

**City of Fredericton
Recreation Master Plan**

**Appendix B: Input from Final Public Meeting
to Review Draft Recreation Master Plan**

Appendix B Comments from Final Public Meetings to Present the Draft Recreation Master Plan

The draft Final Report for the City of Fredericton Recreation Master Plan was presented to Members of Council on Monday, October 6th and then made available on the City's web site. Three open public meetings were held on October 15th and 16th as well as a meeting with Staff on October 16th, to review the final draft and invite comments including items requiring edits. The following items reflect the participation and the comments received following those presentations. Edits (these would be items such as typographical edits, points of consistency between the full document and the Executive Summary, as well as points of clarification and accuracy) where required have been made in the Final Report. Most comments were not of this nature and did not result in changes to the Final Report. That said, many of these items are relevant to the ongoing delivery of recreation services and will be considered as part of the ongoing operation of the Recreation Division, within the context of the recommended directions of the Master Plan.

Each public meeting as well as the presentation to staff commenced with a half hour power point presentation that has been placed on the City's website. Following the presentation by the consultant participants were provided with an opportunity to ask questions. The points listed for each of the presentations were responded to by the consultant during the course of the meeting. Except where noted by way of italic comments following the participant's question(s) the response to these questions can be found by reading the full text of the Recreation Master Plan. The consultant's comments to these questions have not been repeated here.

AB 1: Public Presentation, Wednesday, October 15th

The initial Public Presentation was held on Wednesday, October 15th at Willie O'Ree Place, 7:00 PM. 23 members of the public attended. Comments from participants included the following points. Where comments result in a change to the report this has been noted.

- There is a need for more opportunities for pick-up activities on an informal drop-in basis (e.g., badminton, volleyball) as there is a feeling that organized groups and leagues get all of the gym time.
- Compared to other cities, how does Fredericton measure up?
- The poor quality of soccer fields needs to be addressed.
- Pleased with concept of 'Sports Hubs'.
- Good plan.
- Track and field infrastructure development in financial community or private partnerships (e.g., with track and field group) would be a good strategy.
- What is there for seniors within the plan?

- Would like an 8 lane, 50m pool but understand the costs to build and run such a facility. Felt that prior to building, a feasibility study – outlining the building and on-going maintenance cost was a good idea to ensure that it was financially sustainable.
- City needs to have designated off-leash trails for dogs. Need to incorporate a strategy similar to Halifax.
- Baseball fields used listed at 10 when it should be 15. *The City has identified 10 unlit hardball (baseball) fields, 1 lit hardball (baseball) field, 5 lit and 5 unlit softball diamonds.*
- User fees for those living in Oromocto limit use of City of Fredericton facilities.
- What is the definition of an ‘undeveloped park’? *This question resulted in a footnote in the Plan defining an undeveloped park*

AB 2: Presentation to Recreation Division Staff Thursday, October 16th:

Sixteen staff attended this session. Staff identified several edits for accuracy and clarification which have been made.

AB 3: Public Presentation, Thursday, October 16th

The second public presentation of the draft Master Plan was held at 2:00 PM at the Stepping Stone Senior Centre. Twenty One (21) members of the public attended. Their comments are noted below.

- A participant from the Northside Senior Centre would like to see that Centre run like Stepping Stone; Johnston Ave Senior Center needs a coordinator like Stepping Stone.
- Establish Royal Road as Recreation Hub.
- Indicate a schedule that the City should follow to deal with program details.
- One participant asked if the Plan recommend a second indoor pool?
- What data (demographic shift, etc) determines the view on a need of a 2nd indoor pool?
- Happy to see the City looking at healthy eating model.
- How does report refer to greater access to gymnasium? Any plan to move on this now?
- Need for City owned and operated gym facility.
- Why doesn't the City pursue tournaments to fill hotels and promote sport tourism?
- Why are there more outdoor pools on the Northside?
- Like that the Plan addresses everyone.
- Is it part of the Recreation Division mandate to host sports tournaments, run leagues and host tournaments for leagues?
- Community level recreation, should practices not be included in the Plan's summary for this?

- Is the YMCA a hub?
- Infrastructure Development – Where is the Small Craft Aquatic Center?
- Have not read the document but, seems that all that has been looked at and talked about refers to sport and sport related activities. Has heard nothing that refers to cultural side of recreation/how does the city define recreation?
- At what point does the City look at the consumer's perspective?
- City should realign departments to make services more user friendly are there any plans a corporate reorganization?
- One participant would like to see a 2 km loop of trail groomed and lit from 5 PM onward till about 10:30 PM to encourage community usage.

AB 4: Public Presentation, Thursday, October 16th

Twenty two participants attended the third and final public presentation of the draft Recreation Master Plan held at the Stepping Stone Senior Centre at 7:00 PM. Comments from that meeting included the following points.

- There is a need to clarify term 'Neighbourhood'. *The term as used in the context of the Recreation Master Plan is defined in the Plan document.*
- -Should the Plan not distinguish by walking distance (e.g., Minutes) where to situate facilities? *In a general manner it does and this can be found in the Plan document.*
- Plan does not mesh with philosophy of 'healthy living'.
- There is an inconsistency between the draft Final Report and the Executive Summary with respect to Action Step #41, and SD Fa 001. *This has been adjusted.*
- Meetings with UNB should be held to work in unison.
- Need an indoor track and this is not reflected in the draft plan.
- Good to see reference to barrier free access for persons with a disability. What does it mean?
- Good to see reference to soccer improvements (e.g., second artificial turf).
- There is no field time available for senior soccer.
- Need a second fieldhouse.
- Like the concept of recreation hubs.
- Working with partners to build needed facilities is a great idea.
- City should look at increasing the % of land dedication that developers need to provide to the city (up from 8%).
- Southside pool should be located where people can walk and bike to it.

- Community Gardens should be added to Plan (urban farming, organic gardens, etc.).
- Reference to the Library should be added to plan.
- What else is planned for development at Grant Harvey?
- Like the idea of many fields in one place – great idea - less driving for parents!
- When will a second artificial field be built?
- When will there be an artificial turf available for soccer shoulder season at an indoor arena?
- One person indicated that he was not using the currently available artificial turf as it costs too much.
- The plan is comprehensive and well thought-out.