PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY #2:  
Survey and Open House

Introduction
Public engagement is integral to the development of the Community Parks and Trails Strategy (CPTS). Overall, the process consists of an Advisory Committee of community representatives and two public Open Houses with corresponding online surveys. The following provides a summary of the second Open House and survey.

Executive Summary
The following Vision statement was developed after incorporating suggestions from the public process:

“A vibrant community where all residents can easily access community trails and local parks for recreation, exercise, social gathering and nature appreciation”.

With regards to the supply and distribution of Neighbourhood parkland, only a small majority of survey respondents agreed it is somewhat adequate. This sentiment is also reflected in the spatial analysis on the concept plan showing gaps in several localized areas. This is largely due to the size and shape of the land area in EA G that makes it particularly challenging to have an even distribution of community parks and trails.

With regards to water access, given the small response rate and the high level of community interest, it is recommended that a focused study and public survey of the potential water access sites should be undertaken including an inventory, development opportunities and priorities.

Support for the proposed community trail system was split with half the respondents requesting additional community trail connections. Expanding trails as opportunities arise during the development process is well supported.

The short-term priority identified during the process was improvements to existing Neighbourhood parks including Dashwood, Columbia Beach, Rivers Edge and San Pareil. Other priorities include expanding Water Access opportunities and acquiring land or rights of way for expansion of the trail system as opportunities arise.

Overview of Input Received
Both the Survey and Open House addressed similar content. Input was sought on: the draft Vision statement; adequacy of the Neighbourhood Parks supply and distribution; completeness of the proposed Community Trail network; and priorities for future action.

Fourteen (14) people attended the first Open House, held on May 22nd from 5:00 – 7:30pm at Oceanside Place.
Ten (10) people completed the online survey, which was available from May 22nd to June 5th, 2013 on the RDN website. It was also available in hard copy at the Workshop. Ninety (90%) of the respondents are from French Creek and the remaining 10% from Dashwood. This results in a skewing of the data. Given the small number of participants responding to the survey and attending the Open House, the results are viewed as a general indication at best. The conclusions drawn at this stage in the Strategy relies on staff knowledge and input from the Advisory Committee and the Electoral Area G POSAC.

**Vision Statement**

The proposed draft Vision statement was developed using key words chosen by residents in Survey #1. The respondents were very supportive of the proposed draft statement with minor suggestions. The vision statement is revised below to reflect public input:

“A vibrant community where all residents can easily access community trails and local parks for recreation, exercise, social gathering and nature appreciation”.

To what extent are you satisfied that the vision reflects your values and the kind of parks and trails system you hope will be created in your community?
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**Adequacy of existing Neighbourhood Parks supply**

A small majority of survey respondents (60%) somewhat agreed that the number and distribution of Neighbourhood park land was adequate. This is consistent with the spatial analysis on the Concept Plan that shows some areas being well serviced while others are not. (The Conceptual Plan shows the gaps in the provision of Neighbourhood parkland as the space in between the Neighbourhood parks shown as large circles). Electoral Area G is a challenging land base owing to its size and shape. The Electoral Area is divided into pockets and narrow corridors by natural and man-made features. The two urban areas, E & N railway, Island and Inland highways, Englishman River and French Creek all contribute to the challenge of providing a balanced system of community parks and trails. The one area that could be viewed as inadequate according to the spatial analysis is the Fourneau Way area south of Parksville and west of Top Bridge Community Park. There is some undeveloped private property in this neighbourhood so an opportunity may arise.
**Do you feel the number and distribution of Neighborhood Parks is adequate?**
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**Water Access sites**
Generally, the response to improved water access sites was positive with suggestions for signage that clearly indicates the property lines. Given the small response rate, a focused study and public survey of the potential water access sites should be undertaken including an inventory, development opportunities and priorities.

**Please check the ones that you support being improved.**
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**Completeness of the proposed Community Trail system**
Half (50%) of respondents were somewhat unsatisfied that this proposed Community Trail network. Respondents would like to see more community trail options shown on the plan. Some residents support the roadside trail along Highway 19A, while others prefer to have off-road trails.
Does this proposed trail system reflect the vision for an inter-connected community?

Short, Medium and Long-Term Priorities
As indicated in the graph below, a priority to improve existing Neighbourhood park sites was a consistent theme, specifically Dashwood, Columbia Beach, Rivers Edge and San Pareil. Acquiring linear parkland to expand the trail system, as opportunities arise, is also a priority. Expanding control and improving water access sites is also seen as an important opportunity that would benefit the Electoral Area. As noted earlier, acquiring Community parkland through the development process will need to be strategic. Neighbourhoods that are well served should look at cash-in-lieu options and limit new parkland dedication to the few areas that are devoid of Community parkland suitable as Neighbourhood Park.
In terms of priority how would you rate the following strategies?