements to arenas (96% v. 81%), indoor tennis facilities (80% v. 62%) and outdoor pickleball courts (78% v. 64%)
- Respondents that visit community centres, indoor pools and arenas a few times a year or less were more likely than respondents that visit all of these facility types once a month or more to:
  - suggest more information on what is available (35% v. 16%) as ways to encourage them to use indoor recreation facilities more often

Key Observations:

10. Frequent users of recreation and sport facilities tend to have more children and/or youth within their household than infrequent users.
11. Frequent users of recreation and sport facilities also tend to be frequent users of parks and trails, particularly youth-based and sport amenities.
12. Infrequent users of recreation and sport facilities need more information on opportunities to participate.
Frequency of Visiting Parks (Q5)

- Respondents that visit smaller parks, larger parks, active parks and passive parks once a month or more were more likely than respondents that visit all of these park types a few times a year or less to:
  - have children age 10 years and under (50% v. 10%)
  - be frequent users of trails and pathways (85% v. 13%), community centres (36% v. 15%), arenas (40% v. 13%) and indoor pools (33% v. 8%)
  - suggest upgrades to existing parks (45% v. 25%), access to pathways and trails that are closer to your home (30% v. 17%), updates to existing trails (39% v. 20%), active amenities within existing parks (23% v. 9%) and passive amenities within existing parks (35% v. 17%) as ways to encourage them to use parks, civic spaces, natural areas and trails more often
  - indicate that active parks (97% v. 68%) and opportunities for high level athlete training and competition (58% v. 45%) are important to them
  - feel that not enough support is being given to providing parks and recreation opportunities on or adjacent to the Thames River (56% v. 42%)
  - feel that not enough support is being given to maintaining and upgrading older parks, recreation and sport facilities (56% v. 42%)

- Respondents that visit smaller parks, larger parks, active parks and passive parks a few times a year or less were more likely than respondents that visit all of these park types once a month or more to:
  - have lived in London for 20 years or more (64% v. 52%)
  - suggest more information on what is available (32% v. 21%) as ways to encourage them to use parks, civic spaces, natural areas and trails more often
  - be satisfied with parks, recreation and sport opportunities for adults ages 55-64 years (83% v. 71%), older adults (84% v. 71%) and seniors (81% v. 69%)

Key Observations:

(Note: There are many similar observations as those for frequent users of indoor recreation facilities.)

13. Frequent users of parks tend to be stronger advocates for the parks, recreation and sport system than infrequent users.

Frequency of Visiting Trails and Pathways (Q5)

- Respondents that visit trails and pathways once a month or more were more likely than respondents that visit all of trails and pathways a few times a year or less to:
  - be frequent users of community centres (33% v. 24%), arenas (33% v. 25%) and indoor pools (25% v. 10%), smaller parks (77% v. 36%), larger
parks (53% v. 15%), active parks (52% v. 34%) and passive parks (60% v. 4%)
- suggest upgrades to existing parks (37% v. 28%), access to pathways and trails that are closer to your home (30% v. 20%), updates to existing trails (38% v. 25%) and passive amenities within existing parks (34% v. 22%) as ways to encourage them to use parks, civic spaces, natural areas and trails more often
- be satisfied with parks, recreation and sport opportunities for adults ages 19 to 54 years (83% v. 75%),
- indicate that passive parks (97% v. 85%) and trails and pathways (98% v. 85%) are important to them
- support improvements to off-leash dog parks (75% v. 67%)
- feel that not enough support is being given to providing parks and recreation opportunities on or adjacent to the Thames River (53% v. 44%)

- Respondents that visit trails and pathways a few times a year or less were more likely than respondents that visit all of trails and pathways once a month or more to:
  - support improvements to golf courses (73% v. 64%)

Key Observations:

(Note: There are many similar observations as those for frequent users of indoor recreation facilities.)

14. There is a strong correlation between the use of trails and the use of passive parks.
Appendix D  Stakeholder Input Sessions – Detailed Feedback

This section provides a detailed summary of the feedback from all three Stakeholder Input Sessions shared at the meetings and afterwards by email. Feedback has been organized according to the five themes of the focus questions. Prior to the facilitated discussion at each session, participants asked questions of clarification.

Positive Impact

Participants identified a number of positive ways parks, recreation programs, sports services and facilities make a difference to residents and their organizations, including:

General:

Participants said that London is home to many quality parks and facilities that provide valuable access to nature and in-demand programs and services. They noted that the pools, community gardens, soccer pitches, playground equipment and tennis courts are well used, and go beyond the provision levels of sports and recreation for many other communities. They also said that Parks and recreation facilities can be the first experience visitors have with London, so it is important for it be a positive experience. Some said London parks are the only safe places to walk, bike, and run in the City. In general, participants recognized that parks and green spaces (even small ones) are very important to communities.

Opportunities to participate in sports and be active:

Provide important opportunities for youth. Participants noted that programming and activities for youth are vital for physical activity, learning new skills, and providing options for leisure and recreation.

Provide opportunities for recreation for people with different levels of ability. Participants said that when parks, recreation programs, sports services and facilities are accessible, they provide much needed places for inclusive physical activity for people with ranges in mobility and ability. Abilities in Motion (AIM) specifically noted that they would not exist without access to public, accessible aquatics facilities.

Affordable for all levels of income. Participants said that it’s helpful that the parks are free and programs and facilities are inclusive of all levels of income, which is essential for low income families and more costly sports like hockey.

Good for public health:

Enhanced physical and mental health. Participants recognized that access to green space and recreation opportunities promotes mental, physical, social and cultural health for individuals and communities. They noted that they offer opportunities for people to
be active; meet new friends; find others with common interests; feel included and connected to the community; and have fun.

Strong neighbourhoods and sense of community:

Creating a sense of ownership and strong communities. Participants said their ability to use facilities and parks for events and meetings gives them and their members a sense of ownership. It was also noted that parks, recreation and sport facilities and amenities are important to creating strong, high quality, appealing communities, which in turn also improves neighbourhood marketability.

Increasing affordability:

Shared facilities allow organizations to serve communities at lower costs. Participants said that sharing facilities allows many different groups to provide weekly or occasional programming without the burden of costly overhead. Sharing facilities maximizes their use, keeping costs low for all.

Provide opportunities to connect to the environment:

Parks and green spaces and the programming and activities that take place within them help to connect people to the natural environment and environmental movement.

Specific positive impacts:

Participants also identified specific ways parks, recreation and sport programs impact their organizations and members, including:

- Spectrum programming is fantastic, and especially important to kids.
- The cricket pitch at North London Athletic Fields provides cricket clubs and groups a facility to practice and play. Additional cricket pitches are desired.
- Jorgensen Park and the Byron Optimist Community Centre on site is in full use by the Byron Community Organization.
- Existing connections between parks and the Thames Valley Parkway (TVP) are important because they provide safe routes between the parks. The more connections the better.
- Soccer facilities, provided by the City of London, are essential to organizations such as Street Soccer.
- The opening of the East Community Centre and the pathway connecting Pottersburg Park to Kiwanis Park is greatly appreciated by Argyle Community Association.
- The number of arenas in London provide a significant amount of choice for skating clubs. However, additional arenas with sufficient seating for large skating competitions are needed.
Trends & Changes

Participants noted the following trends and changes their organizations are experiencing that impact their use of parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities:

General:

People are generally more active. Participants said they are seeing an increased recognition of the benefits of being active, which is resulting in more people being active and more demand for programs and facilities.

More interest in passive recreation activities. Some participants said they are seeing increased interest in more passive recreation activities, e.g. gardening.

Positive impact of library programming. Participants from the London Public Library said there is a relationship between their programming and the number of incident reports they receive, i.e. more programs result in less incident reports and vice-versa.

Demographics:

Changing demographics. Participants said they are seeing additional immigrants in London, which is increasing the demand for programs and facilities as well as new types of programs. Participants also said more older adults are participating in sports and recreation activities. Some participants said they are seeing more children in established neighbourhoods.

More families and children. While London as a whole is aging, it was noted that some neighbourhoods (Sherwood Forest) are seeing growth in the number of young families. Given this trend, there is a need for existing parks to be upgraded with amenities appropriate for children and families.

A new cycle of demographic growth putting pressure on existing facilities. Interest in sports and recreations programs is growing, but services are levelling off because organizations do not have enough facility space or resources to accommodate the increased demand.

Growth in the Old South area means there are now more young families with children again. It was noted that eventually, these kids will grow up and move away. Schools, recreation centres and other public facilities need longer term visions to accommodate changing demographics in the city.

Accessibility:

Increased demand for accessible programs and facilities. Participants said there is a greater demand for organizations and programs that serve individuals with complex needs and require accessible programs and facilities.
Accessibility in parks, between parks, and broader infrastructure. Participants said that there has been an increase in people with physical and cognitive disabilities using parks, recreation programs and sport services. Participants suggested that there is a need for greater accessibility in parks and facilities beyond what is available today. People want to be integrated into groups, activities, and spaces, whereas in the past they would have been separate. Participants noted it is important to think about the full recreation site to ensure that it is designed to be truly accessible.

Time/season of use:

Time of use is expanding. Participants said people are participating in sports and recreation activities and using parks and trails later in the day. This has resulted in an increased need for lighting, especially for fields and trails people use to commute to and from work.

More interest in winter cycling. Participants representing cycling groups said more people are cycling in the winter, which requires winter maintenance of trails and pathways to keep them safe.

Environment:

Changes in climate and the environment. Participants noted that temperatures are getting hotter earlier and remaining hotter for longer in the season. Demand for shade from both trees and structures is increasing.

Increased flooding in the Thames Valley Parkway (TVP). Participants identified growing concerns related to the TVP, including increased flooding and people going through the ice in the winter. These were identified as significant issues because the TVP is used as a major commuter route.

Activities:

More demand for activities. Participants noted that demand has increased for the following activities:

- Hockey;
- Swimming: interest has particularly increased in the northwest;
- Football: participants noted that additional amenities are needed to meet demand, e.g. fields that are lit, have turf, large change rooms, storage and washrooms;
- Curling: interest has increased for kids, as well as older adults. Older adults with limited mobility are transitioning from wheelchair basketball to curling; and
- Fishing.

Increased demand for specific sports and activities. Participants noted trends including more women participating in sports, more co-ed teams, and higher demand for blind sports.
Participants also identified increased demand and trends in the following sports and activities:

- **Baseball**: increase in diamond usage; decrease in the number of diamonds available; and decrease in diamond quality. Some teams need to venture to other neighborhoods to find available diamonds. Youth interested in playing are turned away because there are not enough diamonds to accommodate them.
- **Soccer**: more older adults are joining clubs, there is an increased demand for indoor soccer, and pitches are well used and there are not enough fields to accommodate additional demand. Artificial turf allows for longer seasons.
- **Hockey**: registration is increasing, starting younger, with more girls playing, and arenas don’t have enough ice for user groups.
- **Cycling**: the 50+ crowd is strong, and more youth are becoming interested. Cycling is popular in Old South, and increasingly so with millennials for a variety of reasons including reduced environmental and financial impacts.
- **Paddling**: families are starting junior groups.
- **Geo-caching**.
- **Adopt-a-Park program**.
- **Community orchards inside community gardens**.

**Other:**

**Development charge calculations.** Participants commented that changes in the way that Development Charges are funded has impacted the way that developers and the City do business together.

**Challenges & Priorities**

Participants identified the following challenges and priorities facing their organizations:

**General:**

**Low levels of physical activity.** Encouraging those who are not yet active to become active is especially important for seniors and those with mobility challenges who need to engage muscles that are otherwise not used.

Need for additional space and programming to keep up with increasing demand:

**Lack of available space leading to competition for access.** Most participants said their organizations are outgrowing their space and/or losing space to redevelopment. Pilot projects through partnerships with other facilities have helped but are only temporary. With growth comes competition for access – and there are many types of initiatives, not just sports, hoping to make use of park spaces. For example, the use of park space for naturalization and food security (community gardens and orchards) also warrants planning. Participants specifically said the decommissioning of Farquharson Arena would be a great loss to the community. They would like to see the arena saved and upgraded to include 2 rinks and appropriate size and number of change rooms.
Additional facilities and programs. Several participants said increased membership is a priority for their organization and they would greatly benefit from additional facilities and related amenities to meet demand. There was also a desire to see additional amenities at existing and future facilities (e.g. bike racks, practice facilities, washrooms, lighting, and Wi-Fi in parks and arenas).

Increased demand is leading to different needs for change room facilities. With higher numbers of users, and increases in co-ed teams, participants said there are different needs with respect to change rooms. Issues included scheduling change rooms for hockey (particularly in older arenas with smaller change rooms) and lack of outdoor family change rooms and change rooms suitable for clients with a support person.

Victoria Park. Some participants said that Victoria Park is over used and suggested spreading out festivals and activities to other parks and facilities.

Accessibility:

Accessibility and inclusion across the board. Participants said it is important that everyone in the city can be included in parks, recreation, and sports opportunities. There are a number of good things happening in parks and facilities but there is still a lot of room for improvement.

Lack of accessible facilities and equipment. The lack of accessibility of existing facilities and equipment is a challenge for those providing programming for individuals with different levels of ability. For example, it would be great if London Curling Club were to be made accessible. Wheelchair basketball players are transitioning to curling with age.

Maintenance:

Maintenance of facilities. Maintenance of existing facilities was identified as a challenge by a number of participants. It was noted that a high-level of use is causing existing facilities to deteriorate and the costs associated with maintenance is a significant burden for organizations. Some participants said additional maintenance is needed during winter months. Others noted baseball and soccer facilities are in particular need of additional maintenance.

Funding and resources:

Costs and funding. Participants noted that rental costs are continuing to increase which acts as a barrier for use even with volunteers helping out. Some participants said their organizations have to use secondary venues because of the limited availability of City facilities and these secondary venues are more expensive. Participants also said even minimal costs act as a significant barrier for low-income residents and people experiencing homelessness and advocated for the importance of subsidy programs.
Limited financial flexibility to upgrade or repair facilities. Often, organizations seeking upgrades or repairs to their facilities must go through the City for quotes from contractors, which can be very high. Organizations have been able to source contractors to do the work for lower prices but this process is not permitted.

Non-profit organizations are not permitted to fundraise to support their programming. Small non-profits would like to be able to fundraise, in a similar way that charities are permitted to fundraise, to be able to raise income to support the delivery of their programs and services. Member/user fees are not sufficient to cover existing programming while also supporting an organization that is trying to grow and be an active part of its community.

Safety:

Improved safety. Participants raised safety concerns about existing parks and facilities in the City of London. Suggested solutions included, the use of design guidelines that improve safety and increasing the number safe injection sites in the City.

Environment:

Wildlife. Participants said animals in parks and on trails is a growing concern. Canadian Geese were noted as a problem because of the number of droppings they leave on paths and they are known to be aggressive with park users and kayakers. Participants also said they have seen an increase in the number of deer, coyotes, and beavers.

Poor water quality. Water quality within the river needs improvement and water levels are low.

Climate change, tree planting and environment policies. Participants commented that increased heat in the summer and a lack of shade will continue to be a challenge with climate change. Trees and built infrastructure need to be considered as part of the solution. Also, “environment" is seen as being addressed through existing policies on Natural Heritage and Environmentally Significant Areas. Tree planting projects in parks do not ‘fit’ under these policies which are not designed to support or plan for naturalization or planting efforts in other neighbourhood or recreational parks.

Access and information:

Information access. Participants said that accessing and navigating information related parks and recreation can be difficult and suggested the City work to better coordinate existing information. There was a suggestion to have one central website that includes all information related to programming, even non-City run programming.

Transportation and Parking:

Transportation and access to programs, service, and facilities. It is important the programs, services and facilities are located in the City and ideally are served by public and/or para transit. Transportation is the main challenge for people with accessibility
needs. Currently wheelchair users have to leave the City to participate in popular sports (e.g. to Ilderton Curling Club and to Dorchester Basketball).

**Parking.** With increased demand in parks, recreation and sport programs and services, parking has become a challenge. Not everyone can take public transit, and building new spaces is too expensive.

**Development:**

**Identifying new areas of growth.** The City and the development industry need to be in sync on what constitutes a growth area and where growth is coming in London, or else amenities and recreation space may not happen where they need to. Through development charges, growth pays for growth and recreation is an important component to funding facilities and amenities.

**Specific activities and organizations:**

**Curling.** Representatives from London Curling said their facility is at the end of its life span. They also said they would like to offer wheelchair curling and additional programming to women, schools, and post-secondary students but they would need new facilities to do this. The opportunity to use Silverwood Arena was raised for long-term curling needs.

**Cricket.** Participants representing Cricket Clubs said they are experiencing significant growth, nearly 20% in the past year, and their biggest challenge is a lack of cricket pitches and related facilities, including practice cages, change rooms, and paved parking. Other challenges they are experiencing include:

- competition for space between tape-ball and hard ball players as well as other summertime uses allowed on cricket grounds, including barbecues and soccer tournaments;
- The existing January 5th scheduling deadline. They said this date is too early and acts as a barrier, especially for scheduling and hosting tournaments.

Cricket Club representatives advocated for additional cricket grounds, noting that any new facility should be on high ground to prevent damage from flooding and would need to include the correct type of grass for cricket. They also said they would like to partner with local schools and offer lessons to the 4-H in London but would need additional facilities.

**Football.** Representatives representing football leagues said that there is a need for additional amenities and improved field conditions in order to meet an increasing demand for football, including fields that have lights, fields with turf, and washrooms and changerooms (such as a football fieldhouse at City-wide Sports Park). They also noted that in some instances they need rely on secondary school facilities, which are more expensive than City facilities and can be difficult for their members to get to.
Specific challenges and priorities identified by organizations included:

Orchard Park Sherwood Forest Ratepayers Association:
- Development of Sherwood Forest Park
- Resurfacing the tennis courts at A.L. Furanna Park

Abilities in Motion:
- Finding a safe location to offer their adaptive paddling program.
- Finding outdoor paddling locations. Fanshawe is great but specialized equipment is needed to support limited mobility and the water quality needs to be improved.
- Would like to use little boats in the pools but need storage.
- Would like to introduce more non-traditional uses of pools (e.g. assisted scuba).

London Aquatic Club:
- LAC membership is growing quickly, with plans to expand to 300 competitive swimmers within the next three years. They have outgrown their ability to rent additional city facilities to support the demand.
- Canada Games Aquatic Centre needs an expansion to create an additional pool to serve as a warm up/warm down tank. They also have limited deck space.
- Canada Games Aquatic Centre is no longer the correct depth for competitions; it is now considered too shallow based on new standards. After September 2018, the LAC will not be able to host many of the regional, provincial, and national meets, which are critical to bringing financial resources to the club to operate and expand their programming. Losing these events also reduces economic development opportunities for the City. If these challenges are not addressed, the Centre risks losing competitions and swim meets, customers, and income.

London Junior Knights Hockey:
- Funding.
- Need for more than 1 hour of ice per week from the City to practice.
- Need to source our own indoor space. “Home ice” would be nice.
- Dry land training space is needed for hockey.
- More hockey arenas are needed in the City.
- Would like to start sledge hockey but no access to additional ice.

Support

Participants identified a number of different areas where their organizations could benefit from additional support, either from the City of London or other avenues. Nearly all participants noted that additional funding would help support their organizations’ growth and sustainability into the future.

General:

Responding to changing demographics. Participants said the City needs a mechanism/process that is able to more quickly respond to changing demographics and associated needs.
Simplified sport field booking process. Some participants said it would be easier for their organizations to book times at sports fields if they could simply book what is available as opposed to having to book in advance.

Additional facilities and programming:

Additional facilities and programming. Nearly all participants said additional facilities and programming would help support their organization and members now and in the future. Specific facilities and amenities identified include: sports fields with lighting and artificial turf; cricket grounds; change rooms and bathrooms.

Expanding availability of accessible activities:

Accessible programs and facilities. Some participants said that parks, recreation programs, sports services and facilities could support their organization’s needs by expanding the availability of accessible activities (e.g. curling, paddling) and accessible gym equipment (e.g. hand bikes to develop upper body strength for paddlers). They also said that support and/or funding for physical activity for children with special needs is important.

Participants noted a number of ways their organizations could be supported with respect to increasing accessibility, including:

- Provide barrier-free facilities that are accessible throughout a person’s entire visit. Include accessible/assistive equipment and supports wherever necessary (e.g. change room lifts at pools).
- Provide more accessible opportunities, e.g. raised garden beds, a variety of sports offerings, etc.
- Provide snow clearing for paths (including school routes, trails and pathways).
- Provide accessible transportation and wayfinding to improve safe access. Consider providing and funding an accessible bus service available to all organizations who need accessible transportation. Organizations could help coordinate this.
- Provide paths to amenities, picnic areas, etc. to help people independently navigate parks.
- Colour contrasting on steps/curbs to improve safety for visually impaired.

Providing adequate infrastructure to support growing neighbourhoods:

Participants said the City could support the needs of the development industry through appropriate infrastructure to support future neighbourhoods. It is important that facilities are prioritized in areas that are growing and expected to grow. The cost to do business relative to the development industry’s relationship with the city is important.

Improving affordability for individuals and service providers:

Participants said this goal could be supported through subsidies and affordable or free options for organizations and low to mid income families; relaxed rules to allow non-profits to fundraise; and a more flexible procedure to allow organizations to fund infrastructure projects more cost effectively.
Simplifying and improving access to information about parks and recreation systems, programs, and facilities:

It was suggested that the City look into ways to improve navigation of parks systems and facilities. This includes simplifying information around service, operations, planning, and programming. An online resource or an app would be helpful.

Better and more consistently maintained parks:

Participants said that maintenance support could include more frequent lawn mowing (not just the soccer fields); providing more garbage cans; more frequent inspections (to fix things like holes in fields); more frequent infield dragging; and ensuring gates and hardware are functioning properly. Winter maintenance of the pathway system was also noted as important from an accessibility perspective. Suggestions for specific parks included:

- Optimist Park: needs an extra garbage can; weather protection for benches similar to Glanworth Park; and wooden shelves for the storage shed to better organize gear.
- Thames Park: flood plain issue needs attention.

Policies for new tree plantings:

Additional policies: Participants suggested two new policies to include as part of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan to deal specifically with new tree plantings in parks (not existing Natural Heritage areas or ESAs):

- Naturalization policy: this policy would speak to how naturalization areas can be identified, goals related to naturalization and planting, etc. It should also provide guidance for what to do in cases of NIMBYism when organizations face unreasonable or unjustified opposition to planting. Over time, there will be even more of a sense of competition for space in parks. A policy will help everyone deal with that challenge in an orderly and logical fashion.

- Shade policy: this policy would set standards for shade in public parks and especially around playgrounds, sports fields, trails, etc. Shade policies do not generally deal exclusively with trees, but things such as shade sails and other structures. The development of a shade policy should likely involve the health unit and health community, while the City’s planting partners would like to be involved in the development of a naturalization policy.

Supporting existing and potential new community groups and organizations:

Subsidizing facilities for organizations. Participants said affordable/free meeting space and other supports would improve their organizations’ ability to sustain themselves and plan. It was also suggested that the city continue to support the development of active community organizations in ways similar to “NeighbourGood London” which informs people about forming and running community organizations and events.
Financial support. Participants said the City could support organizations and their users by reducing rental and user fees for those who cannot afford to pay the full cost. They also suggested making it easier for organizations to obtain required insurance.

Specific organizations’ requests for support:

Abilities in Motion suggested a number of programs that could benefit from increased support from the City’s parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities, including:

- Develop a Spectrum program for kids learning to paddle.
- Develop a disabled sailing and dragon boating program.
- Install a dock near the museum.
- Make an indoor pool available to AIM in the winter to provide adaptive kayaking; learning to paddle; paddle safety; storage for a few small boats; and non-traditional uses like scuba diving.
- Provide basic paddling instruction through “Bring your pelican to the park” initiative.
- Support for specific programming like: Boys and Girls Club’s ‘Swim to Survive’, ORCA’s ‘Bring your pelican to the park’.

Support for specific types of use:

Flexible programming and an additional baseball diamond. Participants said that the increased demand for baseball and the lack of diamonds to accommodate it could be addressed by allowing some flexibility: all diamonds could support an additional 4 teams with some flexibility in the scheduling/programming. Participants would also like to see a new 300-foot baseball diamond located in the southwest area of London before the neighbourhood develops.

Informal unstructured play, recreation. Participants suggested providing more opportunities for less structured, informal recreation. The City used to have a program where high school students acted as sports facilitators in parks for kids. The loss of this program has hurt informal play. Participants said they would like to see this program return, along with other grassroots programs for kids to promote physical activity and provide more opportunities for lower income kids to try sports.

Safety and crime prevention in parks:

Investigating ways to improve safety. To make parks, recreation and sport facilities safer, participants suggested ensuring parks, baseball diamonds and trails be well lit at night for park users and commuters; investigating and improving unsafe cycling infrastructure (Old South, Woodfield, downtown); and providing Wi-Fi in parks and facilities.

Education. Participants suggested that education could be provided around helmet use, concussions, and awareness on how the design of public spaces can affect health.
Working Together

Participants identified the following ways that organizations, the City and others can work together to meet future needs:

Consultation:

**Continued consultation.** Participants said they appreciated being consulted and highlighted the importance of maintaining communication with stakeholder organizations. They said it is especially important to consult organizations on the design of new facilities to ensure needs are met and to avoid having to alter or renovate a facility after it is built. Specific suggestions related to consultation included:

- Meet with the cricket hard ball clubs together and the cricket tape-ball clubs together.
- Consult with the disability community and the organizations that serve them before, during and after construction of facilities.
- Take consultation to the community groups and neighbourhoods rather than asking groups to come downtown.
- Continue dialogue with the Urban League and other neighbourhood interests to meet emerging parks, recreation and sport needs and avoid missing out on opportunities.
- Continue working with developers to identify growth opportunities so both the City and the development community can be successful.
- Connect with Vision Loss Rehabilitation, they are willing to provide input into City projects and activities (e.g. pathway winter maintenance: ClearingOurPath.ca).
- Consult Participation House, they are will to consult on projects that require accessibility input.

**Ongoing communication and notification.** Participants suggested a number of ways to strengthen communication between organizations, the City, and communities going forward, including creating an online calendar for community groups/organizations to post their events. This could help reduce duplication and improve coordination of what is going on in communities for both volunteers and participants. They suggested continuing to provide opportunities for groups to meet and discuss issues.

Partnerships:

**Partnering with other levels of governments and private organizations.** Participants suggested working with local schools and other private facilities that may have capacity to host sports and recreation events, including tournaments. There was also a suggestion to connect with and seek support from the provincial and federal government and international organizations.

**Continue working with and encouraging volunteers.** Participants said they continue to work with their volunteers to improve parks, recreation and sport facilities. They suggested finding ways to encourage more residents to volunteer and help create a sense of ownership of parks and recreation facilities in the City of London.
**Partnerships.** Participants suggested that the City maintain, enhance, and be open to new partnerships with private organizations. Such partnerships could provide funding to make facilities more accessible; fundraise for various causes; and augment City capital projects on City owned and privately-owned lands. Continuing to partner with Western University to access their amenities was also suggested.

**Funding:**

**Identify and fill funding gaps.** There was a suggestion for the City to work across departments to identify funding gaps and solutions related to parks, recreation and sport facilities.

**Specific suggestions:**

Participants suggested a number of ways that their organizations, the City, and others could work together on actions that would meet future needs of a diverse and changing demographic, including:

- Develop multi-use (instead of single-use) facilities that benefit many groups of users.
- Consider emerging health needs of London’s aging population in the development of new programming and facilities.
- Provide more accessible facilities, equipment, and services.
- Provide family focused services and activities.
- Provide programming and services in a variety of languages.
- Consider more inclusive programming that responds to individualized needs (e.g. private swim times for women).
- Focus on underserved populations.
- Ensure the Master Plan is reflective of all demographics so the Council of the day is aware of the needs of the broadest community.
- Develop financial partnerships with organizations to help cover capital costs. Investigate ways to provide financing to organizations that can be repaid overtime.

**Next Steps**

At the end of each Stakeholder Input Session the consultant team and City staff thanked participants for their time and feedback and provided them with a brief overview of next steps in the process, including:

- All feedback received at the sessions will be summarized in a report, which will be shared with participants in draft prior to being finalized and posted to the project website;
- Additional opportunities to participate are currently underway and will continue to take place throughout the summer, which participants are encouraged to promote with members of their organizations;
- The consultant team and City staff will share and seek feedback on the Draft Master Plan recommendations later in the year; and
- The consultant team and City staff are targeting to present the Draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan to City Council in early 2019.
Attachment 1 – Agenda (Stakeholder Input Session)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session #1</th>
<th>Session #2</th>
<th>Session #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 28, 2018</td>
<td>May 30, 2018</td>
<td>June 4, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 – 9:00 pm</td>
<td>6:30 – 9:00 pm</td>
<td>6:30 – 9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill Industries</td>
<td>Kiwanis Seniors’</td>
<td>Goodwill Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255 Horton Street East</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>255 Horton Street East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6:30pm  Welcome

Scott Stafford, Managing Director, Parks & Recreation
Lynne Livingstone, Managing Director, Neighbourhood, Children & Fire Services

6:35  Introductions and Agenda Review

Matthew Wheatley, Swerhun Facilitation

6:40  Project Overview

Steve Langlois, Monteith Brown Planning Consultants

7:10  Facilitated Discussions

Focus Questions:
1. How do parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities in the City of London make a difference to your community and organization?
2. How has your group’s usage of parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities changed over the last few years? Why has it changed?
3. What are the most pressing challenges and priorities facing your organization?
4. How can parks, recreation programs, sports services and facilities continue to support the needs of your organization? Please be specific.
5. How can your organization, the City and others work together to meet future needs?

8:40  Wrap Up & Next Steps

9:00  Adjourn
Attachment 2 – Participant Lists

Session #1 – May 28, 2018

Participants: 21
- Argyle Community Association
- London Beefeaters Football
- Byron Community Organization
- Can-Bike
- Cranbrook Community Association
- Elgin Middlesex Soccer Association
- Forest City Cricketers
- London Children's Connection - WFC
- London Cricket Club
- London Curling Club
- London Cycle Link
- London Minor Football
- London Public Library
- London Skating Club
- Piccadilly Area Neighbourhood Association
- Street Soccer London

Session #2 – May 30, 2018

Participants: 7
- Abilities in Motion (AIM)
- London Aquatic Club
- London Development Institute
- London Junior Knights
- Orchard Park/Sherwood Forest Ratepayers

Session #3 – June 4, 2018

Participants: 21
- Argyle Community Association
- Forest City Derby Girls
- LCRC Lambeth
- London Blizzards Sledge Hockey Club
- London Centennial Wheelers
- Middlesex-London Health Unit
- Old South Community Organization
- Participation House London
- ReForest London
- Sunday Night Slo-pitch League
- SW London Baseball
- Third Age Outreach, St. Joseph’s Health Care London
- Vision Loss Rehabilitation Ontario
Attachment 3 – Questions of Clarification

At each session participants asked questions of clarification prior to the facilitated discussions. The questions and responses provided are included below. All responses from the consultant team and City staff are noted in italics.

Stakeholder Input Session #1: Goodwill Industries (May 28th)

1. Do you have the demographics forecasting broken out by ages? Yes, we have information related to the different age groups that will inform the updated Master Plan. Generally, we know that the baby boomer generation has the highest growth rate and youth have the lowest.

2. I understand that the Cycling Master Plan is separate, how much can the Parks and Recreation Master Plan affect the Thames Valley Parkway, which runs through a park? The Cycling Master Plan integrates on-street cycling routes and off-road routes such as the Thames Valley Parkway. However, through the Parks & Recreation Master Plan we can look at whether there is a need for a separate cycling path through parks or additional pathways in parks.

Stakeholder Input Session #2: Kiwanis Seniors’ Community Centre (May 30th)

1. Did this study’s demographic data come from the work done through Development Finance’s Development Charges Study (by Watson and Associates)? Yes, it did.

2. The City is undergoing a Development Charges Study that looks at growth over next 10 years, the outcomes of which are due in a year. How does this Master Plan fit in with that? Ideally this Master Plan update would have come before the Development Charges Study, but the City is working to make sure the two are integrated. While the timing isn’t perfectly aligned, we have enough information to be able to influence what happens in the Development Charges Study.

Stakeholder Input Session #3: Goodwill Industries (June 4th)

1. Does the final report analysis and trends include impact of increased heat in summer temperatures? Yes. Shade, built infrastructure and many other options are important and will be considered.

2. What is being done to ensure integrity of survey data? Can you limit individuals to only one response, so a person cannot skew the data with multiple responses? Online surveys are helpful because they allow for broader access, but it’s true that this is a limitation. It can be hard to limit responses to one individual for a variety of reasons: for example, we can’t limit participation by IP addresses because places with public computers, like libraries, are meant to provide access to more than one person. We do look for trends in the data, for example, looking for waves of input that are excessively similar. That aside, the survey is one of several inputs, including sessions like today, which we look to. We are doing outreach to get representative populations as well. Different tactics help smooth out the data.

3. I am disappointed to see cycling is not part of Parks and Recreation Master Plan. The City’s plan for cycling is only based on transportation. Transportation plans are only a small piece of puzzle. We are looking at strategic plans down to master plans, using all of them to feed down into our own work. We will look to transportation plans to integrate with the Parks and Recreation Master Plan to address cycling matters.
Appendix E  Targeted Focus Group Summaries

Focus Group Summary 1: Organizations Serving Newcomers & Immigrants

Overview

On June 4th, 2018 the City of London hosted a focus group with organizations that work with newcomers and immigrants as part of its consultation on the Parks & Recreation Master Plan. The purpose of the focus group was to engage, raise awareness, and learn about the challenges and priorities of organizations that provide service and support to groups that face barriers to participation as well as discuss ideas and opportunities to be considered within the Master Plan.

The focus group began with an overview presentation outlining the process being followed to update the Master Plan, including additional ways organizations and the clients they serve can get involved and share feedback. Following the presentation participants participated in a facilitated discussion guided by a series of focus questions (see Attachment 2 for the meeting agenda and focus questions). 5 people representing 3 organizations (College Boreal, the YMCA of Western Ontario, and the Cross-Cultural Learner Centre) participated in the focus group.

This summary was written by Swerhun Facilitation, a third-party facilitation firm that is part of the consultant team led by Monteith Brown Planning Consultants that has been retained by the City of London to assist with the development of the Parks & Recreation Master Plan. This summary is not intended to provide a verbatim transcript of the focus group but instead provides a high-level summary of the perspectives and advice shared by participants during the facilitated discussion. This summary was shared with participants in draft prior to being finalized.

Summary of Feedback

This section provides a summary of the feedback shared at the meeting, organized according to four themes from the focus questions, including:

1. Coordination, Use, and Funding
2. Factors and Trends
3. Gaps and Improvements
4. Working Together

Coordination, Use, and Funding

Participants shared the different roles their organizations play in the coordination, use, and funding of parks, recreation programs, sport services and facilities, including:
• Raising awareness. Participants from all three organizations said one of the primary ways they help their clients access parks and recreation facilities and programs is through raising awareness of City run programs and facilities, including Spectrum Programs.

• Renting City facilities. A representative of the Cross Cultural Learner Centre (CCLC) said they sometimes rent City owned facilities to offer sports programs, noting that any available discounts offered by the City would be helpful to their organization and their clients.

• Collaborating through facilities. Representatives from the YMCA said they run various programs through two City owned facilities, including the Bostwick and Stoney Creek Community Centres. They noted that there are many opportunities for the City and the YMCA to collaborate within these facilities.

• Providing subsidies. The YMCA noted that they often provide temporary free memberships and ongoing subsidized memberships to newcomers to help them get involved and stay active.

Factors and Trends

Participants identified factors and trends impacting their organizations’ and clients’ use of parks, recreation, sport services and facilities, including:

• Youth are looking for workplace training and leadership opportunities. CCLC said youth are looking for programs that will help them prepare for the workplace. For example, the Spectrum Program could include safe food handling programs or resume building workshops.

• Newcomers are looking for social experiences as part of the recreation and sports experiences. Socializing is a really important aspect of recreation activities for newcomers and providing facilities that allow for a range of such activities is important.

• Youth interest in sports. Basketball and soccer currently seem to be really big sports for youth. More girls seem to be interested in volleyball. There is also interest in soccer and cricket among adult males, and fitness and computers among adult females.

• Language can be a barrier to accessing programs. Accessing programs or even knowing they exist can be a real problem because of the language barrier for newcomers.

Gaps and Improvements

Participants identified gaps and provided the following suggestions for improvements to parks, recreation, sport services and facilities, including:

• Provide subsidies. Offering free or subsidized membership can help get people involved and active. It would be helpful to families if the Play Your Way subsidy allocation could be shared between family members so parents could transfer their allocations to their kids if they aren’t using it.
• Recreation activities can be a new experience for newcomers. Having entry level activities (for beginners) can have a big impact.

• Technology can be a barrier. Many newcomers have no or limited access to computers, which can make it difficult for them to access and sign-up for programs.

• Provide multi-lingual staff/facilitators. Staff that speak the most common languages can help people learn about what’s available and sign-up for programs. They could even run the programs. Multi-language materials were requested.

• Coordinating programming for the entire family. It can be difficult for families to get their kids to different programs in different locations across the city. Coordination of multi-age activities would be very helpful for families. It would be even better if there were programs for adults/parents coordinated at the same time as programs for children/youth, as well. Such an approach might even allow parents to use more of their funding/subsidy from the City.

• Female-only swimming lessons, programs and environment. Additional female-only swim lessons and programs would be helpful and would strengthen the current offerings. Facilities need to be configured in such a way that allows for privacy during female-only programming (e.g., curtains), with consideration of female lifeguards.

• Safety through design and education. Participants said people often report that they don’t feel safe in London’s downtown parks and have experienced violence, racism, and sexism. There was a discussion around how park design can help increase safety and reduce crime. Participants questioned whether the City’s R-Zone Policy for facilities (which can result in someone being banned from a facility for certain types of behaviour) is, or could be, used for parks. Participants also suggested that a diversity and inclusion strategy could help, noting that educating the community about newcomers can be important to help reduce incidents of sexism and racism.

• Distribute specialized services and programs throughout the City. Participants said if specialized programs are only located in one place it can be difficult for people to get to them. Facilities need to be accessible by transit.

• Subsidizing transportation. Participants said they’ve found that seniors on fixed incomes and others with low-incomes are reluctant to pay for transportation to get to facilities and programs. When CCLC provided bus tickets they saw increased turn out to programs. Once people are able to get to the facility, they participate in more than just the fitness classes – they socialize, build community, check on each other, and tell one another about different programs.

• Improve the booking/reservations process. Participants said clients don’t always understand that they need to book facilities/spaces in order to use them, or they don’t know which ones need to be booked. If it is not being used they will just go and use it.
Have Play Your Way applications online. It would be helpful if organizations could submit applications online.

Working Together

Participants identified the following suggestions for working together in the provision of parks, recreation, sport services and facilities, including:

- Neighbourhood Service Days. Participants said this is a great model that could be expanded by: staff taking computers with registration systems to libraries and family centres to help people register; coordinate with organizations when these days are happening, so they can inform their clients; and include translators to make these initiatives more effective.

- Have City staff come to organizations. Participants said it would be great to have Parks & Recreation staff attend the programs they run to explain what additional programs are available, subsidies offered, etc. to help raise awareness and get people involved. Having translation would be great. College Boreal said they could organize seminars with City staff.

Attachment 1 – Agenda

Focus Group

Monday, June 4, 2018
10:00 – 11:30 am
Central Library, 251 Dundas St. Tonda Room

Proposed Agenda

10:00 am Welcome
10:05 Introductions and Agenda Review
10:15 Overview Presentation
10:30 Facilitated Discussion

Focus Questions:
1. What role does your organization play in the coordination, usage, and/or funding of parks, recreation, sport services, and facilities? Has this role changed in recent years?
2. What factors and trends are impacting your organization’s and your clients’ use of parks, recreation, sport services, and facilities?
3. What types of parks, recreation, sport services, and facilities would you like to see improved and why? Are there gaps?
4. How can we address these gaps? What criteria should be used to identify priorities?
5. How can the City continue to work effectively with others in the provision of parks, recreation, sport services, and facilities (including with organizations such as yours)?

11:20 Wrap Up & Next Steps

11:30 pm Adjourn

Attachment 2 – Participant List

Newcomers and Immigrant Focus Group

Number of participants: 5

Participating organizations

- College Boreal
- YMCA of Western Ontario
- Cross Cultural Learner Centre
Focus Group Summary 2: Organizations Serving Low-Income and/or Homeless Populations

Overview

On July 12th, 2018 the City of London hosted a focus group with organizations that work with people experiencing homelessness and low-income as part of its consultation on the Parks & Recreation Master Plan. The purpose of the focus group was to raise awareness about the Master Plan process; to engage organizations that provide service and support to groups that face barriers to participation and learn about their challenges and priorities; and discuss their ideas and opportunities to be considered within the Master Plan.

The focus group began with an overview presentation outlining the process being followed to update the Master Plan, including additional ways organizations and the clients they serve can get involved and share feedback. Following the presentation, participants engaged in a facilitated discussion guided by a series of focus questions (see Attachment 1 for the meeting agenda and focus questions). 8 people representing 5 organizations participated in the focus group (see Attachment 2 for the participant list).

This summary was written by Swerhun Facilitation, a third-party facilitation firm that is part of the consultant team led by Monteith Brown Planning Consultants that has been retained by the City of London to assist with the development of the Parks & Recreation Master Plan. This summary is not intended to provide a verbatim transcript of the focus group but instead provides a high-level summary of the perspectives and advice shared by participants during the facilitated discussion. This summary was shared with participants in draft prior to being finalized.

Summary of Feedback

This section provides a summary of the feedback shared at the meeting.

Parks are an important resource for people experiencing homelessness. Participants noted that people who are homeless spend a lot time during the day in public parks. Some of the reasons for this are that they are required to leave shelters during the day and/or they have often been banned from other places. Some participants said their outreach teams work in parks to help people who are homeless connect with available resources.

Parks should be a welcoming and safe space for everyone. Participants said that while many people who are homeless use parks frequently they often don’t feel welcome and as a result have found places where they won’t be seen or approached. Participants suggested using a harm reduction approach that focuses on identifying and meeting the needs of people who are homeless, not treating them as though they are committing a crime or nuisance. Participants identified a number of ways the needs of people who are homeless could be met in parks, including:

- expanding safe needle disposal facilities and garbage and recycling receptacles;
• keeping washrooms open longer and providing access to showers and sinks;
• installing additional benches and water fountains;
• providing access to food through the use of community gardens.

Use parks and facilities to help create a sense of belonging. Participants suggested using creative and culturally appropriate installations and activities in parks and facilities to promote a sense of belonging for all, especially those who are marginalized. Existing installations and activities identified as good examples included, Rainbow Crosswalks and the City’s recognition of Indigenous Solidarity Day and Full Moon Ceremonies. The Medicine Wheel was suggested as an additional installation that could be used to show that everyone deserves respect.

Develop de-escalation strategies and policies to reduce the number of people being banned from facilities. Participants noted that many people experiencing homelessness and mental health issues have been banned from facilities because of disruptive or unsafe behaviour. There were suggestions to provide staff with additional training to help de-escalate situations that may result in individuals being banned or arrested. There was also a suggestion to create a strategy to allow people to regain access to facilities if/when appropriate.

Connect with Indigenous People to understand and help promote the healing power of parks. Participants said that parks present a real opportunity for healing, especially for Indigenous People. It was noted that parks could be used for healing through the use of therapeutic spaces that help people reconnect with the natural environment. Participants said it is important to acknowledge and respect Indigenous People and their practices in parks and natural spaces. It was also noted that many traditional medicines grow naturally in parks, which should be recognized and promoted.

Consult organizations that serve people experiencing homelessness before implementing policies. Participants suggested City staff continue to consult organizations that serve people experiencing homelessness. They said they could help the City identify potential issues with policies that may impact people who are homeless before they are implemented.
Attachment 1 – Agenda

Focus Group

Monday, July 12, 2018
1:00 – 2:30 pm
Central Library, 251 Dundas St. Tonda Room

Proposed Agenda

1:00 pm   Welcome
1:05      Introductions and Agenda Review
1:15      Overview Presentation
1:25      Facilitated Discussion

Focus Questions:
1.  What role does your organization play in the coordination, usage, and/or funding of parks, recreation, sport services, and facilities? Has this role changed in recent years?
2.  What factors and trends are impacting your organization’s and your clients’ use of parks, recreation, sport services, and facilities?
3.  What types of parks, recreation, sport services, and facilities would you like to see improved and why? Are there gaps?
4.  How can we address these gaps? What criteria should be used to identify priorities?
5.  How can the City continue to work effectively with others in the provision of parks, recreation, sport services, and facilities (including with organizations such as yours)?

2:25     Wrap Up & Next Steps
2:30 pm  Adjourn

Attachment 2 – Participant List

Low-Income & Homelessness Organizations

Number of participants: 8

Participating organizations

• Atlohsa Native Family Hearing Service
• London Cares
• The Salvation Army Centre for Hope
• United Way
• Unity Project
Focus Group Summary 3: Organizations Serving Persons with Disabilities

Overview

On July 5th, 2018 the City of London hosted a focus group with organizations that work with persons with disabilities as part of its consultation on the Parks & Recreation Master Plan. The purpose of the focus group was to raise awareness about the Master Plan process; to engage organizations that provide service and support to groups that face barriers to participation and learn about the challenges and priorities; and discuss their ideas and opportunities to be considered within the Master Plan.

The focus group began with an overview presentation outlining the process being followed to update the Master Plan, including additional ways organizations and the clients they serve can get involved and share feedback. Following the presentation participants engaged in a facilitated discussion guided by a series of focus questions (see Attachment 1 for the meeting agenda and focus questions). 6 people representing 6 organizations participated in the focus group (see Attachment 2 for the participant list).

This summary was written by Swerhun Facilitation, a third-party facilitation firm that is part of the consultant team led by Monteith Brown Planning Consultants that has been retained by the City of London to assist with the development of the Parks & Recreation Master Plan. This summary is not intended to provide a verbatim transcript of the focus group but instead provides a high-level summary of the perspectives and advice shared by participants during the facilitated discussion. This summary was shared with participants in draft prior to being finalized.

Summary of Feedback

This section provides a summary of the feedback shared at the meeting. Responses provided by City staff and the consultant team are noted in italics.

*Increased desire for integration.* Participants said they are seeing a significant increase in the desire from the individuals and families they work with for more integration. They said parents and children with disabilities want to have the same experiences that others without disabilities or special needs have.

*Create a public inventory of facilities’ accessible features and equipment.* Participants said it is very important for individuals with disabilities to know which facilities are accessible and what accessible equipment is available. They noted that a facility may be listed as accessible but may not have the specific equipment they require. For example, there may be a ramp to get into a facility with a pool but no lift to get into the pool.

Participants suggested creating a single coordinated resource people could contact to get information about facility accessibility to ensure there is consistent information. They also suggested putting pictures on the City’s website of different facilities to show what
accessible equipment they offer and identifying accessibility features in the Spectrum Program Guide.

**Use of facilities and parks.** Participants noted that their organizations use City operated facilities and outdoor space to run their own programs and host fundraisers. They also said they have difficulty running activities at parks as there are always a lot of other people in the park who don’t respect the booked space.

**Use of City run programs.** Participants said that the individuals and families they serve appreciate the efforts made by City staff to serve individuals with disabilities. The success of the Camps on TRACK program was mentioned. It was also noted that some individuals, especially those with higher needs, are often unable to participate in many programs because they are geared towards higher functioning individuals. As result, those with higher needs can be segregated and left out.

**Add more programs during the day.** Participants said many of the adults they work with don’t have a typical 9:00 to 5:00 work schedule and would benefit from additional programs being run during the day. They mentioned specifically cooking programs in fully accessible spaces so chairs can slide under the counters. They also said that families would benefit from additional after school programs for children with disabilities.

**Perform accessibility audits.** Participants suggested the City do an accessibility audit of all their facilities. There was also a suggestion for the City to hire individuals with different disabilities to help perform audits. *City staff noted that they are currently working with the March of Dimes to perform an accessibility audit with the intention that the City would be able to do their own audits going forward.*

**Improve accessible transportation.** It was noted that there can be a two to three day wait when booking accessible transportation, which can act as a significant barrier to the use of parks and recreation facilities for people with disabilities. Participants suggested the City investigate partnerships with organizations that work with people with disabilities to offer more frequent and flexible transportation.

**Continue consultation.** Participants said they appreciated this focus group and suggested the City continue to consult people with disabilities to understand issues and needs with facilities and programs. They noted that it is important to consult people with a variety of different disabilities to fully understand the range of needs. They also said it is important to hold consultations before and during the construction of facilities to identify and address potential issues in advance.

**Specific programs and facilities.** Participants identified specific programs, facilities and equipment they feel would benefit people with disabilities, including:

- Sensory friendly programs with smaller group sizes and additional staff for people with autism.
- Accessible cooking and kitchen facilities.
- Additional accessible changerooms, especially for people who use wheelchairs.
- Sledge hockey equipment and programs for kids. There was a suggestion to run a “learn to sledge” program, similar to the “learn to skate” program. It was also suggested that this program could be integrated with “learn to skate” program – at same time in a different area of the ice and allow siblings to take the sledge learn to skate as well.
- More support needed for children to integrate into camps. First couple of days are always very difficult but after that they settle in – being sent home on day 1 or 2 of a camp is not acceptable – just need more patience.

Attachment 1 – Agenda

Focus Group

Thursday, July 5, 2018
1:00 – 2:30 pm
Central Library, 251 Dundas St. Tonda Room

Proposed Agenda

1:00 pm  Welcome
1:05  Introductions and Agenda Review
1:15  Overview Presentation
1:25  Facilitated Discussion

Focus Questions:
1. What role does your organization play in the coordination, usage, and/or funding of parks, recreation, sport services, and facilities? Has this role changed in recent years?
2. What factors and trends are impacting your organization’s and your clients’ use of parks, recreation, sport services, and facilities?
3. What types of parks, recreation, sport services, and facilities would you like to see improved and why? Are there gaps?
4. How can we address these gaps? What criteria should be used to identify priorities?
5. How can the City continue to work effectively with others in the provision of parks, recreation, sport services, and facilities (including with organizations such as yours)?

2:20  Wrap Up & Next Steps
2:30 pm  Adjourn
Attachment 2 – Participant List

Persons with Disabilities Focus Group

Number of participants: 6

Participating organizations

- Abilities in Motion
- Community Living London
- Participation House Support Services
- London Blizzard Sledge Hockey
- Thames Valley Children’s Centre
- Thames Valley Children’s Centre – Youth Council
Focus Group Summary 4: Organizations Serving Indigenous Communities

Discussion with Journey Together Planning Table

June 18, 2018

Past Activities

Historically consultation has occurred without action or recognition of the Indigenous voice which has led to disengagement and lack of trust of the City of London processes.

- What is the Indigenous voice that informs city policy?
- What is the role of the City of London’s Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Committee? Attended in the past and was excluded from voting.
- Why is there no Indigenous voice at that table or at the committee formed by Council?

Future Engagement

Can be accomplished by building relationships, capacity, and acknowledging the land, sport origins, and truth and reconciliation.

Need for greater understanding of planning opportunities and making clear and public what all the opportunities are for having their voice heard. Input needs to be dealt with meaningfully.

When you develop relationships with Indigenous people (not just during planning periods), planning together is better.

When engaging be kind, respectful and soft spoken. Use two ears and only one mouth. Be open to hearing things that mean change.

Build capacity in the community to participate in planning for recreation at a decision-making level – hiring Indigenous staff, leadership in strategic plan.

Use Indigenous –methodology, decision makers, and staff, build capacity and implement changes

Engage with local First Nations of the Traditional territory upon the land which it is built. i.e., clear cutting for development that includes parks, protection of natural spaces.

Ask staff who work directly with families for perspectives

Go outside into nature and be connected to mother earth to have conversations and discussions about mother earth
A collective indigenous voice is needed in London – would help with engagement – including partners that are using event spaces, parks etc. Currently individuals have no voice.

Last Census undercounted Indigenous population in London at 9,000 individuals. Service providers know there are likely closer to 20,000 within the City limits.

Important to collect statistics on Indigenous participation. This can be done confidentially and needs to include clear messaging about why data is being collected. i.e., passing an iPad around the room

How will we know when we see meaningful change? (further discussion needed around this)

**Building Relationships and Capacity**

Be more visible at Indigenous events and in communities, this helps to change the perception in the city –not just during planning times.

Share about partnerships publicly – use the media- make the relationship the City has with Indigenous people more visible. Indigenous community members need to know that the City of London is working with Indigenous people to acknowledge the historical relationship

Make acknowledgement of the land and traditional territories more visible in the community to educate the public on the relationship to the traditional territory and the relationship – at facilities and parks

Recognition of Truth and Reconciliation is necessary (see specific call to actions related to sport #87-91)

Hire Indigenous staff so Indigenous people will see themselves and know that staff understand their experiences

Train staff in history and cultural competence specifically about Indigenous peoples so families know that they are understood, including and particularly casual staff who are customer facing. Must know the history and its impact on families

Provide information about Indigenous peoples within recreation facilities and acknowledge the territory

Acknowledgement of the origins of traditional games should be made visible. One way this could be achieved is to create a mural at Kinsmen arena, where most lacrosse is played, that acknowledges the origins of the game. Celebrate the origins of the game by inviting dancers to open the start of tournaments.

Make visible the relationship with Indigenous people and to the territory though the inclusion of artwork and information about the territory
Keep reconciliation at top of mind at all times.

**Participation in Programs/Services/Ceremony/Events/Sport**

**Registration**

Printed Spectrum guides must be made available at Indigenous centres and printed application forms for subsidy made available

Adapt marketing to fit the population you are trying to serve

Partner with Indigenous events and locations to offer outreach registration opportunities for Spectrum and subsidy

Provide the opportunity to register and apply for subsidy in all community centre locations

**Programming**

Gap in Indigenous programming available through Spectrum. Create program opportunities in partnership with Indigenous organizations. These would be Indigenous-led, within Indigenous spaces and content that appeals to Indigenous families – traditional languages, arts and crafts, cooking, sport etc.

Good example was a program with the Grand Theatre that assisted Indigenous kids 8-13 to write plays and perform over an 8 week period.

**Creating Safe Spaces**

Recreation and community centres currently are not considered safe spaces for the Indigenous community. (needs to be explored further). It is not just about staff and programs but about other participants, parents, general public and overt racism making the spaces feel unsafe.

One idea – incorporate Indigenous art into the centres

**Park Space**

Parks need to have adequate washroom and handwashing facilities and shade for families that must travel a long distance by bus to attend events

Provide information about plant and animal species within parks to help educate families and children

Recognize the traditional territory of the park in all London parks

Highlight the importance of the forks of the river and provide care for the trees planted there. Bring media attention to this to help inform Londoners. This again makes the relationship visible.
Dedicated large green spaces within parks in London is needed for various ceremonies. These spaces need to be close to the river and can accommodate a sacred fire. Information about the space should be clearly visible for the general public. Sometimes these fires are kept burning by family members for up to 4 days. (note different Nations have different ceremonial needs and should be recognized in planning for the space)

These spaces should be in the most densely populated parts of the City of London so everyone can access the space easily (see map of Census population provided to Journey Together planning table).

**Racism**

Many examples of incidents of racism. Sport is an area the City could make a difference. The City of London should take a leadership position to deal with racism within any sports organizations that use city facilities.

- Make a statement about racism in sport and the city ‘s stance – zero tolerance
- Develop standards for coaches, players, umpires, referees and parents
- Current RZone (Respect and Responsibility Zone) program needs to provide specific examples of unacceptable racist behaviour and how it should be dealt with
- Create a hotline for racist incidents under RZone
- Train staff in how to address incidents of racism in City facilities and provide adequate support. Need to better understand what racism looks like and a city employee’s role in addressing it
- Provide cultural awareness training to staff to support Indigenous families in recreation facilities i.e., be soft spoken, respectful and listen
- Use bulletin boards in recreation facilities to communicate to general public about RZone and be specific about zero tolerance for racism – provide specific examples
Focus Group Summary 5: London Child and Youth Network
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Organizational Role & Planning

LPL
- more arts and culture than recreation programs provided
- provide space for Spectrum programs
- conscious of programs offered so as not to compete with spectrum program usage – not a role at this time but very interested in using public spaces as “pop ups” etc. – library space pop up by wading pool would be awesome – CYN – Literacy/Built Env. initiative

London Bridge (large child care provider)/ Chelsea Green/Epilepsy SW Ontario
- do not use parks(LB)
- sometimes use Rowntree Park spray pad in the summer, sometimes don’t want to risk because of risk with items in the grass (CG)
- promote Spectrum/activities in Glen Cairn Park close but no time to do sweeps for needles (CG)
- annual run Kiwanis/Springbank but washrooms never open so why moved from City parks because never open on Sundays (City staff not responsive to opening the washrooms on Sundays for events) and Sundays tend to be open so need to be strategic when picking dates. Wonderland bus on Sundays not overly accessible (Epil)
- summer camps in parks/use spray pads which are great and can walk to them

NRCs (Crouch, South London, Glen Cairn Neighbourhood Resource Centres)
- booking parks for events
- use facilities for programs (ex. Pools)
- promote subsidy for Spectrum programs
  - not easy for clients (i.e., have to show ID, and having the right ID)
  - use library computer but still have to go to another location to show ID
- Hello Neighbour to help with registration – new Syrian refugees (SLNRC at South London Community Centre)
- Unique pieces as an NRC, brings in other pieces that make a facility a community hub
- Programming and events
- City does reach out more and come out – a lot more inclusive now

Healthline, Grand Ave Children’s Centre, Sari Therapeutic Riding
- Don’t use the facilities due to safety concerns but families themselves use the parks and spray pads
City of London
Parks and Recreation Master Plan – “What We’ve Heard So Far” Report

- Personal use, listing parks and recreation facilities and event listing for age information London
- Specific programming
- Sari – not much to do with city parks – huge waitlist for programming for children with disabilities… support is needed
- If the City could work with centres to meet their specific requirements (health and safety etc.) more centres would be able to use the spaces and increase the physical activity.

Thames Valley Children’s Centre, London Public Library
- TVCC summer camp would like to coordinate with the City of London. They are working more closely with the city than beforehand. More emphasis when we partner with others.
- LPL – shared facilities, Stoney Creek, Jalna at South London
- Great partnership – share space between both library and community centre
- Worked in planning to avoid duplication
- Collaboration – shared equipment and facilities cost
- Outreach to parks and day camps, adapted a park, clean park, taking programming to the park, nice community partnership
- Increase partnership with community

Childreach/Merrymount/London Children’s Connection
- EarlyON program in parks – increased usage over time – they have a direct impact on programming
- Knowledge exchange – make sure people know what’s in their neighbourhood
- Facilities
  - EarlyON programs at CHOCC, Boyle and Lambeth (+10 years ChildReach) – awesome relationship
  - Stronach EarlyON (10+ year relationship) (Merrymount). Connector for neighbourhood, walkable, awesome staff
  - Facilities grounds are great introduction into City Services
  - Usage of major park depending on weather
  - Appreciate ESA space because wild and natural spaces – less busy compared to City facilities
- Kiwanis and Medway (LCC) – unique outdoor and indoor programs
- IMPORTANT – don’t pay for space
Factors & Trends

LPL

- What we want to do – people in families are increasingly busy, so not able to come to libraries
- Hearing that needles are impacting parents (families) with respect to safety in parks and public spaces
- Cycling, 2 pathways needed for walking and cycling separated – makes parents nervous when bikes whip past
- Geese (their poop!!)
- The Library distributes the Spectrum print program guide. A couple of years ago, print numbers of these were decreased with the expectation that people would go online for this information. We hear complaints repeatedly when these run out and that the website isn’t user friendly.

LB/CG/Epil

- Community gardens are a great asset – there are inclusive and accessible
- Epilepsy is appreciative of the improvements to accessibility for transportation and bike paths
- Lots of clients walk/take bike so needs to be accessible – north to south is hard
- Central events good for accessibility like Victoria Park
- Newcomer families are used to doing low-cost activities; picnics in the parks and using parks as they are free
- Low cost/free sports help families with low incomes ex. Vauxhall basketball low cost option
- Families love cultural events in summer in Victoria Park
- Visual representation of parks/rec/ needs to be more newcomer families – other languages and images.
- Help finding where you could go for events/activities
- Parks help build a sense of community and help families talk/meet each other
- Pools that are accessible for people with disabilities
- Would like to see community centres as hubs for community partners to utilize to check in and use to meet families
- Water for children with complex needs – temperature of the pools is important to make it more accessible, also climbing activities for these kids who may be larger

Healthline, Grand Ave Children's Centre, Sari Therapeutic Riding

- GACC – when was the last time the property was maintained, the equipment and the sand? Parks are geared more toward older children, not appropriate for younger children.
- Sari – chose county camps because of support requirement (volunteers are present) parents train the staff/volunteers as to the needs of the children.
• Accessible parks (need more) or more sections in parks that are accessible.

Thames Valley Children’s Centre, Public Library
• Geography – using parks that are nearby
• Ready accessible transportation – having access to buses to be able to get to the parks, pools, library etc.
• Not enough community centres – can’t always meet the needs of the community (availability)

Childreach/Merrymount/London Children’s Connection
• Trends:
  o Increased public knowledge of outdoor play (depth of evidence is increasing participation)
  o Minimizing screen time – Healthy Kids Community Challenge themes
  o Social awareness – small changes = big impact
  o Risky play
  o Bigger availability of choice in parks – music installation, increased diversity in installation and key people engaged, speaks to increased number of people
• Factors:
  o Housing developments have less outdoor space – pushing people to our local parks
  o Need elements that attract people – shade, water, spray pad, bathrooms, change tables in both male and female bathrooms

Facility Improvements

LPL
• Communication channels – what are they?
• Levels/policies can be a barrier – City appears to have many levels and layers
• Who can one contact to explore possibilities for collaboration, etc.?
• Transportation – the systems all need to interconnect
• How does transportation impact usage? i.e., safe storage for bikes, etc.

LB/CG/Epil
• Accessibility of bathrooms on weekends
• More garbage cans/recycling for garbage and poop bags for animal waste
• Natural climbers and environments as opposed to formal metal climbers
• There is a need for larger climbing equipment for bigger kids
• Lots of facilities for general enjoyment there is a need for Class A facilities for competitive sports – not a huge issue but noticeable
  o Soccer facilities
Figure skating – don’t happen inside the city because of ice fees and facilities aren’t big enough to host these
- A lot of basketball courts outside are at schools and not at city parks
- Need to figure out what groups are interested in what sports and tailor those needs to the neighbourhood

NRCs
- Key to addressing barriers especially for vulnerable populations
- City organized information nights but it’s limited (advertising), hard to get people to come for a one off night – need to coordinate it with events already taking place
- Residents were consulted in the process of planning for the updates to the South London CC – consider doing this for all new builds
- NRCs is still difficult to access event supplies, tables, etc., have to pay for this, residents can access these supplies easier than organizations, residents need more support
- Renting space to use to run a fundraiser should be allowed
- Senior community centre – used space and brought in supplies and then renovated and told them to remove their stuff and told them they can’t use it anymore
- Low income areas facilities are in poor condition (Silverwood)

Healthline, Grand Ave Children’s Centre, Sari Therapeutic Riding
- More parks and playground equipment that is accessible and for younger children
- Need more discussion about what accessible means (sensory needs, Snoezelen areas) respond to other accessible needs
- More age appropriate equipment and spaces
- Specific hours geared to younger children

Thames Valley Children’s Centre, Public Library
- Cost – being aware of what is available, accessibility, open area can be hesitant for parents
- Free programs for people who meet certain criteria – examples yoga, financial literacy, tai chi, leisure activities
- Knowledge of what is available
- Funding – being able to access the services, families with children with special needs; timing of programs depending on age bracket
- Accessibility – making parks inclusive, accessible and safety

Childreach/Merrymount/London Children’s Connection
- Accessibility
- Diversity in assets
• Needle bins
• Garbage pickup and maintenance
• Water fountains – high need
• Pathways – so well used that it’s crowded and hard to use at times
• Outdoor fitness trails – built environment changes that provide opportunities to engage in physical activity
• Trail system could expand into county areas (Calgary as example)
• Homelessness

Gaps and Challenges

• Alignment with strategic priorities – Age Friendly, Child and Youth Network, London Strengthening Neighbourhoods Strategy and with public input

LB/CG/Epil

• Neighbourhood specific options: use resource centres to gauge what the residents need
• Look at what other cities are doing to set benchmark to make sure we are not falling behind; there are good ideas elsewhere

NRCs

• More sheltered spaces in parks – large
• Permanent needs boxes

Healthline, Grand Ave Children’s Centre, Sari Therapeutic Riding

• Discussion with specialized service providers about what accessible means. Speak with parents and caregivers about their child’s needs and wants.
• More shaded areas
• More alignment with Provincial requirements
• Criteria to identify priorities:
  o Neighbourhood need – is this the only accessible space?
  o Is it on a transportation route?
  o Is it maintained?’

Thames Valley Children’s Centre, Public Library

• Usability could be improved. It can be challenging for people to navigate a system and subsidy forms
• Families being able to navigate a website; making them user friendly, plain language
• Having a more in person presence, people may be not comfortable with computers
- Neighbourhood Service Days – they help with the in person communication, bringing the City services to where people are – increasing that face-to-face conversations – libraries can be a good avenue
- Looking at the demographics of the neighbourhoods – this information can help decide what built environment should be upgraded (ex. neighbourhood with more families has more playgrounds)

**Childreach/Merrymount/London Children’s Connection**

- Strong inventory of what already exists – build in areas that can leverage existing assets
- Beautiful sport facilities – how do we make more public spaces more attractive?
- Stop building plastic primary colour installations
  1. Need naturalized spaces that allow for exploration – How does learning happen? Boyle is a great example.
- Identify priorities:
  1. Usage rates
  2. Last time updated
  3. Where areas don’t have services
  4. Does the space service the entire lifespan?
  5. Represent cultural diversity

**Working Together**

- Make it clear on website who on can talk to
- Seems to be word of mouth right now who to talk to about new/other initiatives re these types of things
- Better understanding the needs of the orgs the City works with

**LB/CG/Epll**

- City promoting their rec services through community organizations and that we are having community events – city could attend and promote their programs and services
- E-blasts to organizations with services/new activities that would be happening for families
- Tailor the news by age group

**NRCs**

- More drop-in programs at parks and facilities

**Healthline, Grand Ave Children’s Centre, Sari Therapeutic Riding**

- Sit down with service providers, parents etc. to discuss their needs
- Ongoing communication with the public about what needs to be updated, maintained etc.
Blog for people to communicate needs, wants, Information London would be able to host this
Multi-generational spaces. Something to attract each person to the park.

Thames Valley Children’s Centre, Public Library
City coming to do Neighbourhood Service Days
Neighbourhood Decision Making – good to have library to vote, and accessible for people
Referrals:
  - Having staff knowledge – having them know what is happening so they can provide better referrals to their clients
  - City came to talk to the staff groups to be aware of what is being done/what is happening to be informed
  - This could help in building a long term relationship with City staff – not just every 10 years for a Master Plan
Presenting to people who are directly in contact with families, so they can better serve their families
Resources to have for families – puts the information out there – Family Centre Community Connectors could help play a role

Childreach/Merrymount/London Children’s Connection
Having service embedded in community
Ask people what they want throughout the process
Family Centres have always been great assets in neighbourhoods
Food Maps – connecting to local food environment
Neighbourhood Decision Making project

Other information gathered on sheets:
Knowledge to organizations on what is available and tailoring information
Get information out to families
Partnership with LPL
Neighbour Service Days
Cycling speeds on multi-use pathways
Goose poop!
EQUITY from accessibility lens
Gathering spaces in core
What accessibility means?
Discussion with specialized service providers e.g. Autism
Some agencies can’t use parks due to not compliant
Outdoor spaces – benefits of outside play shade, water, tree coverage
**Needles in parks
Focus Group Summary 6: Age Friendly London Network
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Kiwanis Senior’s Centre

- Too busy – need more space for these kinds of facilities
- Good place to go in the winter when you can’t get outside
- Social interaction very important
- Affordable – everyone pays the same amount
- Compared to Boys and Girls Club – Horton Street Seniors Centre – it is 5 times as much as Kiwanis, and YMCA is very expensive

Spectrum Programs

- Aquafit – the increase in price is always more for older adults than the general adult rates
- There is a stigma to apply for subsidy and seniors are too proud to apply - they shouldn’t have to apply
- Physical activity is so important for seniors – the City should be trying to get as many seniors active as possible so why charge? There has to be a balance between losing seniors who can’t afford it and the rates we charge – right now it’s cheaper to join a private fitness club since it’s $5 per swimming session
- Maybe cost should be lower for the physical activity programs
- If the City wants seniors to remain active they need to subsidize more. Charge the least you have to, to get the most people involved
- Is there anything wrong with the City subsidizing participation?

Proximity to where you live

- Many more seniors living in the Downtown areas – they don’t drive so Kiwanis is the only accessible place to walk to in the summer

Geese along pathways and in park

- This is a big problem
- If you want to increase participation then get rid of the geese
- The City currently has one sweeper dedicated to the Thames Valley Parkway and it is swept weekly, Springbank Park has a dedicated sweeper and it is done almost daily – problem is the number of geese and they poop every 4 minutes – you can never stay on top of it
- Has it become a public health issue yet? Because is should be.
Needles in Parks

- Identified as an issue – response by Parks Operations staff attending - No other municipalities in Ontario collect them; 3 million needles are given out and 1.8 million are collected – the rest end up in the garbage or just left in public places including parks

Urban Camping

- Identified as an issue
- Staff response: they have one staff person dedicated to dealing with “campers”

Facilities

- Ask seniors what they think about having separate seniors centres
- Being near a coffee shop is important
- Create some kind of community atmosphere in any kind of building – need for more Community Centres overall – look at the schools being closed
- Transplant the feeling at Kiwanis into other centres – get to know neighbours, create a sense of community
- Intergenerational great, but sometimes it’s nice to have seniors only so seniors can be seniors
- Satellites
  - One day per week is hardly enough
  - Good start for something bigger
  - Build the need
  - Ties into placemaking and places that build identity, ownership and sense of belonging
  - Supporting meeting place with appropriate means to get there – multiple modes of transportation available to attend
  - Offering seniors places to meet but it needs to be free
  - Programming needs to be made available but also just a place to gather rather than go to people’s homes – free places for meetings
  - Sports clubs – can’t afford to rent to have meetings or gatherings
- Goal and Objective of the Master Plan should be to support social aspect and be FREE!
Appendix F  Child’s Voice Submissions (sample)

Show us how you like to PLAY!

First name:  Juwn  Age:  9

Show us how you like to PLAY!

First name:  Ashton  Age:  11
Show us how you like to PLAY!

Tennis!

First name: Reed Age: 11

Show us how you like to PLAY!

First name: Brynair Age: 5
Show us how you like to PLAY!

First name: Matteo  Age: 11

Show us how you like to PLAY!

First name: Lian  Age: 7-8